

DETROIT REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT RECORDS

BOX 12 OF 16

FOLDER 24

PARTY SCHOOL REPORTS ON
M-L THEORETICAL
QUESTIONS

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PARTY SCHOOL AND A MARXIST-LENINIST EDUCATION

"Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement....The role of vanguard can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by the most advanced theory." (1)

It is our duty to defeat the revisionists and opportunists, build a communist party, and unite the proletariat into the vanguard position in the fight for the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Only in the fight to build a communist party can the revisionists and opportunists be defeated and the proletariat united in its struggle for power. To have such a party in fact is to have a national structure of cadre or agents of the party who are politically advanced, strong theoretically, and ideologically sound, with close ties to the working class movement. We must build such cadre or agents. We must prepare and arm ourselves for the revolutionary struggles ahead. It is these political needs that explain our slogan that: "education is our main political task in this period of party building." (2) These schools are to help each and every comrade and the League as a whole for the fight to build such a party.

It is not enough to recognize that there are two world outlooks on education, bourgeois and proletarian, and to denounce the bourgeois. It is also necessary for every comrade to master the Marxist-Leninist method of education.

But before getting into the Marxist-Leninist method it is necessary to stress the importance of a Marxist-Leninist education. What then is the importance of a Marxist-Leninist education? First of all, Marxism-Leninism is a science which requires deep and thorough analysis: "In particular, it will be the duty of the leaders to gain an ever clearer insight into all theoretical questions, to free themselves more and more from the influence of traditional phrases inherited from the old world outlook, and constantly to keep in mind that socialism, since it has become a science, demands that it be pursued as a science, i.e., that it be studied." (3) And again: "In order to build, you have to know, you have to master science. But in order to know, you have to study. To study steadfastly, patiently." (4) Secondly, Marxism-Leninism is the science which places all of the knowledge of mankind in the hands of the proletariat and the proletariat revolution. And lastly, not studying Marxist-Leninist theory leads to the strengthening of bourgeois ideology - for the development of proletarian ideology comes out of the process of mastering the Marxist-Leninist world outlook.

The method of Marxism-Leninism (and a Marxist-Leninist education) takes as its starting point that all theory originates in practice and must again be proven in practice. It also implies that there is a dialectical relationship between theory and practice. The dialectics of the revolution in the U.S.N.A. require not only an analysis of the revolutionary process here, but also a continuous study of the world wide proletarian theories and experiences if we are to succeed. The dialectical method of Marxism-Leninism requires that we analyse afresh each problem or phenomenon, take into consideration Marxist-Leninist theory, and come up with a genuine solution or projection: "The

Marxist method is correctly applied when we employ Marx's theory to make a study of the phenomena confronting us. And the decision we take will be a new one each time. If you settle a problem one way today, tomorrow you will settle the same problem in a new way, for the situation tomorrow will be different. The situation is constantly changing. History moves on, it does not mark time, but everlastingly moves forward. And the Marxist must constantly move forward, in step with historical progress. The Marxist, however simple the work he is doing, must always be in a ferment, studying, creating." (5) And further: "This implies that in the work of the school an important place should be occupied by the profound and all-round study of the reality of our time, of the great problems raised by life and put forward by the party, by analyzing and interpreting them in the light of Marxist-Leninist theory." (6)

One other aspect of the Marxist-Leninist method must be pointed out. And that is that revolutionary theory must guide revolutionary practice, and that if this theory is to have its scientific validity in our work it must be used in a scientific way. In order to do this it is necessary to know the conditions under which the foundations of Marxist-Leninist theory came about, their historical importance, and then apply this knowledge in both an appropriate and living way to our revolutionary work.

With these points in mind, every comrade must grapple to understand the significance of the party school reports presented here. Every comrade must take seriously his duties and responsibilities around these reports. We desire that every comrade learn and apply this knowledge to the best of their ability in order to be able to master it.

It is necessary at this point to deal with some problems of mastering Marxist-Leninist theory and some suggested guidelines.

