

BOOK REVIEWS

A PERVERSION OF I.L.G.W.U. HISTORY

By ROSE WORTIS

TAILOR'S PROGRESS. By Benjamin Stolberg. Doubleday Doran, New York, 1944. 360 pp.

THE International Ladies Garment Workers Union is one of the oldest, largest and most firmly established unions of the A. F. of L., with a membership of more than 300,000. Its rich history provides many valuable lessons for its own membership and the labor movement as a whole. The union came into existence some forty years ago through the efforts of Jewish immigrants, driven to our shores by religious persecution and tsarist tyranny in their Russian homeland. They imparted to their union the experience, revolutionary fervor and enthusiasm of the Russian Socialist movement in which they were trained. This background contributed greatly to making the I.L.G.W.U. an experimental ground for developing progressive policies both in the field of employer-labor relations and in the sphere of internal trade union organization. Through the years American organ-

ized labor has learned much from the I.L.G.W.U.

The I.L.G.W.U. was the first union in the A. F. of L. to develop the idea that a trade union is not merely an agency for the defense of the narrow economic interests of the workers, but an educational and political instrument of tremendous potentialities. It was the first among the A. F. of L. unions to take issue with the Gompers policy of "pure-and-simple trade unionism" and to advocate a policy of labor's active participation in the political life of the nation.

These advances by the I.L.G.W.U. did not, of course, come about automatically. They were the result of bitter and costly struggles against employers, as well as struggles between a militant rank-and-file membership and an opportunist leadership. Many of the advanced policies first initiated (and still fought for by the workers of the I.L.G.W.U.) are now the accepted policies of progressive A. F. of L. and C.I.O. unions.

* * *

Several months ago a book appeared, entitled *Tailor's Progress*, publicized as the unofficial history of the I.L.G.W.U. An objective account of that union, written by a responsible labor historian, could be a great contribution to the evaluation of labor's role in the nation, to furthering the unification of labor's

for
unit
T
of
and
has
war
won
in
th
catic
with
labor
inter
of
amor
Ce
Stolb
tiona
gar
hones
task.
Th
efficie
I.L.G.
viewe
import
zines
and
least
most
of the
is the
who
Stolbe
again
bor ci
I.L.G.
great
Mos
has ag
precipi

forces, and to strengthening national unity.

The increasing numerical strength of the organized labor movement and the high degree of patriotism it has shown in its contribution to the war and the recent election have won for labor a new place of honor in the life of the nation. The publication today of any book dealing with the history and problems of the labor movement thus arouses great interest, not only among the millions of organized workers, but also among the general public.

Certainly, therefore, Benjamin Stolberg, with his record of reactionary prejudice, Red-baiting, vulgar cynicism, and intellectual dishonesty is the last person for such a task.

Through the influence of the very efficient publicity department of the I.L.G.W.U., *Taylor's Progress* was reviewed and popularized by the most important newspapers and magazines in the country. Those papers and commentators who have been least friendly to labor have been most enthusiastic in their evaluation of the book. Included among these is the notorious labor-baiter, Pegler, who made use of the material in Stolberg's book for his rantings against "foreign" labor leaders. In labor circles, including leaders of the I.L.G.W.U., the book has aroused a great deal of protest.

Most recently, a sharp controversy has again flared up around the book, precipitated by two vice-presidents

of the I.L.G.W.U.—Joseph Breslaw and Charles Zimmerman, both of whom condemn the book unmitigatedly. Since their sentiments reflect those of thousands of rank and filers, the discussion has been taken up again in the press, particularly the Yiddish press, resulting in a full-dress, heated debate. The Yiddish press condemned the book, the only exception being the Social-Democratic *Jewish Daily Forward*, the mouth-piece of Mr. Dubinsky. The book was likewise publicly criticized by the widow of Morris Hillquit. Emil Schlesinger, son of the former I.L.G.W.U. president, Benjamin Schlesinger, in an interview for the *Jewish Morning Journal*, denounced Stolberg as a liar and a scandal-monger.

