

Contributions to the Discussion

"Cease Fire!" Partition Slogan

Editor:

Comrade Judd's elaborate defense of the "Editorial Tragedy" on Palestine fails, in my opinion, to clear that editorial of the basic charge leveled against it, namely, that it HEDGED on the partition question and evaded giving a POLITICALLY RELEVANT answer to the IMMEDIATE problem of Palestine.

For some mysterious reason Judd's brief compels him to resort to crude misrepresentations of Palestine realities.

As an example, Judd insists on speaking of the fighting in Palestine as if the Jewish nationalist movement has "gone to war to affect this partition."

Is this the case or is the reverse true?

The real situation can be briefly summarized thus: The Mufti-controlled Arab nationalist movement, directly abetted by the six Arab states and indirectly by Great Britain, is waging planned warfare against the Jewish population of Palestine.

The strategic aim of this war is to create unmanageable chaos and violence which will convince the UN that partition is not realizable without major armed intervention. This, it is hoped, will lead to a reopening of the question by the UN.

Thus understood, the interests of the anti-partition struggle run directly counter to the appeal to "Cease Fire."

On the other hand, no circumstance other than the cessation of the fratricidal hostilities can do more to insure the implementation of the partition plan.

"Cease Fire" is in essence a pro-partition slogan.

It is no surprise, therefore, for those acquainted with the Palestine situation (which unfortunately does not include Judd nor the writer of the disputed editorial) that appeals to "Cease Fire" have come ONLY from the pro-partitionist camp and not from the Arab nationalist camp.

Judd apparently has the delusion that LABOR ACTION is alone or was the first to issue the call to "Cease Fire."

Comrade Judd "discovers" a contradiction between Al Findley's support of the slogan "Cease Fire" and Leon Shield's demand to break the treacherous imperialist arms blockade against the Jews of Palestine.

Without claiming analogous situations but merely to illustrate a point, let us take a not too far-fetched instance of a prolonged race riot between Southern poor whites and Negroes.

Would we not, in such an instance, call for an immediate cessation of the fratricidal rioting, and at the same time vigorously oppose any governmental restrictions on the sale of arms to the Negroes for self-defense as playing into the hands of the lynchers.

Is there anything in the Palestine picture that would justify the denial of the right of self-defense to the Jewish population of that country? I hope we are not going to hear echoes of the Stalinist line of 1929 which placed the stamp of aggression on the legitimate defense efforts of the Jewish population.

RESULTS OF PARTITION DEFEAT

It must be apparent to even Judd that the war AGAINST partition could be waged only with the aid of foreign arms, the intervention by foreign recruits and with the almost direct diplomatic support and indirect military aid of the imperialist power occupying Palestine.

It should also be apparent that the strategic and oil interests of American imperialism are pushing the United States into support of British policy. The conjunctural election aspirations of the Truman administration and the Republican Party alone stand in the way of a complete reversal of U. S. policy.

At this point the defeat of partition can result in: (1) Continued British rule of Palestine under a Morrison-Grady plan; or (2) an Arab national state. Obviously, the former is the more probable eventuality.

Looked at in this way, the struggle against partition is, in effect, a struggle against the early independence of Palestine from continued Anglo-American rule. (This view is confirmed by Russia's support of partition, which stems from the realiza-

tion that partition is the only plan likely to tear strategic Palestine out of the tight control of Anglo-American imperialism.)

FOR CRITICAL SUPPORT

Partition is, unfortunately, the only way out of the impasse. It is admittedly a bad solution. It must, however, be accepted as the politically indicated transition stage to a truly democratic solution—a unified, bi-national Palestine.

Partition is the de jure recognition of the distrust engendered between the two peoples. The Arabs do not trust the Jews and the Jews do not trust the Arabs.

This means that two states in Palestine is the only way that BOTH peoples of Palestine can, TODAY, gain a measure of self-determination and independence.

The truth of this thesis is not diminished by pointing to imperialist forces that fish in the troubled waters. ANY solution offered today runs the danger of being messed up by imperialist meddling.

Partition IS realizable WITHOUT imperialist intervention if the active enlistment of Anglo-Arab League imperialism in the anti-partition war were ended by the progressive anti-imperialist forces of the world.

Judd insists that the right to self-determination can't be invoked even as a permissive justification of partition in Palestine. Why? Because the Arabs too are oppressed by imperialism and are struggling for national liberation. Hence they cannot be considered oppressors. If the Arabs are not oppressors, asks Judd, how can you invoke the right of self-determination against them?

Our honored editor must indeed be suffering from historical amnesia. Else how could he have ignored the many instances in modern history where several peoples fought to free themselves from a common imperialist oppressor and, yet, in the very moment of liberation, the more numerous people attempted to deprive the smaller people of its national rights.

Comrade Judd's masterful study in confusion deserves further consideration, but the 1,000 word limitation has been reached.

Ed Findley.