One of the problems in mastering Marxist-Leninist theory is shown by some comrades, while in their enthusiasm to master this theory, concentrate on the form to the exclusion of the content. This approach is diametrically opposed to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism and tends to undermine its essence. It is not the Marxist-Leninist method of learning, but the bourgeois method of learning by rote: "We do not need cramming; but we do need to develop and perfect the mind of every student by a knowledge of the principal facts. For communism would become a void, a mere signboard, and a communist would become a mere braggart, if all the knowledge he had obtained were not digested in his mind. You must assimilate it critically, so as not to cram your mind with useless lumber, but enrich it with all those facts that are indispensable to the modern man of education." (7) The Marxist-Leninist method of learning (and therefore the C.L.'s) is the conceptual method of learning. The conceptual method of education emphasizes learning - nay more, mastering - the content or essence of whatever is being studied. This does not mean that the mastering of the form is not helpful in given situations. This does mean that the political meaning, significance, etc. must be placed first, and whatever memorizing of form which helps to master the content, comes second; "These results are a sound basis for working more persistently and in a more qualified way, so that all the communists and the working people master Marxist-Leninist theory. This requires deep and continuous study of the actual works of our great classic teachers,

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and of our Party documents and materials, in which the experience of the international communist movement is generalized. This study is not and cannot be an aim in itself, but is closely linked with the present revolutionary practice and should serve this practice. We should not study anything that comes to hand, but we should have a definite aim, selecting the respective literature for this purpose. The study of Marxist-Leninist theory should help us to gain a deep knowledge of the Party's policy in every field of activity and to carry it out correctly, to understand and successfully wage the struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism, to know the laws of class struggle, of the relations between the conditions of material life and the consciousness of man, of the economy and politics, to understand and solve correctly the contradictions and problems to which the development of the life of our country gives rise.

This cannot be achieved by simply learning some formulas and theses by heart, but only when the fundamental principles, the Marxist-Leninist methodology, are mastered; when the dialectical materialist method of interpretation of phenomena and the solution of questions is assimilated, when both dogmatic attitudes and subjective views are combatted." (8)

The key to learning Marxist-Leninist theory, just like the key to making revolution in the USNA or anything else, is to make a thorough analysis. What the revolution needs is leaders, and leaders are those who make thorough analyses and offer genuine leadership based on such analyses.

The dialectical approach is to seek those aspects which motivate things, that is, "what is the opposition, the connection, the history, the environment and the motion." (9) From this it can be seen that the materialism of an object or thing demands the dialectical approach in order for its essence to be truly grasped. "Its study arms people so that they are not satisfied to analyze facts and phenomena merely by their external appearance, by what appears on the surface, but by delving deeper into them, by discovering their content, their essence, the objective laws that guide their social development. For, it is not rare for it to happen that the external form of social processes and phenomena distorts the essence hidden below, so that it seems something new, normal, progressive, whereas in essence it is completely the opposite." (10)

Other aspects to the question of education (for example: the seminar method, the revisionist tendency on education, etc.) are dealt with in the last political report on education. This report is to stress the importance of a Marxist-Leninist education in our revolutionary work at this time and to indicate some attitudes within the CL which need rectification, it should generate considerable discussion.

In summing up and concluding we will take a quote from Stalin in the History of the CPSU(B):

"The history of the Party further teaches us that a party of the working class cannot perform the role of leader of its class; cannot perform the role of organizer and leader of the proletarian revolution, unless it has mastered the advanced theory of the working

class movement, the Marxist-Leninist theory.

The power of the Marxist-Leninist theory lies in the fact that it enables the Party to find the right orientation in any situation, to understand the inner connection of current events, to foresee their course and to perceive not only how and in what direction they are developing the present, but how and in what direction they are bound to be developing in the future.

Only a party which has mastered the Marxist-Leninist theory can confidently advance and lead the working class forward.

On the other hand, a party which has not mastered the Marxist-Leninist theory is compelled to grope its way, loses confidence in its actions and is unable to lead the working class forward.

