FOSTER TAKES EXCEPTION

In Solidarity of Jan. 27th. the editor, explaining his reasons for having so abruptly closed the "boring from within" debate without giving me an opportunity to state my position clearly, says, that just after the debate had been closed, he received three "partial answers" from me, two of which he suppressed.

Possibly the editor of "Solidarity" may have received my "partial answers" just after the closure of the debate; I dont know anything positive to the contrary. But I do know that they were fowarded to him three, two and one weeks, respectively, before its close. And as for my answers being "partial," as Solidarity's editor slurringly insists, I cant see wherein they have sinned in that respect. In my original statement I stated that the subject was a large one, and that if I were elected editor I would see that it was thoroly discussed. The editor of "Solidarity" chided me for making this "threat," saying: "This question and all that bears on it are open for discussion in "Solidarity."

Then he suggested that the subject be taken up piecemeal, naming a dozen different phases of it to be separately treated. He added several etceteras to these and said: "The foregoing are only a few of the possible suggestions. Let us have a flood of light on the American Labor movement." And, nevertheless when, in strict conformity to the rules laid down by Solidarity's editor, I took up a couple of the different phases of the subject in an effort to more clearly state my position I am "bawled out" as having written but partial answers and suffer the penalty of having them suppressed.

I recognize that consistency is often a very doubtful virtue, nevertheless, occasionally a little of it may be appreciated—not to mention fair play at all.

WM. Z. FOSTER.