* * *

Now for a glance at the book itself.

What contribution does *Taylor's Progress* make toward an understanding of the history of the I.L.G.W.U. by the millions of newly organized workers, including the workers of the I.L.G.W.U. itself? To what extent does this book help to clarify labor's vital role in the life of the nation?

Some background data are here in place. Last May, the I.L.G.W.U. celebrated its 40th anniversary at its Boston convention. On that occasion President David Dubinsky—much to the surprise of his colleagues on the General Executive Board—announced the publication of a new book by Benjamin Stol-

berg, which he described as an unofficial history of the I.L.G.W.U. As such, it was distributed among the delegates as a gift of the International. Dubinsky also announced that arrangements had been made with the publishing company whereby every member of the International might purchase a copy at a reduced price, and urged all delegates to see to it that members of the International purchased and read the book. In his capacity as President, he officially thanked Mr. Stolberg for the book and in a very flattering introduction presented him as an honored guest speaker. Thus *Tailor's Progress* actually became an integral part of the convention.

Once, however, the delegates began to sample Stolberg's concoction, a storm of protest developed which has been brewing in inner circles since the convention and has reached the crescendo already referred to.

Mr. Dubinsky's colleagues have become accustomed to taking much from their chief; but this book, it appears, has gone beyond all bounds. Instead of an accurate union history they found the book to be a most shameful distortion, filled with calumny, and carefully planned and executed to create the proper atmosphere for the glorification of David Dubinsky and the strengthening of his control over the union. To build up the stature of Dubinsky as the great savior of the garment workers, his predecessors, as well as many of his present colleagues (par-

ticularly those who at one time or another have disagreed with him, especially with regard to his attitude towards the Soviet Union), are portrayed as nincompoops, neurotics, opportunists, Tammany politicians, Hutcheson bureaucrats. For example, Benjamin Schlesinger, his immediate predecessor, is paid the tribute (through the device of "quoting" an unnamed cloakmaker) that he "was a son-of-a-bitch. But he was *our* son-of-a-bitch" (p. 105). Dubinsky's opponents—the Left Wing leaders—are pictured as foreign agents, irresponsible fanatics and crooks, enmeshed in a net of gangsterism. From the first page to the last this "history" is a travesty on the record of the garment workers.

In his opening pages, Stolberg cynically dissociates himself from "the professional immigrant lovers" who idealize the East Side. This is what he has to say about the thousands of Jewish men and women who came to this country in the early years of the 20th century as a result of religious and political persecution:

Many of them were in the grip of a semi-barbarous and reactionary priesthood and of a bigoted racial isolationism. In the old country they had lived in that classless limbo of the ghetto, part ragged proletarian, part ragged bourgeois—hawkers, hucksters, and cobblers, shoe-string middlemen—all preying on each other's poverty (p. 8).

But a good many of them were half-baked and semi-educated, vehemently misinformed and vociferously muddled.

More
ing
var
Euro
bo ju
this
had
their
new
ting
with
one l
hinds
variet
ment
ism,
Marxi
has c
tion f

Suc
garm
came
ened
their
diffic
be cor
ing A
any w
ing Jo
volum
teria

How
builde
speaks
shows
ment v
cynical
worker
the me
I.L.G.W.
forefro

More often than not their early training had been of the orthodox Jewish variety, which in those days in Eastern Europe was really nothing but a mumbo jumbo of vulgar scholasticism. With this background, against which they had rebelled, it was no wonder that their radicalism often turned into a new orthodoxy, an equally hair-splitting body of prejudice to be defended with more heat than light. Today, as one looks back with the perspicacity of hindsight, it becomes clear that all these varieties of left-wing doctrine fundamentally reflected the Byzantine socialism, the mongrel mixture of Western Marxism and Eastern nihilism, which has characterized the Russian Revolution from Bakunin to Stalin (p. 6).

Such a portrayal of the immigrant garment workers, from whose ranks came forward stalwart and enlightened trade union activists who built their union in face of the greatest difficulties, is an outrageous insult to be condemned by every self-respecting American trade unionist. Is it any wonder that the *Jewish Morning Journal* declared that Stolberg's volume is excellent propaganda material for anti-Semites?