It may seem that all that is required for mastering the Marxist-Leninist theory is to diligently learn by heart isolated conclusions and propositions from the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin, learn to quote them at opportune times and rest at that, in the hope that the conclusions and propositions thus memorized will suit each and every situation and occasion. But such an approach to the Marxist-Leninist theory is altogether wrong. The Marxist-Leninist theory must not be regarded as a collection of dogmas, as a catechism, as a symbol of faith, and the Marxists themselves as pedants and dogmatists. The Marxist-Leninist theory is the science of the development of society, the science of the working class movement, the science of the proletarian revolution, the science of the building of the Communist society. And as a science it does not and cannot stand still, but develops and perfects itself. Clearly, in its development it is bound to become enriched by new experience and new knowledge, and some of its propositions and conclusions are bound to change in the course of time, are bound to be replaced by new conclusions and propositions corresponding to the new historical conditions.

Mastering the Marxist-Leninist theory does not at all mean learning all its formulas and conclusions by heart and clinging to their every letter. To master the Marxist-Leninist theory we must first of all learn to distinguish between its letter and substance.

Mastering the Marxist-Leninist theory means assimilating the substance of this theory and learning to use it in the solution of the practical problems of the revolutionary movement under the varying conditions of the class struggle of the proletariat. (13)

FOOTNOTES

- (1) Lenin, What is to be Done?, New World Paperbacks, Pp. 25, 26.
- (2) C.L. Report on Education, Spring of 1972.
- (3) Lenin, Ibid., P. 28.
- (4) Stalin, On Communist Education, Kalinin, Moscow, 1952, P. 186.
- (5) Kalinin, Ibid., Pp. 26, 27.
- (6) Hoxha, Study M-L Theory, P. 52.
- (7) Lenin, The Young Generation, International Pub., P. 32.
- (8) Hoxha, Report to the 6th Congress of the Party of Labor of Albania, Pp. 155, 156.
- (9) White Chauvinism Report - C.L., P. 2.
- (10) Hoxha, Study M-L Theory, P. 24.
- (11) Stalin, CPSU(B), P. 355.

Party School on Revisionism

The History of Revisionism

"There is a saying that if geometrical axioms affected human interests, attempts would certainly be made to refute them."(1) So it is with Marxism-Leninism, the doctrine of the working class. So once the direct challenges to Marxism were soundly defeated, the bourgeoisie attempted to revise Marxism to their liking, to nestle within the working class with a distorted "revolutionary theory" which gave theoretical justification to opportunism.

Revisionism systematically opposes Marxism on every question from philosophy to economics to political struggle. In summary, revisionism is a system of liberal bourgeois views within the Marxist movement which attempt to sacrifice the fundamental interests of the proletariat and cater to the needs of the bourgeoisie. Lenin points out in Marxism and Revisionism (p. 219) the historical development of revisionism:

"In the first half-century of its existence (from the 'forties' on) Marxism was engaged in combatting theories fundamentally hostile to it. In the first half of the 'forties' Marx and Engels demolished the radical Young Hegelians, who professed philosophical idealism. At the end of the 'forties' the struggle invaded the domain of economic doctrine, in opposition to Proudhonism. The 'fifties' saw the completion of this struggle: the criticism of the parties and doctrines which manifested themselves in the stormy year of 1848. In the 'sixties' the struggle was transferred from the domain of general theory to a domain closer to the direct labour movement; the ejection of Bakunism from the International. In the early 'seventies' the stage in Germany was occupied for a short while by the Proudhonist Muhlberger, and in the latter 'seventies' by the positivist Duhring (whom was crushed by Engels celebrated work Anti-Duhring). But the influence of both on the proletariat was already absolutely insignificant. Marxism was already gaining an unquestionable victory over all other ideologies in the labour movement.

"By the 'nineties' this victory was in the main completed. Even in the Latin countries, where the traditions of Proudhonism held their ground longest of all, the labour parties actually based their programs and tactics on a Marxist foundation. The revived international organization of the labour movement--in the shape of periodical international congresses--from the outset, and almost without a struggle, adopted the Marxist standpoint in all essentials. But after Marxism had ousted all the more or less consistent doctrines hostile to it, the tendencies expressed in those doctrines began to seek other channels. The forms and motives of the struggle changed, but the struggle continued. And the second half-century in the existence of Marxism began (in the

'nineties') with the struggle of a trend hostile to Marxism within Marxism.

