

Against Social-Democratic Infiltration of the Marxist-Leninist Movement—Part 4

The New Browderite Strategy of the MLOC/CPUSA (M-L)

Barry Weisberg's MLOC/CPUSA (M-L) is nothing but an agency of social-democracy trying to smuggle itself into the Marxist-Leninist movement. Examination of the political positions of the MLOC/CPUSA (M-L) reveals that Weisberg's social-democratic sect is walking in the footsteps of Earl Browder. Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the USA in the 1930's and early 1940's, worked to destroy the revolutionary character of the CPUSA by corroding it with liberal-labor politics and American exceptionalism. Ever since, Browderism has remained a deadly curse subverting the working class movement and a byword for ultra-opportunist, revisionist politics. Weisberg has taken up the teachings of Browder precisely because Browderism is social-democracy disguised as communism. The Browderite teachings are tailor-made to serve the social-democratic efforts to infiltrate the Marxist-Leninist movement.

In the past two years or so, the MLOC/CPUSA (M-L) has set forth a new Browderite strategy to replace the equally Browderite formulas of the "three worlds" theory that they were reluctantly forced to abandon. The MLOC/CPUSA (M-L) has in effect taken up Browder's American exceptionalist banner of U.S. imperialism being allegedly a still young and vigorous capitalism. They have put forward the Browderite perspective that "reindustrialization" will open a path for the harmonious, peaceful and crisis-free development of U.S. imperialism and its "unrivaled" hegemony over the entire capitalist-revisionist world abroad and the working masses at home for "the next 10-20 years." In line with this opium dream, they have drawn the conclusion that revolutionary action is futile, if not downright "infantile leftism," and that the communist program is only of "educational" significance. Slavishly following Browder and Khrushchov, they oppose the struggle against opportunism tooth and nail under the banner that allegedly ultra-leftism, sectarianism and leftist impetuosity form the main danger to the communist and workers' movement. Their plan is to fight revolutionary Marxism-Leninism while building a "united labor front" with the open social-democrats, with the Khrushchovite and Browderite revisionists of the CPUSA, and with the other soldout forces, forces that all combined form the "left" wing of the Democratic Party. Sabotaging the struggle against the growing and dangerous fascistization being carried out by the monopoly bourgeoisie, they regard the Democratic Party and its "left" flunkies as allegedly a barrier against the fascism of the Reaganites. They find fascism among the working masses, but not among the big bourgeoisie as a whole. In line with Browder, they find that fascist reaction in the big bourgeoisie exists only in an ultra-right fringe concentrated in the Republican Party. In short, they have elaborated an all-sided system of Browderite politics.

Liberal-labor politics is the common platform of the entire opportunist marsh that forms a "left" tail of the Democratic Party, including: the pro-Chinese "three worlds"; the pro-Soviet revisionists of the CPUSA; and the social-democrats. The MLOC/CPUSA (M-L) has allied now with one section of the liberal-labor bog and now with another section, yesterday with the "three worlds" and today in the "united labor front" with the Khrushchovites and social-democrats, but it has always stayed within the confines of the Browderite swamp. It was precisely because the MLOC/CPUSA (M-L) recognized the social-democratic, Browderite essence of pro-Chinese "three worldsism" that they spent years singing hymns to the new Browderite "directors of the main blow against Soviet social-imperialism" of the OL/CPML.

Indeed, the MLOC/CPUSA (M-L) has always been the close class brothers of the social-chauvinist OL/CPML. The Weisberg sect worshipped the OL/CPML from the founding of the MLOC in 1975 to the MLOC's appeal for unity in a single party with the "three worlds" in the notorious "Open Letter" of March 15, 1978. It was only under the fierce pressure of the struggle of the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists against social-chauvinism and "three worldsism" that the MLOC grudgingly gave up direct advocacy of the "three worlds" theory in late 1977. But even then the MLOC remained the chief opponents of the struggle against Chinese revisionism or any revisionism. They issued their "Open Letter" for unity with the "three worlds"; they vacillated on the question of the "main blow" and continued to babble on about whether Western imperialism was "adequately reformed" or not; they denounced our Party for fighting social-chauvinism and called this "The heart of the difference between the MLOC and COUSML (predecessor of MLP, USA — ed.), in many ways..." (Class Against Class, August 1978, p. 43); and so on. Indeed, in an editorial on March 1, 1979, their journal *Unité!* was still insisting that the Khrushchovite "three worlds" had not yet given "a direct call to the U.S. working class to set aside its struggle against U.S. imperialism." In (1979, mind you!

