

WHY NOT CHEAP MILK?

By MANUEL GOMEZ.

PARADOXES are often highly illuminating. Consider the astonishing paradox of our minority: farmer-labor Communists who insist that the idea of a mass farmer-labor party was a childish illusion from the start.

The comrades of the minority profess to be greatly amused. They take their amusement seriously and the party should take it seriously too. It would seem that they have been suddenly struck by the "naive innocence" with which our party entered originally into the movement for a "broad, all-inclusive" labor party. Their present attitude—an attitude of ridicule toward the conception that there must be a broad mass base for any labor party agitation—is too important to let go by without analysis. It proves conclusively that the majority has been right in labeling the minority tendency opportunistic.

The labor party campaign was an application of the united front. But why do Communists go into united front campaigns? For the purpose of building the Communist Party. Of course, but that is not all. "It is a question . . . of going forward with the rising masses of the workers," said Comrade Zinoviev at the meeting of the enlarged E. C. of the Comintern, Dec. 4, 1921, when the united front policy was being formulated.

Independent of what organizational benefits may accrue to the Communist Party, a Communist united front campaign must be based upon an issue which in itself constitutes a forward movement for the work class. Every step of our policy must be rooted in the understanding that "the Communists have no interests separate and apart from the working class as a whole."

Consequently, when local farmer-labor parties were springing up on all

sides—when great masses were responding to the farmer-labor slogan—when large numbers of workers were moving, and apparently, for all their confusion and vacillations, in the right direction—the Workers Party threw itself into the campaign for a nation-wide farmer-labor party, based on the trade unions, organizations of poor farmers and working class political parties. We did this in an effort to win the leadership over the masses, to unmask the reactionary labor bureaucracy, and to gain influence and members for the Workers Party. But it was not just a trick to outwit the A. F. of L. fakery, altho every one of them from Johnston to Fitzpatrick, tried to make the masses believe the whole business was nothing but a cynical Communist maneuver. It was a sincere move on our part to participate in the creation of a federated party of workers and farmers—not an "all-inclusive" party necessarily, but one based on organized masses, in which the Workers Party would be a militant left wing.

Communists realize the shortcomings of a "farmer-labor party" and its creation is certainly not a matter of principle with us, but we were confronted with what might possibly have been a major historical development in the United States and we were obliged to take an attitude toward it. In any case, we held to the conception that a farmer-labor campaign must be considered objectively (from the point of view of the interests of the broad masses) as well as subjectively (from the point of view of the Workers Party as an organization).

Now the minority refers to this as our "illusion." Following upon the hectic adventures in the field of farmer-laborism, under the guiding star of

Comrade Pepper, they have developed a penchant for farmer-laborism and farmer-labor slogans, under any and all circumstances, irrespective of the movement of the masses—in spite of the fact that the Material development in the United States may take an entirely different road from that of the farmer-labor party.

The following apology is from Comrade Rodachi, who has organized the deviations of the minority into a system of pseudo-Maxist deviation:

"The the campaign for a labor party may or may not result in the formation of such a party, yet, the process of the campaign itself, the maneuvers of the campaign, would bring us in contact with the masses, would strengthen our party numerically, would teach our party maneuvers and activities, and is bound to extend the influence of the party to greater numbers of workers and exploited farmers."

In this paragraph we have the whole secret of the errors of the minority. Here we have the idea of maneuvers without a practical goal (the minority considers themselves speak of a broad labor party as an illusion). Maneuvers without any basis in the forward movement of the workers. Maneuvers for practice, maneuvers for the sake of experience, maneuvers for the purpose of making immediate contacts for the Workers Party. For this, Rodachi is willing to advocate the masses to farmer-laborism, with the farmer-labor slogan, against their own ultimate class interests.

Now we are in a position to see why it is that the minority is constantly shouting for "action," "organ-

ization," without the slightest regard for the objective needs of the masses, and why they ridicule the majority for thinking in terms of the masses. The minority wants to "organize," "crystallize," "maneuver" everything in sight—or out of it. A half-dozen fake, camouflage farmer-labor parties (which could, no doubt, be "crystallized") would not help the working class onward, but would only confuse it. Nevertheless, we might get a few members for the Workers Party.

And we find ourselves in the comfortable paradise of the subjectivist. If it is good for us organizationally, it must be good!

Comrade Rodachi and his group have turned our revolutionary motto upside down. Instead of "The Communists have no interests separate and apart from the working class as a whole," we find the famous doctrine of "The working class has no interests separate and apart from the Communists!"

A queer sort of Marxism this, which bases its policy on the Workers Party instead of on the working class as a whole! Such policy logically translates itself into the slogan, anything is got members! Which is a slight variation of the old B. P. slogan of, anything to get votes! Our minority comrades are to be sharply differentiated from the opportunist leaders of the B. P., but that is where their tendency leads.

Edward Bernstein, the father of revisionism, wrote in 1898: "The final aim is nothing, the movement is everything." This is the beginning and end of opportunism.