



Mr. Broun Advertises His Qualities

By WM. Z. FOSTER.
(Prisoner 52350.)

(Communist Candidate for Governor of New York State.)

In the New York Herald-Tribune of Sept. 9, Mr. Heywood Broun, "socialist" candidate for Congress, had a big advertisement, costing a couple of hundred dollars, assuring whom-ever it may concern that he is not a Communist. He reprints with indignation the cartoon of Burck in the Daily Worker flaying him as a monkey begging for pennies for the unemployed. Broun says, "I am not a Communist. I am a socialist."

But Mr. Broun's excitement is needless. He need not be in such a hurry to assure his masters that he is harmless. They know it already. That's why he is fed at the trough of the brass check. That's why his rabid utterances are spread through the capitalist press.

A Political Fool.

It is true that while using him as a tool, along with the social-fascists generally, to confuse the workers, even the capitalist press can't refrain from laughing at him. He is a natural born political fool, his stupidity reaching new heights in his attempts to convert the republican party to "socialism" through Mrs. Pratt. Burck was right, a monkey cutting up monkey shines, begging pennies for capitalism for the workers—that's Broun.

Mr. Broun is right when he says he is no Communist. Communists are revolutionists. All over the world they are staking their lives and liberty in the struggle to overthrow capitalism. What has Mr. Broun in common with all that? Just nothing! No more than his peer, Norman Thomas. To overthrow capitalism is the very last thing either of them are thinking of.

Broun Is Just Beginning.

Mr. Broun is also right when he says he is a "socialist"—that is a "socialist" of the "socialist" party brand that simply parades the name, but that has forgotten Marx (Broun never knew him) and wars against the Soviet Union where in the face of monumental difficulties the workers are building socialism. He is a "socialist" of the MacDonald, Noske, Second International type, that serves as the last bulwark of capitalism.

The political clown, Broun, finds his new "socialist" clothes ill-fitting as yet. He has not yet learned to patter off the radical phrases in pseudo-Marxian language. All he knows yet is the open opportunist maneuvering for votes. But, under the skillful leadership of Hilquit and Thomas, he will earn the whole "socialist" bag of tricks for deceiving the workers. In this campaign, though he is a ridiculous figure to the workers, Broun serves to rally the petty

able to influence and direct the liberation movement of the Negro workers in other parts of the world, and it is therefore, comrades, significant and important that we should give full support to our Negro work.

The "New Masses" Literature

By MAX BEDACHT.

In the "New Masses" of Sept., 1930, we find an editorial paragraph headed "Dogma vs. Law." In this paragraph we are treated to the following categorical statement:

"We have only one magazine in America: The New Masses, dedicated to proletarian literature. And there is no publishing house of standing and intelligent direction to help clarify the issues. Nearest is the International Publishers, perhaps, but this house devotes itself solely to a rather academic approach to economics and makes little attempt to influence either the popular mind or our intellectuals. It is as stodgy and unenterprising, in a Communist way, as the Yale University press and similar organizations."

It is rather surprising to find such a paragraph in a magazine which claims to be dedicated to proletarian literature.

First of all, we would expect from "the only magazine dedicated to proletarian literature in America" a more correct conception of proletarian literature. According to the New Masses, Ryazanev's "Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels," Stoklov's "History of the First International," Lenin's "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism," and similar writings issued by the International Publishers, are not proletarian literature. Of course, we do not know on what grounds the New Masses refuses to qualify such books as proletarian literature. Are they ruling these books out because they are not literature, or are they refusing to acknowledge them proletarian?

It seems to me that a magazine that claims to be "dedicated to proletarian literature" should attach a little more importance to the theory of Marx and Lenin than to rule the books of these revolutionists out of the classification of proletarian literature, or to declare that a publishing house that specializes in the bringing out of such literature lacks intelligent direction. The writers and administrators of "the only American magazine

Support the "Workers"

By I. AMTER.

The U. S. Census Bureau has announced that 10,000,000 women in the United States are gainfully employed. We do not yet know what part of these women are young workers, unmarried and married women.

If we take the experiences and facts of preceding periods and apply them to the present one, with its multiplied use of automatic machinery and the subdivision of work—in other words the use of unskilled and semi-skilled labor, then we will understand why so many

bourgeois elements, upon whom the "socialist" party is counting so much.

The workers must repudiate the mount-bank Broun, his still more dangerous social-fascist colleague, Thomas, and the whole "socialist" ticket. The Party of the workers is the Communist Party. It alone fights for the immediate interests of the workers and for their final emancipation. The coming elections must be a mass mobilization of the workers under its revolutionary banner. Workers, Vote Communist! Support the Workers' Unemployment Insurance Bill! Strike against wage cuts! Build the T.U.U.L! Join the Communist Party!

(Written at Hart's Island Penitentiary.)