The MLOC/CPUSA (M-L) has never been able to disassociate itself from the renegade politics or the sorry fate of the "three worlds." Thus the struggle against Chinese revisionism was a tremendous blow to the MLOC/CPUSA (M-L). Not only is the Chinese revisionist OL/CPML in the throes of severe crisis, but the social-democratic Weisberg sect too sees total collapse staring them in the face.

The Policy of "Retreat"

In December 1978, while reeked with crisis and degenerating from day to day, the MLOC crossed its fingers and took the desperate gamble to declare itself the so-called "CPUSA/ML." But within just a few months, Weisberg's sect faced utter catastrophe. Desertions and splits wrecked their already minuscule ranks. All the schemes they had cooked up fizzled into thin air. From then on, they have been following the policy of "retreat," as the Second Plenum of their Central Committee in June 1979 called it (as cited in their journal *Organize!* for October 1979). But this "retreat" has turned out to be five crossing a pool of quicksand for them. Squabbles and dissension have led to further splits and disintegration. Social-democracy is once again proving to be synonymous with splits, lack of unity, chauvinism and anarchy.

As a result, the CPUSA/ML cannot even pretend to be anything but an empty shell. It barely hangs on in two cities, and even there lacks the organization to maintain the most minimal presence among the masses. They themselves acknowledged last year that in each locality "the dis-

tribution of *Unité!* can be measured in dozens" and that even the "distribution of free materials has dwindled to an all-time low." (*Organize!*, Sept. 1979, pp. 24, 13)

They also confess that "there is very little contact with white workers," while "In addition, contact with Chicano, Puerto Rican, Chinese, Japanese and Filipino workers, as well as Native Americans, are all negligible." Overall, they sum up that "It must be frankly admitted today that our Party is largely isolated from the majority of workers" and that "Seldom does the Party attend major demonstrations, pickets, forums, etc. Let alone initiate them." (*Ibid.*, pp. 14, 16, 24) Actually, even to say that they seldom attend mass actions is a gross exaggeration on their part.

Since these confessions, things have gone still further downhill for them. Thus, a month ago, *Unité!* wrote that "Since the split in the Party one year ago, various aspects of the Party's work have been curtailed...." (Report from the 6th Session of the CC, *Unité!*, Nov. 1, 1980) Indeed, they have even evacuated their one bookstore, hardly a year after it was opened in Oakland. This was probably just as well for them, for the continued display of Maoist material and of social-democratic works, such as books written by Richard Barnet, co-director of the Institute for Policy Studies, would sooner or later have proven too big a scandal. And their press is today more anemic than ever, as they prove to be zeros theoretically, unable to speak to any of the burning questions facing the revolutionary movement. For example, despite the fact that they have made a big fuss about alleged Maoist "infantile leftism," to this day they have been unable to articulate their views on the question of Mao Zedong Thought.

This tiny sect of vagabond intellectuals is caught in this acute disorder, the disorder that caused the self-proclaimed policy of "retreat," because of the intensification of the class struggle. In particular, the sharpening of the struggle against Chinese revisionism and the denunciation of Mao Zedong Thought blew up the grab bag social-democratic federation that Weisberg had pulled together. The "CPUSA/ML" proved to be a mere federation whose "unity" was devoid of any principles. Hence the principled struggle against revisionism caught them in a vise-like grip. A major role in their fiasco was played by our Party's powerful polemics, which they repeatedly cursed and fumed at.

Fighting the Left in Order to Unite with the Right

In order to extricate itself from this crisis, the Weisberg sect has launched the slogan "Defeat the Left in Order to Fight the Right." With this slogan, the "CPUSA/ML" announced a new phase of its permanent crusade against "the Left," that is, against Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary struggle. The particular feature of this slogan is that it is a call to throw away everything that might block practical unity with the labor bureaucracy, the social-democratic coalitions of chieftains, and the "left" wing of the Democratic Party.

Today the bourgeoisie is stepping up the activation of social-democracy to oppose the revolutionary movement. Social-democracy paints the plans of the bourgeoisie in general and the Democratic Party in particular with a faint "socialist" tinge. It seeks to keep the masses under bourgeois influence, to wipe out any spirit of revolt and any revolutionary sentiment, and to attach the mass movement as a tail to the liberal-labor politics of the Democratic Party. The Weisberg sect's new slogan and strategy are part of this increased activation of social-democracy.