However, it is not only of the early builders of the union that Stolberg speaks with such contempt. He shows no greater regard for the garment workers of today. Particularly cynical are his remarks about women workers, who to this day are among the most advanced workers of the I.L.G.W.U. and have been in the forefront of the fight for progressive

policies in the union. In the chapter on workers' education, Stolberg says:

It was soon discovered that motives which made the average working girl enroll in the Workers' University had rather little to do with a thirst for knowledge. More often than not these students were moved by some different urge—a desire to make nice friends, especially young men; interest in a sentimentally rather than academically fascinating instructor; or the plain wish to escape the loneliness or a narrow and dreary family circle (p. 290).

This intellectual snob, who earned Pegler's praise as the "mocking skeptic of the left-wing," is here revealed as the mocking skeptic of all labor's deepest-going aspirations. He sneers at the very idea of workers' education. "All democratic theories to the contrary notwithstanding," a cloakmaker or a dressmaker, says he, cannot engage in serious class work involving discussions of wage structure or economics of industries. It is characteristic of Stolberg's arrogance and shallow-mindedness that this view should be advanced in the face of the widespread educational activities of many trade unions and the wide response that has been shown to the Jefferson School, the George Washington Carver School, and other such popular educational centers. If the I.L.G.W.U. workers are staying away from union classes, it may be because they resent the distortions and the Red-baiting taught there even today, and have given up hope of gaining any real under-

standing of their own union, or of the world around them from Trotskyite and Social-Democratic professors.

Cynical contempt for the masses, so characteristic of both Stolberg and Dubinsky, pervades the entire book. Workers are divided into four categories. The cloakmakers are characterized as spitoon philosophers; the pressers as uncouth ignoramuses (*balagulas*); the dressmakers as starry-eyed idealists, while the cutters, from whose ranks hails the chief character of the book, David Dubinsky, are described as the realists, responsible for all the achievements of the I.L.G.W.U.

This distorted characterization is belied by the facts of history, as Stolberg himself reveals in the book when he shows that the dressmakers were the first to organize and to lead to victory the mass strike of 1909 which firmly established the union.

The book falsifies the history of the internal struggles of the union, between the militant rank and file and the bureaucratic leaders. These struggles have centered throughout on basic issues: the right of workers to determine union policies without interference from the employers; a more militant policy in defense of economic interests; union democracy and freedom of political opinion. But Stolberg describes the early struggles in the union known as "the Biznow and Horowitz affairs," for example, as merely unprincipled feuds of top leaders. He ignores the

fact that it was just these early struggles that laid the basis for the powerful rank-and-file movement in the later period. That movement, despite the Left-wing defeats, seriously influences the life of the union to this very day, and accounts for much of its progress.

* * *

The most shameful pages of the book are those dealing with the mass expulsions which have come to be known as the struggle of the Joint Action Committee.

The years between 1920 and 1930 marked a crucial stage in the history of the American labor movement, characterized by sharp internal struggles around basic policies such as the organization of the unorganized, industrial unionism, a labor party, recognition of the Soviet Union, international labor unity, etc. These struggles found their sharpest expression in the I.L.G.W.U., whose membership was among the most advanced section of American labor. Stolberg disposes of the whole business with one pat phrase—it was a "Communist conspiracy"—instigated by the Communist International and financed by Moscow gold to capture the union!

One is reluctant at this time to rake up old quarrels and differences; however, since Mr. Dubinsky saw fit to have this book published at this time, to spread these poisonous distortions among the thousands of new workers unfamiliar with union his-

tor
at
cat
A
I.L.
sion
of t
the
con
It v
Wir
mer
berg
lead
effor
over
was
Gen
In
for t
ers v
pelle
An
clude
leade
matt
ratiza
real j
as w
ever
signe
lated
1926
packe
locals
for th
the
fough
reinst
with
that t

tory, it becomes necessary to expose at least some of the crassest falsifications.

