

BOOK REVIEWS *and* COMMENT

W. Z. Foster Spikes Stolberg's Slippery Review in "New Leader"

By WM. Z. FOSTER.

IN the "New Leader" of January 28, Ben Stolberg essays a review of my book "Misleaders of Labor." The result is a woeful exhibition of his political bankruptcy. Stolberg, alleged progressive, proves himself to be a slippery defender of the right wing leadership in the labor movement.

Stolberg agrees that all my charges of corruption and reaction against the Green-Woll machine are well-founded. But, as a real Menshevik, he justifies these leaders by ignoring the subjective factor completely and blaming everything immediately upon the objective situation. He says: "After all is said and done, these 'misleaders' are at bottom only a reflection of social conditions which have weakened this labor movement." With this conception he naturally draws the conclusion that nothing can be done about it. His article does not contain even a suggestion of an opposition program. It is an acceptance of the rule of Green, Woll and Co., without striking a blow. These worthies could ask for no more loyal service in demobilizing the opposition than that performed by Stolberg. He writes as a retainer of reaction and a shoddy intellectual of the Green-Woll regime.

Especially pained is Stolberg at my criticism of his ideological cronies, the "socialist" union leaders. In reality, my criticism is restrained. Have they not capitulated to the A. F. of L. leadership? Where is the one-time S. P. advocacy of industrial unionism and a militant union policy? What is the essential difference between Hillman's standards of production and Green's new wage policy? Have not the S. P. leaders accepted this whole "union-management cooperation" betrayal? Did not the whole "socialist" trade union leadership work hand in glove with their close friends, Woll, McGrady, etc., in smashing the needle trades unions? They were simply the tools of the A. F. of L. leaders and the employers.

Together the "socialist" union officials, the A. F. of L. heads and the employers formed a foul omelet of betrayal which not even a Stolberg can unscramble.

STOLBERG denies that Hillquit has exploited the unions for extravagant fees. But Hillquit himself has not ventured such a denial. If he does we will be glad to specify in even more detail. On the other hand, we demand that Stolberg either put up (as I did in my book) or shut up when he makes wholesale and ridiculous charges of left wing grafters, and of provocateurs on the Central Executive Committee of the Workers (Communist) Party. He must specify or stand condemned as irresponsible. Name names and furnish proof, Stolberg, or hold your peace as an irresponsible. Stolberg even tries to cite me as having fought against the left wing in the needle trades. This is silly. The criticisms I directed against the left leaders was that they did not fight more timely and aggressively against the gang of right wing agents of the needle trades employers whom Stolberg attempts to shield.

ON the one hand, Stolberg, in order to free the reactionaries of responsibility, criticizes me for not looking enough to economic causes (an unfounded charge) to explain the corrupt and reactionary leadership, but on the other hand, when it comes to analyzing the shameless surrender of the so-called progressives to the right wing he forgets his economics altogether and blames it all on me, saying: "He drove all bona fide left wing trade unionists, such as the Chicago Federation of Labor, into the arms of reaction." Thus, when John Fitzpatrick comes out and supports the capitalist politician Smith, an In-sull stool-pigeon so noisome that even the Republican senate voted to reject him, then Stolberg comes forward and blames the left wing for Fitzpatrick's treachery. How utterly

stupid. Can sycophantic defense of reaction go farther?

STOLBERG complains that I made a big mistake by joining the Workers (Communist) Party, even manufacturing a "quotation" from me to make his point. He says that I am "through with American labor." But he is counting his chickens before they are hatched. In the period of high industrial activity that is just past, with its ideological bourgeoisification of large numbers of workers, our Party was relatively isolated. But now, in the face of the growing industrial depression, with widespread wage cuts, and the breakdown of the trade unions, it comes ever more to the forefront in the class struggle. The program of the Workers (Communist) Party is correct, both for the immediate struggles of the workers and for the ultimate overthrow of capitalism. Our Party is destined to become the actual leader of the working class. My place, like that of all militant workers, is in this Party regardless of the opportunistic croakings of all the Stolbergs.

NATURALLY, Stolberg, apologist for the right wing, bitterly assails the Workers (Communist) Party and its program as "fantastic" and having "not the slightest bearing on the problems of the American working masses." Of course, Stolberg considers all revolutionary views as ridiculous, so it is idle to expect him to support the ultimate program of the Communist Party. But what can he say against our immediate program for the trade unions? Organize the unorganized, amalgamation, Labor Party, democratization of the unions, an aggressive policy—are these "fantastic" proposals? Do they not bear on the workers' problems? Are they not fundamental measures, vitally necessary to liquidate the present crisis in the labor movement? Is not the left wing the only body in the labor movement that has a real program to save the unions?

Let Stolberg attempt to refute this elementary Communist program. Let him present a better program. Stolberg and his ilk cannot propose a program for the workers because he and his like are apologists for capitalism posing as impartial critics

A Text-Book for Bill Thompson

A PRESIDENT IS BORN. By Fannie Hurst. Harpers & Bros. \$2.50.

THIS sophisticated age needs more plausible stuff than the cherry tree stories about George Washington. Our text-books need revision. "A President Is Born" is just a sophisticated glorification of a future

from Ohio, like the last one we had: Warren Gamaliel Harding.

And our Davy's father: "The Old Gentleman could strut off this sense of his Americanism. Probably once a year he got his yellowing citizenship papers out of a drawer in his desk he kept locked, and with his steel-rimmed spectacles low on his nose, re-