In these activities, the "CPUSA/ML" is, however, not original but a mere echo. It is following a parallel course of action with its long-time Browderite brothers of the OL/CPML "three worlds." Today the "three worlds" are rapidly merging with open social-democracy, one day hailing the DAW's "Progressive Alliance" and the next day jumping into the Citizens Party's Carterite donkey cart. Like the "CPUSA/ML," the OL/CPML is combining this with a continuous stream of diatribes in its press against "ultra-leftism." It moans and groans about its pitiful condition today and blames it all on an alleged past of "ultra-left" sins. But coming from the Pentagon-socialists of the OL/CPML, who criticized Carter for not being warmongering enough, this talk of an alleged "ultra-left" past is indeed a very sick joke. The real purpose of this campaign is to throw up a fiction of "leftism" yesterday in order to fight the revolutionary left politics today. In this vein, they even denounce the very idea of mass actions in favor of what they consider the more "flexible tactics" of electoral cretinism and coalition with the social-democratic chieftains.

The Weisberg sect is marching in step with the "three worlds" once again. The "CPUSA/ML" too is flagellating itself for alleged "ultra-left" sins in the past. They are on the same path of pretification and merger with open social-democracy. Just as the baby kangaroo never strays too far from its mother, so today the baby social-democratic Weisberg sect is bounding back into the pouch of the mother that raised and fostered it. As part of this, they are flaunting the most ultra-rightist Browderite positions. Their current campaign could thus more aptly be called: "Fight the left in order to unite with the right."

We shall elaborate the various features of the new Browderite strategy of the "CPUSA/ML" in detail. The rest of this article condemns the "CPUSA/ML's" Browderite perspective of the crisis-free development of U.S. imperialism through "revitalization" of industry and their support for this savage capitalist offensive. This social-democratic perspective serves them as another reason to denounce the revolution. In the following parts of "Against Social-Democratic Infiltration of the Marxist-Leninist Movement," we shall then examine the strategy and tactics that follow from this perspective, including the "united labor front" with the Khrushchovite CPUSA and the social-democrats; the replacement of revolutionary action with Browderite "education"; the pretification of the Democratic Party, or its "liberal" wing, as a bulwark against fascism; and so forth.

* * * * *

A Classical Browderite Assessment of U.S. Imperialism

As a fundamental cornerstone of its contribution to the present-day activation of social-democracy in the U.S., the "CPUSA/ML" is advancing a classical Browderite assessment of the strength and character of U.S. imperialism in the world today. They are putting forth the picture of an in-

vincible U.S. imperialism on the verge of overcoming its crises and contradictions. They are conjuring up this vista with their cowardly imagination as the basis to justify their opposition to revolutionary struggle and to advocate the most flabby liberal bourgeois politics under the banner of being realistic, of being "sober and factual."

This is just like Browder. At the end of the Second World War, U.S. imperialism unfolded its plans to dominate the entire world. Browder became an early apologist and enthusiast for the U.S. drive for world hegemony. In 1943-44 he published his notorious "Teheran theses" which showed U.S. monopoly capital virtually ruling over the whole world, peacefully, without contradictions either with the masses of people or with rival imperialist powers. Similarly he visualized a crisis-free evolutionary advance for American capitalism at home. From this Browder concluded that revolution was impossible, and unnecessary at any rate. He elaborated an entire system of liberal-labor politics in which the communists were supposed to abandon the revolution and instead simply play an "educational" role within an all-embracing unity with the "liberal" bourgeoisie.

Mr. Weisberg has resurrected these teachings of Browder. The social-democrats of the "CPUSA/ML" are preaching the same theory of the harmonious development of American capitalism by painting a panorama of a crisis-free U.S. imperialism. For some time now, the pages of *Unité!* have been laced with stories about the invincibility of U.S. imperialism, about its "recovery" from this or that crisis, and with speculations on whether U.S. imperialism is stronger than Soviet social-imperialism. The basis for this agitation was spelled out at the Second Plenum of the Central Committee of the "CPUSA/ML" in June 1979 where the Weisberg clique argued that "there is a possibility for U.S. imperialism to stave off the crisis and through modernization of industry and other means as pushing the crisis onto the colonies to emerge again the unrivaled leader of the western imperialist bloc" and that "the overall strength of the U.S., if the question of revitalization of industry is resolved, could place the U.S. in an unrivaled position regarding these other imperialist powers in the next 10-20 years." (*Organize!*, October 1979)

There it is, in brazen form: the pipe dream of the Weisberg sect for the stabilization and "recovery" of U.S. imperialism through the "reindustrialization" of American capitalism. With this pipe dream, they are negating the most fundamental teachings of Leninism on the question of imperialism.