"Bernstein, a one-time orthodox Marxist, gave his name to this current by making the most noise and advancing the most integral expression of the amendments to Marx, the revision of Marx, revisionism. Even in Russia, where, owing to the economic backwardness of the country and the preponderance of a peasant population oppressed by the relics of serfdom, non-Marxian Socialism has naturally held its ground longest of all, it is plainly passing into revisionism before our very eyes. Both in the agrarian question (the programmes of the municipalisation of all land) and in general questions of programmes and tactics, our social-Narodniks are more and more substituting 'amendments' to Marx for the moribund and obsolescent remnants of the old system, which in its own way was consistent and fundamentally hostile to Marxism.

"Pre-Marxian Socialism has been smashed. It is now continuing the struggle not on its own independent soil but on the general soil of Marxism - as revisionism."

The historical, philosophical and financial roots of revisionism spring from the bourgeois class. The error made by many petty bourgeois intellectuals in stating that the source of revisionism is this upper strata of the working class, is based in the fact that revisionism has as its main source of strength in the upper strata of the working class and the petty bourgeois intellectuals to the masses of the working class, as much as the majority of the unions are naturally led by the skilled workers. It is also important to know that the real basis of bribery, and therefore, in the final analysis, revisionism is in the enormous wealth that is robbed from the colonies by the imperialists. These giant trusts and monopolies can afford to pay off a certain section of the skilled sector of the working class, and this imperialism is the real basis of revisionism. Lenin pointed out in "Theses on the Fundamental Tasks of the Second Congress of the Communist International" (Lenin on Revisionism, p. 60) that:

"One of the chief causes which retard the revolutionary working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries is that, owing to the colonial possessions and the superprofits of finance capital, etc. capital has succeeded in these countries in singling out a relatively broader and more stable stratum, a small minority, a labour aristocracy. The latter enjoys better terms of employment and is most imbued with the narrow craft spirit and with petty-bourgeois and imperialist prejudices. This is the real social 'bulwark' and at the present time it is almost the principal social bulwark of the bourgeoisie."

Modern Revisionism is Counter-Revolution

The question is often raised, "What is the difference between revisionism and modern revisionism?" The answer is simply this, that the first attack by the revisionists came prior to the Soviet revolution. The first revisionists could only attack the theories of Marx and Engels. Lenin defeated these attacks and the result was the great October revolution and the establishment of the Third International.

After the death of Engels, Bernstein, who himself had once been a Marxist, and other revisionists captured the Second International. (The First International Working Men's Association founded by Marx, existed from 1864 to the defeat of the Paris Commune in 1872. This organization laid the foundation of the building of the World Socialist Republic.) The Second International existed from 1889 to 1914. Concerning its history Lenin states that "This was the period of the quietest and most peaceful development of capitalism, a period without great revolutions. The labour movement grew strong and mature in that period in a number of countries. But the leaders of the workers in the majority of parties, growing accustomed to peaceful times, lost the capacity for revolutionary struggle.....They betrayed the workers, they helped to drag out the slaughter, they became enemies of socialism, they passed over to the side of the capitalists." (Lenin, 3rd Communist International, p. 3) The substance of revisionism was expressed by Bernstein in his phrase, "The movement is everything, the final aim is nothing." The period of the Second International was a period of wide-spread imperialist expansion and relative peace within the imperialist countries. The "goods" of the world helped finance the reforms and revisions of the opportunists. This rotten chauvinist degeneration within the Second International was exposed by the willingness of most of its members to side with their own bourgeoisie during the first World War and by the scathing polemics of V.I. Lenin.

