

**PRO AND CON: DISCUSSION** *Fourth Round*  
**Israel, Zionism, and the Arab Question**

To the Editor:

The discussion which started between Hal Draper and myself on the question of Israel is running the risk of continuing forever. I had hoped to let it rest, but Hal Draper's last reply in LABOR ACTION for Dec. 13 obliges me once again to make some clarifications, for I see that the question is still far from clear.

Draper reproaches me for not making a distinction between "immigration" and "colonization." In the case of Palestine, massive immigration necessarily ends in colonization; first of all, on account of the Zionist propaganda; but also and above all, because everywhere in the world where two ethnic groups come up against each other, the one which is better developed technologically, and therefore is the stronger, is led to dominate over the other. We've seen that in North Africa, for example, the most insignificant French official, a letter-carrier or an ordinary worker come over from Europe, even if he had had no prejudices against the Arabs before crossing the Mediterranean, quickly becomes a racist, and feels much more solidarity with the colonial administration than with his class brothers of the native population. How could it be otherwise in Palestine? Among the immigrants, there are very few consistent internationalists. On the contrary, those among the Jews who are consistent internationalists generally stay in their countries of origin. Thus

colonialism develops by itself, and turns not only against the Arabs but also against the Arabs but also against the oriental Jews.

Draper reproaches me next for not feeling the tragedy of the persecuted Jewish people. I can assure him that I felt this tragedy as much as any European socialist during the last war. But in any case immigration into Palestine is no solution to this situation. On the contrary, at the time when the crushing of Nazism and fascism had permitted many European Jews to live normally again in Europe, the development of immigration into Palestine created a new wave of anti-Jewish feeling in the East, in the countries which up to then had been sheltered from Nazi propaganda. That had the most disastrous consequences, turning against the Jews themselves. That is why those who can live in their countries of origin must be encouraged to stay there, and to seek a solution in abandoning their ancestral prejudices and fusing with the people in whose midst they live; those who unfortunately are in search of a haven must find it in some country, and the role of socialists is to struggle to open the doors of the U. S., France, England, etc., to them.

Finally, Draper found a contradiction in my last letter, for I spoke of "limitation" of immigration and then of "banning" this immigration. And I willingly recognize that on this point I did not ex-

press myself with sufficient clarity. In my opinion, for a satisfactory solution of the Palestinian problem to be found (and it is high time), it is necessary to stop immigration as quickly as possible. Every new arrival of immigrants makes an agreement more difficult, more improbable. Later, only an all-Palestine government will be able to decide if the country can absorb new arrivals. But I used the word "limitation" in one sentence: "But he (Draper) does not say a word about the limitation of Jewish immigration into Israel." In my thinking, I was considering this not from my point of view but from Draper's, believing (rightly, as his reply proves) that he could more easily accept limitation than a banning of immigration. I was wrong in not making the sentence clearer by writing: "But he does not even take a position for the limitations of Jewish immigration into Israel." (In his reply, Draper replied to this question clearly.)

I believe it would be useless to go back to other points discussed; all readers of LABOR ACTION have, I think, understood my position and Draper's. What I wish is that I have made them understand how much the existence of the state of Israel is an obstacle to the development of the Arab masses toward socialism.

J. GALLIENNE

Damascus, Syria, Jan. 3.

While it is inadvisable (but not useless) to go back to all the points originally raised by Comrade Gallienne, I do want to remind him (in view of his concentration on the immigration question) that this exchange started with a letter of Gallienne's in which he solidarized himself or seemed to be solidarizing himself with the articles of Clovis Maksoud, attacking our reply to Maksoud and making no criticism of Maksoud himself.

Maksoud had gone far beyond any demand merely for banning Jewish immigration. He had proposed and envisioned what would be a mass deportation of Jews from Palestine (see LA, Aug. 16).

Now Comrade Gallienne—who inveighs against our proposal for serious limitation but not a ban on Jewish immigration, and who devotes himself once again to pressing his viewpoint on this aspect of the general question—was not sufficiently stirred by Maksoud's point of view even to mention his dissent with it, or with any other part of Maksoud's anti-Israel article, in the course of his attack on our reply.