Renouncing the Revolution in the Face of the "Invincible" Bourgeoisie

First of all, it is strikingly evident that the "CPUSA/ML" is preaching its Browderite sermons about the vitality of U.S. imperialism in order to justify a renegade attitude to the revolution. They are taking the defeat of the revolution as the basis for their strategy and tactics. Just imagine! Here we are in a period of unprecedented crisis of the capitalist-revisionist order. The general crisis of capitalism is deepening before our very eyes. Economically the present crisis in the U.S. can only be compared to that of the Great Depression of the 1930's — and within the present crisis, an even greater crash is being prepared. Furthermore, this crisis is an all-round crisis affecting politics, culture, industry, finance, and so on. The stage is being set for gigantic class battles.

And what do we find? The Weisberg social-democratic sect has already granted the U.S. imperialists decades of recovery. Even the bourgeoisie is singing funeral dirges and moaning that it can't see "the light at the end of the tunnel." But Weisberg is already playing a lively polka for capitalism. For example, when starting in November 1979 Carter did his best to whip up a chauvinist war hysteria against the Iranian revolution, the "CPUSA/ML" did not waste any time in pronouncing that U.S. imperialism had made a miraculous recovery from its political crisis. According to *Unité!*, "The recovery was a capitalist's dream." Allegedly national "unity" was achieved behind U.S. imperialism and the "political crisis had been resolved." The "CPUSA/ML" eagerly drew the moral that "This class of exploiters has proved that even under deteriorating economic conditions it is still powerful enough... to restore the people's delicate confidence in the system of capitalism." ("1979, A Stumble and a Recovery," *Unité!*, Dec. 15, 1979, p. 7, col. 2-3; p. 1, col. 1; emphasis as in the original)

Of course, this recovery turned out to be another pipe dream of Weisberg's sect. It rapidly blew up in the face of the failure of the hysteria campaign, the holding of numerous mass actions in support of the Iranian people, the uprisings of the black people in Miami and elsewhere, the emergence of the mass movement against the reintroduction of the draft, and other manifestations of mass ferment.

Yet on the pretext that there is a "possibility" to stave off the crisis, the Weisberg sect has already denounced the revolution. Following the timeworn path of the Maoist "three worlds," Weisberg expresses his renunciation of revolution through pontificating about the absence of a revolutionary situation. Thus Weisberg himself stresses that "There is nothing more absurd than the wild proclamations... that a revolutionary situation can be predicted for the 1980's. A sober and factual preservation of the actual motion of classes and balance of class forces leads to the conclusion that a revolutionary situation is not on the horizon in the U.S. in the next few years." ("The November Elections and... the Future of U.S. Imperialism," *Unité!*, Oct. 15, 1980, p. 6, emphasis as in the original) Weisberg's "sober and factual" tired-out platitudes about how the present is not yet the time for the uprising are empty and irrelevant. They are nothing but the typical code words used by Chinese revisionism over the last decade to denounce revolutionary work and struggle, pledge loyalty to the American bourgeoisie, and blame the alleged "backwardness" of the masses for one's own renegacy. Sure enough, time to fame, the CC of the "CPUSA/ML" had's and pulled that "a careful and detailed evaluation of the alignment of class forces in the present period" shows that "the majority of the working people... are moving toward the right." (Six Plenum of the CC, *Unité!*, May 15, 1980, p. 4, col. 1) The social-democrats are "soberly and factually" tacking up a sign over the class battles of the 80's: "Abandon hope all ye who enter here!"