Today, no one in their right mind would dare to attack Marx and Marxism as a scientific system. At least such attacks do not come in the realm of theory. Today, the question is much more acute. Revolution is a real thing. Therefore, the shift has been made in the tactics of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. Instead of attacking the theories of Marx and Engels, the revisionists today attack the concrete expression of Leninism. In other words, the shift has been made so that today the target of the revisionists is no longer the abstractions of Marxism, but the concrete motion of the revolution. This makes the revisionists a hundred times more dangerous, more deceitful and more brutal. The Chinese are a thousand times correct when they explain that modern revisionism is counter-revolution in practice.

In summary we see that classical revisionism laid the basis for the opportunism and jingoism that preceeded WWI. During that huge imperialist slaughter these opportunists rallied the workers for their mutual slaughter. These opportunists helped crush the growing Marxist-Leninist movement in 1919. These opportunists paved the way for German fascism by misleading and bridling the militant German Social Democratic workers. Lenin's struggle against the established revisionist parties had to be resolved by building parties of a new type. It is clear now that under even more difficult conditions we are going to have to build a new Party based on Marxism-Leninism.

The main projections of the revisionists, their main tenents center around the deep desire and need of the proletariat for peace. The massive onslaught of the modern revisionists was signaled by the death of Stalin and further by favorable (to the revisionists) conditions

of post World War II and the end of the Imperialist War of Aggression against Korea. What was the concrete situation? First of all, WWII left 20 million Soviet peoples dead. More than 80 million Chinese were dead, half of the USSR was totally destroyed. Europe was in ruins. There was not a single complete factory, school, road or railroad left in the People's Democratic Republic of Korea. The overwhelming majority of the seasoned Communists in Europe, the USSR and China were dead. In Yugoslavia for instance, only two elected members of the Central Committee remained alive at the end of the war (and one of those was Tito). Under such conditions the struggle for peace became an acute question. It is here the revisionists struck hardest against Leninism and proletarian revolution.

- 1) Peaceful co-existence--Now this is a perfectly legitimate Leninist slogan. It is a framework of struggle against the capitalist powers where the workers haven't as yet reached maturity. But to the revisionists, peaceful co-existence no longer meant co-existence between states with different social systems -- now it meant peace between the enslaved colonies and the imperialists.
- 2) Peaceful competition--A perfectly legitimate Leninist concept that was proposed in order to allow the Soviet Union time to develop. It was transformed into a prohibition against any other form of struggle against imperialism. This was the basis for Marshal Malinovsky saying that the USSR should abandon war as an instrument of national policy. For Lenin, imperialist peace was the period between and adjunct to imperialist war. Lenin stated clearly that the imperialists only desire peace as a means of getting what they can't get from war and as a continuation of the policies of imperialism. For the revisionists, however, peace is a thing in itself, something separated from the policies of imperialism or socialism, something which stands outside of politics, something to be grooved for from the imperialists.
- 3) Peaceful transition--This is the third and best known projection of the revisionists. The revisionists took this to mean legislative transition--that is to say transition from capitalism to socialism by parliamentary means. Peaceful transition should be the desire of every real proletarian communist. It is the working class that is slaughtered and suffers in war, and especially civil war. To the real communist, peaceful transition means the seizure of state power in such a way as to prevent the formation of two states, and the resultant civil war. This can only be done by making the most detailed preparations for a most violent transition. Leninism accepts the unity of opposites expressed in peaceful transition by violent means. The Communist League has never projected a possibility of a legislative transition--but we do hope for and must propagandize for a peaceful transition. Leninism teaches that revolution must be the mass act of millions of people, a violent and planned act so as to avoid the bloodshed and suffering of the working class. It is in this spirit that Marx says that the Communist Party is the midwife to a society pregnant with change. A perfect example of the revisionist line on peaceful transition is the current Allende government in Chile. Here instead of preparing for violent confrontation with the imperialists

and educating the people in scientific socialism, the revisionists projected peaceful transition through bourgeois democracy. The Russian revolution was relatively peaceful on Nov. 7, 1917, but this was because the working class and peasant masses were overwhelming in strength compared to the bourgeois class. After the successful insurrection the civil war was an extremely violent battle mainly due to the strength of the international bourgeoisie who attempted to save their class allies in Russia.