Perhaps he overlooked it. I assume from his subsequent letters that he himself would not favor deportations. We also found out from Gallienne's second letter that he would oppose any armed action against Israel. I am pointing out that although Gallienne at first seemed to solidarize himself with the Maksoud line, he has fortunately moved some distance away from it in the course of his three letters.

(2) "Draper reproaches me next for not feeling the tragedy of the persecuted Jewish people," writes Gallienne. I did not. I had mentioned in parentheses that the post-war plight of the Jews in Europe is "a problem which, I am afraid, plays no role in Gallienne's considerations."

Gallienne quite unnecessarily protests that he "feels" for their plight. But simultaneously he proves that this plays no role whatsoever in his political thinking on the subject. In fact, he makes some statements that are simply astounding.

He writes: "at the time when the crushing of Nazism and fascism had permitted many European Jews to live normally again in Europe," immigration into Palestine intensified Arab hostility. It sounds just as if Gallienne thinks that the end of the war solved the plight of uprooted masses of Jews in Europe.

He says "many European Jews" could again live normally: how many? The post-war Anglo-American Commission of inquiry confirmed the fact that there were something like 100,000 destitute refugees for whom there was no visible space in Europe or on this planet. Later came persecution also in the Stalinist sphere. Besides, in what parts of Eastern Europe or Germany or Austria (most of Europe) can the former Jewish inhabitants who managed to survive pick up again a "normal" life, economically or otherwise?

Gallienne's one-sided focus on the Arab side of the problem blinds his thinking to the other half, in spite of impeccable feelings on the subject.

Now secondly, link this up with Gallienne's argument in the same passage that Jews who are internationalists generally stay in their country of origin, hence the nationalism of the Jews who do immigrate into Israel. . . .

True of Zionist "pioneers,"—but what has this to do with the post-war influx of which he is speaking? Thousands and thousands of Jews had to get out of Europe, or at any rate were moved to do so by the burning ground behind them, not by any motive comparable even to that of a French official who moves to North Africa.

Gallienne's generalization about internationalism is true—but irrelevant precisely to the post-war plight of the Jews who formed the bulk of the post-war influx to Israel.

Thirdly, while of course as anti-Zionists we, like most socialists, urge Jews to live and fight inside their own countries, we must raise an eyebrow at Comrade Gallienne's unfortunate expression about "ancestral prejudices" and his insistence that Jews must "fuse" with the people of their country.

Our program on Palestine, as we see it, is an attempt to develop for today a consistent and principled anti-Zionist position which takes into consideration that it is not only the Arabs who have a right to justice. Gallienne offers definitive evidence in his letter that he sees clearly only the Arab side of the picture, just as the typical Zionist focuses only on the interests of the Jews.

(3) "Draper reproaches me," writes Gallienne, "for not making a distinction between 'immigration' and 'colonization.'" He forgets to add: the reproach is for not making this distinction in developing his own policy, that is, in developing a socialist policy. This consideration is still completely absent in his present letter.

All he discusses is how immigration and colonialism commonly go together in the thinking of non-socialists, indeed in the thinking of (sophisticated or naive) imperialists. This isn't exactly on the point! At any rate, it has nothing to do with our point, as we explained it.

On "limitation" versus "ban" on immigration: Gallienne admits that "later, only an all-Palestine government will be able to decide if the country can still absorb new arrivals." That is, he does not necessarily propose to a future all-Palestine government that it ban immigration. Well then, to whom now is he proposing the ban which he insists on as against our "limitation"? (To the Israelis perhaps?)

The fact is that insistence on a "banning" proposal as against our program for limitation does not make political sense—except on the basis of the perspective that such a ban will eventually be achieved and enforced by Arab power over Israel, a situation that can be realized only by war, which Gallienne is against.

The "all-Palestine government," presumably, will be constituted by peaceful agreement of Arabs and Israelis: at that point Gallienne will have to propose our program, and not his! Before this point, his "ban" proposal is directed to no one; before this point, on the other hand, our "limitation" program already makes sense as an integral part of a revolutionary program for Israeli-Arab unity through federation.