Of course, Weisberg and his sect prefer to hide the fact that their "careful and detailed evaluation" and "sober and factual" analysis are code words for their support for the

wonder-working powers of "reindustrialization." Hence they raise all sorts of straw men. The issue is not whether the exact hour or year of revolution can be "predicted." Nor is the issue whether there is a possibility for U.S. imperialism to temporarily escape from any particular crisis. Leninism teaches that in all situations, even the most revolutionary, there is always a possibility for setbacks and zig-zags. The revolution does not come automatically, nor does it ever come with a money-back guarantee in advance. No, the revolution requires vigilance, persevering preparations and heroic struggle and sacrifice. Still less is the issue whether or not the insurrection should be started today. On the contrary, the issue is that the Weisberg sect is seeking to stamp out the ferment among the masses, to demoralize it, to subordinate it to the needs of capitalist "reindustrialization," to tie it to the tail of the "reformists," labor bureaucrats, opportunists and the entire "left" wing of the Democratic Party. The issue is that in all spheres of work the Weisberg sect pursues the path of social-democracy, the path of treachery to the revolution, and seeks to justify this by complaining about the "backwardness" of the masses and the absence of the revolutionary situation.

Lenin contemptuously denounced this feeble whining of the opportunists. He taught that:

"... a Marxist, while utilizing every field, even a reactionary one, for the fight for the revolution, does not stoop to glorifying reaction, does not forget to fight for the best possible field of activity. Therefore, the Marxist is the first to foresee the approach of a revolutionary period, and already begins to rouse the people and to sound the tocsin while the philistines are still wrapped in the slavish slumber of loyal subjects. The Marxist is therefore the first to take the path of direct revolutionary struggle, marching straight to battle and exposing the illusions of conciliation cherished by all kinds of social and political vacillators. Therefore, the Marxist is the last to leave the path of directly revolutionary struggle, he leaves it only when all possibilities have been exhausted, when there is not a shadow of hope for a shorter way, when the basis for an appeal to prepare for mass strikes, an uprising, etc., is obviously disappearing. Therefore, a Marxist treats with contempt the innumerable renegades of the revolution who shout to him: We are more 'progressive' than you, we were the first to renounce the revolution!" ("The Crisis of Menshevism," *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, p. 351, emphasis as in the original)

The Weisberg sect has already denounced the revolutionary struggle in advance for, forsooth, there is a possibility of defeat, a possibility that U.S. imperialism will stave off the crisis. The battle has barely begun, and the social-democratic sect is down on its knees cowering before the "invincible" bourgeoisie and pledging its loyalty over and over again.

An American Exceptionalist Dream of the Vitality of American Capitalism

Of course the "CPUSA/ML's" talk of "a possibility" for American capitalism to stave off the crisis is just a ruse. In fact they are putting forward the crisis-free development of American capitalism via "revitalization" not as a mere "possibility," but as the basic perspective for the future. They hold that the general crisis of capitalism may wreak havoc elsewhere, the revolution may be on the agenda in other countries, but not for the U.S. They are singing hallelujahs to the vitality of American capitalism.

The "CPUSA/ML's" perspective on the crisis is utterly social-democratic. They are prettifying the capitalist "reindustrialization" and pretending that the development of capitalist technology, the further rationalization of production and so forth will overcome the inherent contradictions of capitalism. In reality, "reindustrialization" only further sets the stage for the massive revolt that is swelling up in the midst of the working masses.

The "CPUSA/ML's" prettification of the savage capitalist program of "reindustrialization" is a repetition of the stand of the social-democrats of the 1920's, who also held that the rationalization of production and technical progress were the cure to capitalism's ills. They too prettified the brutal capitalist offensive of speeding up the workers, cutting their wages and throwing them out on the street. They advocated that the rationalization of production would prolong the temporary capitalist stabilization of the 1920's, while today the "CPUSA/ML" is preaching that it will bring American capitalism out of its crisis. Stalin punctured these illusions and pointed out in 1928 that:

"The Comintern holds that the present capitalist stabilization is a temporary, insecure, shaky and decaying stabilization which will become more and more shaken as the capitalist crisis develops."

"This by no means contradicts the generally known fact that capitalist technology and rationalization are advancing. More, it is just because they are advancing that the inherent contradictions and decay of the stabilization is developing." ("The Right Danger in the German Communist Party," *Works*, Vol. 11, p. 308)

In direct opposition to these Marxist-Leninist views of Stalin and the Comintern, the renegade Lovestone group took up social-democracy under the theory of "American exceptionalism." In 1928-29, Jay Lovestone, a leader of the CPUSA who was justly expelled and condemned by the Party, advocated that the capitalist stabilization in the U.S. was firm and unshaken. He opposed the Marxist-Leninist assessment that stabilization was giving way to a period of new crises and class battles. The October 1929 Wall Street crash and the vigorous outbreak of class struggle in the early 1930's smashed Lovestone's theory of "American exceptionalism" (and Weisberg-like "sober and factual" analysis) to smithereens.