The Communist League has taken great care to avoid the stupid petty bourgeois worship of violence and bloodshed that makes terrorism a system to itself. We also avoid the belly crawling concept that the ruling class will peacefully hand over the means of production to the toilers upon legislative demand. We see revolution as a class act, led by the communist party, the general staff of the Proletarian Revolution. We try to make that act as swift and bloodless as possible.

The onslaught of the modern revisionists which begun in the post war period had an added advantage in that the Tito and the Yugoslav nationalists held state power. They made Belgrad the capital of world revisionism. Tito utilized Earl Browder's (General Secretary of the CPUSA from 1929-1944) revisionist theories on the reasonableness of imperialism. The basic tenet of these theories was that imperialism had reached a new level, a new stage, in which it was reasonable, non-expansionist and would slowly turn into socialism.

In 1954, General Zuckov (a right-wing pro-fascist commander in the Soviet army) surrounded Moscow with tanks during an important Central Committee meeting. This armed coup d'etat put Krushchov in power and shifted the center of revisionism from Belgrad to Moscow. The revisionist control of the CPSU resulted in the purge of 90% of the previous membership and was slowly consolidated through the 20th, 21st and 22nd congresses of the CPSU. This victory for the Soviet revisionists unleashed the revisionists throughout the world.

As we have indicated, modern revisionism is counter-revolution. Its principle weapons are subterfuge, assassination, murder and provocation. In the Congo the revisionists forced the Lumumba government to rely on the so-called peace keeping forces of the United Nations. The result was the murder of Lumumba, the destruction of the Congolese revolution and the temporary crushing of proletarian revolution in Africa. In Hungary, the Krushchov gang first prepared the conditions for the counter-revolution--then stood by idly while the fascists slaughtered the Communists. Finally after Krushchov had been warned of Chinese intervention, he installed a thoroughly revisionist regime, dooming Hungarian socialism. In Iraq, the revisionists openly conspired against the regime of Col. Karim Kassim. Despite treaty provisions, the revisionists stood by idly until the Iraqi CP had been slaughtered and then Krushchov demanded the halt of the counter-revolution.

Again in Cuba we see the role of world revisionism. At the highlight of the South American revolution, missiles were discovered in Cuba. How was it possible to transport and erect missiles secretly? The USNA has never been able to do it. Then under the supposed threat of nuclear war, Krushchov and Kennedy came to an agreement. That agreement was that Kennedy would guarantee the stability and security of the Cuban regime. In return, Krushchov would guarantee that Cuba would be severed from its reserves in South America, stop the organizational

and propaganda work in South America and no further interfere in countries under the hegemony of the USNA. In the Arab lands, the USSR has been the main pillar of strength of the counter-revolutionary feudalist and bourgeois regimes. In the current crisis it is the strength of the Soviet Union, in open collaboration with the USNA imperialists that is holding up the reactionary regimes from the Zionist Meir to the fascist Kaidaifi (Libya). The superpowers hope to have peaceful plunder of the mideast oil after the planned extermination of the Palestinian peoples.

The treachery of the Soviet Union's fascist gang of leaders is clearly seen on the Vietnam question. Working closely with the political leaders of the USNA, the USSR is attempting to trade revolution for grain, trying their utmost to attempt through the back door what the USNA imperialists have failed to gain through its war of aggression. Nixon faithfully tested the loyalties of the Soviet rats when he mined the harbors and increased the bombing of North Vietnam at the same time he was proposing toasts in Moscow. The revisionists faithfully complied by warning the North Vietnamese to "show restraint" and good faith toward USNA imperialism.

Today revisionism is the primary aspect in all but four parties who hold state power. The Albanian Party of Labour, the Chinese Communist Party, the Vietnamese Workers Party and the Korean Workers Party all have remained victorious against revisionism. Throughout the world, revisionism dominates most of the Communist Parties. However, the current epoch of history is marked by a tremendous world-wide battle to reestablish the party of a new type, the party of Lenin. There are several very important parties which do not hold state power and are leading working class and peasant struggles. Among some of the most important are the Communist Party of the Philippines, the Communist Party of India ML, the Communist Party of Australia and New Zealand. However parties such as the Communist Party of Italy (with three million members) and the Communist Party of Mexico are at least as counterrevolutionary in their own countries as the CPUSA is here.