A civil war began in the I.L.G.W.U. in 1922 with the expulsion of the overwhelming majority of the International membership by the General Executive Board, and continued for ten years thereafter. It was not precipitated by the Left Wing which had the support of the membership (a fact which even Stolberg is forced to admit), but by the leadership of the International in an effort to maintain its dictatorial rule over the membership. Dubinsky was one of the leading lights on the General Executive Board at the time.

In 1926, after a struggle lasting for ten weeks, the International leaders were forced to reinstate the expelled local joint boards and leaders. An agreement was officially concluded pledging the International leaders to tolerance of differences on matters of policy, and to the democratization of the union. But their real intent was not peace and unity, as was soon proved by subsequent events. The agreement they had signed in the face of defeat was violated at the first opportunity at the 1926 Philadelphia Convention packed with delegates of "blue-sky" locals. Stolberg ignores the fact that for three years from 1926 to 1929, the expelled locals and leaders fought for unity on the basis of the reinstatement into the organization with full rights of membership, and that the Needle Trade Workers In-

dustrial Union was organized only after all efforts toward unity had failed.

Time and again Stolberg is forced to admit that the overwhelming majority of the workers supported the Left-progressive leadership on the vital issues, that at every opportunity of expression, whether at meetings or at elections, the workers demonstrated their confidence in the Left-progressive leaders. But what does all this matter to Mr. Stolberg, when the purpose of the book is not to draw the lessons from history but to justify a policy of disruption and Red-baiting?

In fact, this whole section is taken from the prejudiced pages of the *Jewish Daily Forward* whose leadership instigated, led and financed the civil war in the needle trades unions so as to maintain its control of them. Until this day the *Forward* continues as the fountain-head of disunity.

Stolberg devotes forty-eight pages of his book to these distortions. He accuses the Communists of the use of gangsterism, in face of the facts, known to all, that the Left Wing workers and leaders were the victims of terror and violence at the hands of the bosses and reactionary leaders.

Stolberg falsifies the history of the cloakmakers' strike of 1926 called against the demand of the employers for the right to discharge 10 per cent of their workers every season, aimed at undermining the job security won by the union. He states that

the strike was called at the order of the Communist Party. This contradicts the publicly known facts that the decision to reject the demands of the employers and to declare the strike was unanimously voted at a meeting of 20,000 cloakmakers at Madison Square Garden, addressed by the I.L.G.W.U. President Morris Sigman and William Green, President of the A. F. of L. The workers zealously fought for their demands on the picket line in a strike that lasted seventeen weeks, despite the sabotage of Dubinsky, then chairman of the settlement committee. On the eve of the settlement which gave the workers a partial victory, the General Executive Board once more resorted to mass expulsions. They knew that because of the long and exhausting strike, the workers would not be in a position to fight these new expulsions with the same vigor and determination that they had demonstrated six months earlier. These are facts known to every worker who participated in the strike. But the facts, of course, are of no account to Dubinsky's poison-pen artist.

Stolberg justifies this new expulsion on the ground that the Union had to be saved from the "Communist menace." How familiar this sounds to every anti-fascist! What crimes have been committed under the guise of fighting the "Communist menace!" How costly this bogey of Communism has been to the civilized world!

Stolberg charges that the Communist leadership squandered three and one-half million dollars during the strike. This scandalous lie will be repudiated by every responsible worker, including opponents, who have never challenged the integrity of the Left-Wing and Communist leaders of the I.L.G.W.U.

* * *

In dealing with the current period, Stolberg reflects Dubinsky's coldness, if not his underlying hostility, to the basic foreign and domestic policies of the Roosevelt Administration. The entire book reeks with opposition and sniping at the national administration. A characteristic example worthy of the most ardent Dewey supporter is the following pen-sketch of one of the early progressive leaders:

He had a cloakmaker's propensity for ideological hair splitting and interminable gab. . . . He loved power without knowing what to do with it, and would have made a perfect New Dealer of the benign variety (p. 80).