"American exceptionalism" was then taken up by Browder. During World War II he set forth a dozen words of a "young" and rejuvenated American capitalism. While Lovestone speculated on the temporary capitalist stabilization during part of the 1920's, Browder speculated on such features as the growth of state monopoly capitalism, the rationalization of the economy and the growth of employment and jobs in World War II. But history would be no kinder to Browder's modern revisionism than to Lovestone's social-democracy. Browder's pipe dream was exploded after World War II by the outbreak of the post-war economic crisis, the development of the strike movement in

Continued on next page

Continued from previous page

the U.S. in 1947-48, the emergence of a new wave of anti-imperialist struggle around the world, the ferocious reaction and fascization under the Truman administration, the jailings of communists and the purging of the unions, and so forth.

The "CPUSA/ML" is following in the footsteps of Lovestone and Browder when it attributes to "reindustrialization" the possibility of overcoming the contradictions of capitalism. Indeed they attribute such power to "revitalization" that they picture it not just resolving the domestic crisis of the big bourgeoisie, but also subjugating the rest of the world. They paint a picture of "unrivaled" U.S. imperialist hegemony over the entire capitalist-revisionist world, an "unrivaled" hegemony that is to last for decades. This too is a denial of Leninism, which teaches that the imperialist era is marked by the revolt of the oppressed peoples, by the social revolution of the proletariat and by bloody clashes and rivalries among the imperialist powers.

"CPUSA/ML" Supports the Savage Capitalist Program of "Reindustrialization" Under the Code Word of Supporting "Automation"

Of course, the "CPUSA/ML" is not just assessing the effects of "reindustrialization," but actively supporting it. They go to the extent of insisting that the struggle of the proletariat must not harm the general progress of "automation," their code word for the "reindustrialization" plan. Thus the Second Plenum of their Central Committee, in discussing their program for the auto industry, reached the conclusion that "we support automation in general" and, on this basis, considered that "the slogan 'defend every job' is confusing and incorrect." (*Organize!*, October 1979) With this thesis, the "CPUSA/ML" is insisting that the proletarian struggle must be subordinated to the bourgeois program of "revitalization" and must only make minor amendments and improvements on this program.

Once again, the "CPUSA/ML's" stand is nothing but classical social-democracy, which has always supported the rationalization schemes of the capitalists as progressive. In the 1920's, the social-democrats championed the alleged triumph of "Fordism" over Marxism. And today the social-democratic labor bureaucrats heading the United Auto Workers sell the workers down the drain while preaching that increased productivity is the key to the millenium for auto workers. It was on this basis that President Doug Fraser of the UAW, following in the footsteps of Walter Reuth-

er and Leonard Woodcock, sold out the auto contract struggle in 1979 and then tore up the contract in order to give another half billion dollars in concessions to Chrysler.

But just imagine the utter shamelessness of the "CPUSA/ML." First they preach that "reindustrialization" will bring about the "unrivaled" triumph of U.S. imperialism. And then they support that "reindustrialization," that same "automation." This means that the Weisberg sect is supporting the very capitalist programs that it itself claims are designed to subjugate the world and smash the revolutionary movement.

The "CPUSA/ML's" advocacy of "reindustrialization" explains why they have started a big discussion in the pages of *Unite!* on whether or not automation is progressive. To create confusion, they have put forward the idea that there are two types of automation under capitalism, a good type advancing the interests of the workers and "eliminat(ing) a tremendous amount of the human drudgery and toil involved in production" and a bad type "to increase...profits" and lay off workers. (Weisberg, "Science Must Serve Proletarian Revolution, Part Two," *Unite!*, May 1, 1980, p. 8) The conclusion of this sophistry is to support "reindustrialization" in general. Thus Weisberg demands that: "The proletariat support(s) automation in general when it genuinely advances the material well-being of the working masses." (*Ibid.*) A recent article continues this indecent praise of "automation" by lauding it as "unleashing human labor from the hardest, most tedious work to make progress for all in other realms." ("No Loss of Jobs Through Automation!," *Unite!*, Nov. 1, 1980, p. 3) What prettification of capitalism! What lackeys! They write this at a time when capitalist rationalization and automation are associated with increasing overtime and speedup and squeezing the workers dry in the shortest period of time. Of course, *Unite!* does grant that "in the long run, most advances of technology under capitalism are used for the purpose of increasing the capitalist rate of profit, and used against the working class." (*Ibid.*) Only a case-hardened social-democrat could imagine that capitalists only seek profits "in the long run," and not immediately, and only in "most" cases, and not in all investments. This nonsense is spewed forth to further reinforce their plea that there are two types of automation, the good and the bad, so that "each situation must be taken individually." (*Ibid.*) *Unite!* then goes on to elaborate what is in effect the program of the UAW and of Carter himself for dealing with automation.