With the consolidation of the "new bourgeois" rulers in the Soviet Union, the policy of the Soviet Union became what Lenin referred to as "social-imperialism". Socialism in words, imperialism in deeds. The Soviet revisionists are certainly the leading element in the revisionist movement and the enslavement of the Soviet people is a tremendous reserve of international capital. While the Soviet Union claims to be socialist, they are the largest rentier (money lender) state in the world (outside of the USNA). This specific form of imperialism is carried out by loaning money in such a way as to guarantee the dependence of the small poor nations upon the imperialist nations. As Marx said the borrower is tied more highly to the lender than the buyer is to the seller. The Soviet rulers were not concerned with Dubcheck's (the disposed leader of Czechoslovakia) capitalism, but they were concerned that Dubchecks capitalism was leaning toward the western capitalists, there was the rub.

Revisionists Collaborate with USNA Imperialism

One point cannot be emphasized enough. The collaboration between the Soviet ruling class and the USNA imperialists is extremely harmful and dangerous to the people of the world. The June, 1972 Fortune magazine editorialized that the cold war was over and now is the time for a period of working together to solve the world's problems. This is the clarion call to reactionaries throughout the world.

The most highly organized and influential revisionist grouping within the USNA is the Communist Party USA. The comrades must not make the error of considering this group merely a collection of weak old foggies. The CPUSA has a vast reserve in both the USNA and USSR imperialists. The CPUSA influences more workers and working class organizations than any other organization within the class. The basic program of the CPUSA published from their 20th convention in the spring of 1972 is an excellent example of modern revisionism in practice. The line of the CPUSA is basically to form an "anti-monopoly coalition" which can be voted into power. Once this is voted into power it can begin to "curb the power of the monopolies" and "get the war mongers out of the Pentagon" and legislate freedom for the national minorities. For a complete look at the history of the CPUSA and how it evolved as an anarcho-syndicalist organization the comrades should closely study "Dialectics of the development of the Communist League". But let us look briefly at the program of the old party.

Nowhere in their literature or program does the CPUSA even discuss the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin points out in State and Revolution (p. 30): "Those who recognize only the class struggle are not yet Marxists; they may be found to be still within the boundaries of bourgeois thinking and bourgeois politics. To confine Marxism to the doctrine of the class struggle means curtailing Marxism, distorting it, reducing it to something which is acceptable to the bourgeoisie. Only he is a Marxist who extends the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

The revisionists begin their program and base it on the weakness of the USNA imperialists and the love for the Soviet social-imperialists. They claim that the imperialists are retreating when they are in fact strengthened by the collaboration with the Soviet Union. They claim that imperialism is dying slowly and will evolve into socialism. This is in complete opposition to dialectical and historical materialism which states that change is a struggle, a break with the old, a violent battle between the old dying forces and the new arising forces, a leap between quantity and quality.

CPUSA on National Liberation

How does the CPUSA treat the crucial question of national liberation and particularly the question of the independence of the Negro Nation? They rail about the "national question" of the Negro people, yet when it comes to the question of the material basis for this national character, the frontiers, make-up and history and the material basis for the oppression of the Negro Nation by USNA imperialism, the CPUSA becomes lost in a dense bourgeois fog, feebly referring to vague migrations etc.. They attempt to reduce the valiant struggle of the Negro people

for national liberation against imperialism to a battle for culture. What ugly white chauvinism! What does Lenin say on this question?