Or such a gem as this characterization of Dubinsky:

He is all for the "social gains" of the New Deal—without totalitarian undertows (p. 157).

Is it any wonder that Dewey should gleefully quote Dubinsky in his attacks on President Roosevelt?

Hosannas are sung in the book for the defeatist, anti-Semite John L. Lewis. Stolberg boasts of Lewis' high

reg
effo
A.
is th
bor
O
of S
goes
surp
Peg
the
the
exan
man
He
deal
work
lead
man
been
In
will
ate st
under
[Wh
alien
the I
Du
writ
demo
the
rank
in th
pend
for a
they
anti-u
a big
carrie

regard for Dubinsky and the latter's efforts to bring Lewis back into the A. F. of L. Another Stolberg hero is the reactionary Hoover-minded labor politician, Matthew Woll.

On the other hand, his treatment of Sidney Hillman is revolting. It goes beyond all bounds of decency, surpassing the master of Red-baiting Pegler himself. It reveals, not only the pettiness and vindictiveness of the man who held the pen, but of the man who was his mentor. For example, we read in regard to Hillman:

He has always been incapable of dealing democratically with ordinary workers. . . . Of all American labor leaders of foreign birth . . . Sidney Hillman is the only one who has never been assimilated by our institutions.

In politics he is an opportunist who will make alliances in the most disparate strata of society. He never really understood the democratic process.

[What ready copy this makes for the alien-baiting campaign speeches of the Dewey-Bricker camp!].

Dubinsky, through his ghost writer Stolberg, lectures Hillman on democracy at the very time when in the I.L.G.W.U., seven prominent rank and filers—political opponents in the last election—have been suspended from Dubinsky's own local for a period of three years because they dared oppose his anti-Soviet, anti-unity policies! Dubinsky, who is a big gun in the *Forward* clique that carries on clandestine relations with

the Christian-Front *Brooklyn Tablet*, which reprints *Forward* articles; Dubinsky, who champions the defeatist Lewis, defends the anti-Semite Polish government-in-exile, and is the darling of Hearst, lectures Hillman on opportunism!

* * *

This perversion of union history is more than even some of the vice-presidents of the union could take. Joseph Breslaw, on his return from the convention, minced no words in denouncing the book. He was authorized by the membership of Local 35 to publish his views in a pamphlet, *A Cloakmaker Looks at Stolberg's 'Tailor's Progress'*, which is now being distributed among the members. At a recent meeting of his local, Breslaw reported that he had received messages of congratulations from the Joint Boards of Toronto, Baltimore, and many other locals, thus proving the widespread resentment against the book. He assured the members that he would continue to expose the lies, falsifications and slanders contained in the book.

Since the Breslaw pamphlet created a sensation in union circles, it is in place to quote from it. Breslaw branded the book as "a cruel and heartless caricature."

It is a smear at our history, a desecration of our leaders. *The cloakmakers who built our International would not recognize it from the description in this book.* It is written with bias.

Page after page, it is a continuous record of distortions, misrepresentations, inaccuracies . . . it is sensationalist journalism . . . of the type to destroy our faith in our past (p. 45).

Breslaw brands Stolberg's charge of the use of gangsterism, as vicious, as something "which Pegler would really have enjoyed writing." "It is true," says Breslaw, "that we had to fight gangsters, but we did so with our own pickets. *Our strength has been the members of our Union.* . . . Now a new labor-baiter appears upon the scene," who "furnishes labor's enemies with a new reference work on 'labor union criminals' . . . his attack, incredible at the outset, is entirely uncorroborated and unproven" (pp. 17, 18).

Answering Stolberg's charge that he is "playing quite cynically with the Communists," Breslaw states that he has not supported Communist organizations but has supported Russia and has aided the anti-Nazi campaigns. "I supported Russia because of the great admiration I have felt for its progress. . . . Is it so inconceivable to the Stolberg mind that a person can have *honest* convictions, based on personal observation and study? *He prefers cynicism to honesty, politics to principles!*" (p. 21).