The job of communists is of course not to smash machines and pretend that capitalism will be fine if technical progress

is stopped. But it is equally not the job of communists to help the capitalists "revitalize" their industry by promoting the most vulgar illusions about how a "reformed" "reindustrialization," a "reformed" productivity drive, will "genuinely advance the material well-being of the working masses," shorten the workday, lighten labor, etc. The job of communists is to advance the revolutionary organization of the proletariat in struggle against the capitalist offensive. It is in this field, the class organization of the proletariat, that communists seek to ensure the maximum "technical progress," so to speak, and the maximum application of Marxist-Leninist science. The fairy tales about automation in the pages of *Unite!* might just as well be taken from *Business Week* or the *Wall Street Journal*.

But the "CPUSA/ML's" love for "revitalization" is unbounded. It was manifested again in their impotency in the face of the UAW's chauvinist hysteria about imports. *Unite!* "countered" this demand for restriction on imports



Photo shows comrades of COUSML (predecessor of the MLP) working to organize the auto workers' struggle against the 1979 sellout auto contract. The MLP fights the brutal productivity drive and the chauvinist import hysteria. In contrast, the Weisberg social-democratic sect supports "reindustrialization" and automation. It is completely subservient to the chauvinism of the UAW and gave the chauvinist demand "No Import or Export of Capital!"

of autos by demanding "No Export or Import of Capital!" ("Unite to Fight Layoffs and Plant Closings in Auto," *Unite!*, June 1, 1980) Don't worry too much about restricting imports; oh no, just ban the import or export of capital altogether. Behind this jingo nonsense lay the "CPUSA/ML's" implicit stand that the "real problem" was not the imports of autos, oh no, but the lack of adequate domestic investment to carry out the sacred program of "revitalization." *Unite!* amusingly attempted to paint up this stand in all sorts of internationalist colors, but the rabid chauvinism peeked through as they backed up their plan for banning the import or export of capital by explaining that it would ensure that "production remain here, providing jobs for workers. No runaway shops!" (*Ibid.*)

Naturally, having a chauvinist stand themselves, *Unite!* couldn't really oppose import restrictions either. Thus *Unite!* qualified its alleged opposition to the UAW's plans on imports by stressing that "The trade among the capitalist countries does not benefit the international working class." ("Signs of the Capitalist Crisis, Plant Closings and Lay-Offs in Auto," *Unite!*, May 15, 1980, p. 3) All in all, the social-democrats of the "CPUSA/ML" outdid even their social-democratic class brothers in the UAW leadership. The UAW labor traitors demanded import restrictions, while *Unite!* suggested the complete end of foreign trade and dreamed of a domestic capitalist market filled only with American-made autos built in 100% American-owned factories. That is how the ultra-chauvinists of the "CPUSA/ML" "fight" the chauvinist hysteria of the UAW leadership.

In supporting "reindustrialization," the "CPUSA/ML" is supporting the program of the big bourgeoisie. "Reindustrialization" has today become the common theme song for all the capitalist parties, Democrat and Republican, Carter and Reagan. The "left" wing of the Democratic Party, true to its role as lackeys of the rich, prettifies this "reindustrialization" by painting it in even more fantastic colors than the capitalists themselves. The Citizens Party and the "C" PUSA consider it to be the miracle cure for the economic crisis of capitalism. But the "CPUSA/ML" far outdoes the rest in its fantastic claims for this magic potion which it holds will lead to the complete recovery of U.S. imperialism for decades and genuine advances for the material well-being of the working masses. Even the bourgeoisie hesitates to make such an extreme claim. □