Hal DRAPER

**LABOR SCOPE**

**MORE ON THE CASE OF THE 14 AT SPERRY**

In our Dec. 6 issue, we carried an informational article on the case of 14 workers at Sperry's Lake Success plant who were fired as "security risks" and who are being defended by the IUE-CIO. That article was based on a write-up in Fortune magazine.

Below is a follow-up on the Sperry story from a column by Murray Kempton, N. Y. Post columnist, Jan. 5.—Ed.

For the production worker of moderate skills, there are few better places to work on Long Island than the sprawling Sperry Gyroscope plant at Lake Success. Sperry has a strong CIO union and its going rate is, with one exception, the best in the electronics industry.

It is their past good luck of working at Sperry which has compounded the dreary fate of 14 of its hands who have been fired since last January. All are still looking for steady jobs. They have no special skills; they have to explain to each prospective employer why they left jobs at premium rates where they had an average of 10 years' seniority.

Their prospective employers can only draw one conclusion. It happens to be the correct one. These men are out of jobs because they were fired from Sperry as security risks.

So far, no employer has seen fit to jump that hurdle and hire them. In recent months, the local U. S. Employment Service office has ceased even referring them to openings.

Who are these pariahs? They have all been put in the same bag, but they are not, of course, all the same men. None are Communists; you do not have to be a Communist to be a security risk. But, if the notion of security means anything at all, it should help to be an anti-Communist.

**ANTI-CP RECORD**

The Sperry workers may be said to have had one chance in their lives to face up to the Communist problem. Until 1949, they were members of the United Electrical Workers, a union under pro-Communist control. The Sperry local began fighting the UE's national leaders very early; when the CIO expelled UE in 1949, they voted overwhelmingly to stay with the CIO.

At least 11 of the 14 men the Defense Dept. has refused to clear at Sperry were active leaders of the fight against the Communists in UE and in the local's adherence to the CIO's International Union of Electrical Workers. They were not passive rank-and-filers; some of them were union shop stewards; others were members of the local executive board.

One of the men fired after he lost his clearance was in charge of distributing

leaflets against the UE. Another sat on the IUE screening committee set up to pass upon applications for membership to the new local after the CIO took over, and voted to bar 30 applicants upon suspicion of pro-communism.

A third, Daniel J. Lenihan, was Sperry's representative on the UE Members for Democratic Action, an anti-Communist caucus which functioned in the late Forties. A fourth, with as positive a record, was refused clearance because he was alleged to be associated with a Communist still working in the plant.

At the time of their discharge, 11 of these 14 orphans were doing work which could in no way be described as sensitive or involving security information. When the Defense Dept. denied them access to classified work, the union asked that they be transferred to non-sensitive work, and the company answered that there was no such thing as non-sensitive work in the plant.

**WHAT'S THE CRIME?**

After something of a court fight, the CIO took Sperry to arbitration last summer. Joseph Rosenfarb, the arbitrator, was hoping to have a decision last November, by which time this was already the longest arbitration in the history of man.

Meanwhile, the discharged men wait and have lost all reason to look elsewhere; and Irving Abrahamson, their lawyer, does his best to clear them with the Defense Dept. Abramson, an old CIO Commie-baiter and a member of the World War II Enemy Alien Security Board, could hardly be called insensitive to national safety; yesterday he confessed himself a man harassed by shadows.

These are men who have committed no crime. It is no crime to be a security risk. You can cross that shadow line if you have a close relative in the Soviet Union or if you were once convicted of assault and battery. But, once you cross it, you are a subversive. The system did not contemplate economic capital punishment. But that is what the system has produced, and that is where a country goes when it so fears of its own safety that it forgets the least of its citizens.

**LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE**

114 West 14 Street, New York City

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

**READ ABOUT SOCIALISM**

The Fight for Socialism ..... cloth \$2 paper \$1  
 by Max Shachtman

Socialism: the Hope of Humanity ..... .10  
 by Max Shachtman

Marxism in the U. S. .... .35  
 by Leon Trotsky

Plenty for All: The Meaning of Socialism ..... .25  
 by Ernest Erber

The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism ..... .10  
 (LA Special Issue)

Independent Socialist Press  
 114 West 14 Street, New York City