Breslaw thus summarizes his indictment of Stolberg: "He has travelled the gutters looking for that type of sensationalist stuff that sells books, no matter how distorted and untruthful. The pain and grief this causes the cloakmakers and others

who built our International are not even considered. . . . Even where there is truth in the book, it never comes through to the reader because it is surrounded with a setting of lies, distortions and defamations, so as to give an unworthy impression. It is the method of the Nazi who tells you that the Jews want to make war on Hitler because of his atrocities against the Jews. The Nazi fails to tell you of Hitler's atrocities against all mankind. . . . Chapter after chapter by implication the innocent reader gets a feeling that the whole structure of the past thirty-five years was a history of mean, petty men interested only in themselves" (pp. 5, 6).

Charles Zimmerman, another vice-president, though somewhat belatedly, also sent a public statement to the press protesting the Stolberg distortions of the internal struggle in which he had been an active participant.

He accuses Stolberg of misrepresenting the conflict centering for many years about the issue of proportional representation in the union as an attempt of the Communist Party to fortify its control of the union. Zimmerman points out that this was a basic issue of union democracy.

He disputes Stolberg's assertion that the 1926 strike was called on orders of the Communist Party for political purposes, showing that the basic issue of the strike was job security. He denounces as utterly false

Stoll
and
the
for
two
were
man
got
tion
man
Stoll
than
As se
nies
prof
"The
the
about
Arno
It i
merr
refuse
Daily
ever,
again
him f
and s
ter by
past w

The
of Bre
sympto
discont
disrupt
Their
are dis
evading
sky's re
book.

Stolberg's statement that of the three and one-half million dollars spent in the strike only a half million went for strike benefits, pointing out that two and one-half million dollars were spent for that purpose. Zimmerman asks indignantly where Stolberg got his figures. This rhetorical question is out of place, since Zimmerman knows well that the source of Stolberg's information is none other than his own president, Dubinsky. As secretary of the 1926 strike, he denies Stolberg's charges of the use of professional gangsters, stating that: "There is not one iota of truth in the complicated, sensational story about the Left-Wing conspiracy with Arnold Rothstein."

It is interesting to note that Zimmerman's statement to the press was refused publication by the *Jewish Daily Forward*. That paper, however, used the occasion for a diatribe against Zimmerman, reproaching him for taking issue with Stolberg and suggesting that he might do better by stating that his Communist past was nothing but youthful folly.

* * *

The publication of the statements of Breslaw and Zimmerman are only symptoms of the broad rank-and-file discontent with the bureaucratic and disruptive policies of Dubinsky. Their main weakness is that they are directed only against Stolberg, evading the whole issue of Dubinsky's responsibility for this infamous book. The vice presidents know full

well that the real author of the book is Dubinsky, who merely used Stolberg's poison pen to put his own views on paper. This Stolberg admits in so many words in his introduction, which states:

But my greatest debt is to President Dubinsky, to Max Danish, the editor of *Justice*, and to Will Herberg, research director of the New York Dress Joint Board.

It is attested to by Dubinsky's activity in the preparation and distortion of the book.

Summed up, the political objectives of *Tailor's Progress* are not only the glorification of Dubinsky, but the consolidation of the stranglehold of the inner *Forward* clique, headed by Dubinsky, upon the union. Not all of the I.L.G.W.U. leaders were happy with the anti-unity policy adopted at the last convention. There were disagreements on the questions of Soviet-baiting and of support to the Polish government-in-exile. There was serious disagreement on the question of the organization of the Liberal Party. It is true none of these disagreements reached the light of day; but Dubinsky is nervous. The smear of Breslaw in the book is intended as a warning to those leaders of the International who are not part of the inner clique and at times retain a certain independence of action, that Dubinsky and his henchmen will not hesitate to discredit them if they persist in their attitude. As for Zimmerman, who is portrayed

as the white-haired boy at present in Dubinsky's confidence, the book was a gentle reminder that his past has not been forgotten or forgiven.

The publication of *Taylor's Progress* explains many actions of the International. It exposes the domineering hand of Dubinsky, not only over the rank and file, but even over the top leaders and exposes Dubinsky's type of "free" trade unionism. It is the freedom for Dubinsky to do as he pleases without the knowledge or consent of the leading bodies of the union. It means freedom for Dubinsky to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars of union money to carry on anti-Soviet, anti-unity campaigns; freedom to make alliances with the defeatist, anti-Semite, John L. Lewis; freedom to defile the most sacred aspirations of the membership. It means freedom to publish a so-called history of the International which defames, not only the Left Wing, but Right-Wing leaders, dead and living. It explains the hesitancy of vice presidents, in their justified protests against this infamous book, to name the real culprit.

Dubinsky and his anti-Soviet clique have not fared so well of late. The victorious advance of the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition has blasted their anti-Soviet hopes. Dubinsky's attempt, through the medium of *Taylor's Progress*, to destroy the influence of some of his dissenting associates is already meeting with resentment among wide sections of the membership and, it is to be hoped,

will help bring out in the open some of the fundamental differences in the union.

The leaders of the International who believe in a policy of unity cannot maintain the full confidence of the workers and continue as leaders of the workers in the true sense of the word by submitting to the dictates of Dubinsky. The workers will enthusiastically rally to support every effort to do away with one-man leadership in the organization and to make the I.L.G.W.U. a force for unity.

* * *

The intent of Stolberg's book is to foster clique domination and disruption in the union which will only serve to isolate the I.L.G.W.U. from the new and vital forces in the labor movement.

The book is particularly injurious with respect to its possible influence on the new workers in the union.

The bulk of the I.L.G.W.U. membership is new, numbering tens of thousands of young Italian, Negro and native white American women, who came into the organization in 1933 without any union background.

Like the thousands of U.E., maritime and auto workers who have come forward in the leadership of their unions and are the sparkplug of the labor and political movement, this new generation of garment workers could, under proper leadership, take their place in the front ranks of the progressive labor move-

ment to carry on the tradition of their militant sister garment workers who wrote heroic chapters in the history of our labor movement.

In the poisonous atmosphere generated by the leadership of the I.L.G.W.U., as revealed in Stolberg's book, which thrives on factionalism, disunity and Red-baiting, the native abilities of the workers are warped, given no channel for expression.

After eleven years of membership in the union, the new workers, especially in the smaller centers, are still not considered competent to elect their organizers, who are subservient appointees of the general office.

To assimilate these new workers, to develop them as conscious trade unionists, it is necessary to give them a feeling of pride in their union. For they are the new stock from which the future leaders of the union will have to be drawn. But Stolberg's distorted picture can only call forth in them contempt for the union; alienate, rather than give them a better understanding of the union and the labor movement.

The motive of the book is to poison the minds of these new workers not familiar with union history, to sow distrust and disunity, to serve the factional purposes of the ruling clique. Instead of encouraging independent thinking and democratic expression of these workers on matters of union policy, instead of stimulating their initiative, the workers are taught to accept everything Dubinsky does or says as right; they are

taught that if they want to get ahead in the union they had better line up on the "right side," find favor with the leadership in power.

The whole direction of the book is in conflict with the general progressive trends in the labor movement, the growing unity of all constructive forces, the trend toward obliterating factional lines and uniting around a common program of action, as demonstrated at recent trade union conventions.

Taylor's Progress plays into the hands of the labor-baiters and reactionaries who want to portray the labor movement as a gangster-ridden camp of irresponsibles. For the sake of the I.L.G.W.U. and the labor movement as a whole, this libellous book should be withdrawn from circulation.

FOR A DEEPER UNDER- STANDING OF CHINA

By FREDERICK V. FIELD

CHINA'S NEW DEMOCRACY. *By Mao Tse-tung. Introduction by Earl Browder. Workers Library Publishers, New York, 1944. 72 pp.*

IN NO AREA of the world has the United States since Pearl Harbor taken more initiative to bring about the cohesion of the forces of democracy than in China. If our policies