"The proletariat of the oppressor nations must not confine themselves to general, stereotyped phrases against annexation and in favour of the equality of nations in general such as any, pacifist bourgeois will repeat. The proletariat cannot remain silent on the question of frontiers of a state founded on national oppression, a question so 'unpleasant' for the imperialist bourgeoisie. The proletariat must struggle against the enforced retention of oppressed nations within the bounds of the given state which means that they must demand freedom of political separation for the colonies and nations oppressed by 'their own' nation. Otherwise internationalism of the proletariat would be nothing but empty words....." (Questions of National Policy and Proletarian Internationalism, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1967, pp. 114-115)

The Communist League from its inception has concentrated its fire against the revisionists, especially the CPSU and the CPUSA, as some of the most dangerous spokesmen for the bourgeoisie. Our life however, is not removed from the real world and the revisionism which asserts itself against the class as a whole also is found within the League itself. How is it manifested?

Revisionism Manifested in CL

Revisionism is manifested in the Communist League in the most subtle manners. Universally it is found in the opposition to the League's line, particularly around the questions of party building, practice and on the national-colonial question. The CL takes its line on party building straight from Lenin. That the party should be governed by democratic centralism, that it should concentrate on developing theoretically sound cadre who have deep ties in the masses of most exploited and oppressed of the proletariat. There is a continual pull by revisionist influence to build the party through the mass struggle, primarily by exciting the masses with demonstrative maneuvers and education through example. The basic line of the revisionist CPUSA is that no party is needed, what is needed is a mass organization which will join a united front in order to be voted into Washington D.C.. The entire "new left" was groomed with this line by the CPUSA and was also given a healthy dose of hatred of theory. The tendency, especially by those comrades influenced by the "new left" is for the hollow spectacular and quantitative actions which undermine the basic principles of the CL.

On the question of practice we see a stern struggle against revisionism. For instance the comrades will agree on one line of one course of action and then do the complete opposite in practice. We have learned from bitter experience it is not those who talk against revisionism but those who undertake in the daily and difficult struggle against revisionism whose membership is valuable. Lenin pointed out that the essence of Marxist tactics was the concentration on the most exploited and oppressed sections of the proletariat. This concentration is not primarily in the manner of reform movements but in the education around the principles of scientific socialism. This is in fundamental opposition to revisionism.

The CL is involved in a fight for line throughout the USNA. One of the main aspects of this fight is around the Negro National Colonial Question, which is one of the key ~~questions~~ for revolutionaries today. The line of the CPUSA is that the Negro National Colonial Question is a question of "race" and the demand of revolutionaries is for democratic and cultural rights. It is quite understandable that the opportunists will attempt to mask the source of extraordinary profit from which they get the crumbs. But there is no excuse for the fascist ideology of white chauvinism expressed by the line of the CPUSA to develop within our ranks.

Conclusion

Revisionism is the effort of the bourgeois to hold off the victory of the revolution. Revisionism has always represented a last trench effort of the enemy to hold off revolution. Historically the victory over revisionism is the immediate prelude to the victory of the proletariat. The basic tactic of revisionism is to form an alliance between the upper stratum of the working class and the bourgeoisie against the fundamental interests of the proletariat. While the basic tactic of the Marxists is class struggle, the basic tactic of the bourgeois revisionist is class collaboration.

Hence the crucial role of theoretical development in building a Communist Party. No matter how spirited, youthful, wise etc. the cadre are, their basic understanding of Marxism is their best weapon in the battle against revisionism. Comrades, we are preparing for battle, presently through the written word, but soon in the factories and mills throughout the USNA state. Each educational, each meeting, each criticism, should be used to steel us in this preparation for the final onslaught against world capitalism. We have inherited scientific socialism as developed by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tsetung. Ours is a difficult, but ultimately victorious path.

SYNDICALISM DISARMS THE PROLETARIAT

The Communist League is rounding out three years of struggle. During this time, the League has had to deal with a number of counter-revolutionary tendencies within and around the organization.

From the beginning, the Communist League recognized that the root of every anti-working class deviation in the left was the counter-revolutionary revisionism of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.

Since we were small and correctly believed that we had to concentrate our fire on the main enemy, we were forced to forego any public analysis of the various anti-Marxist, petty bourgeois tendencies that have been contending for the leadership of the so-called movement.

It is clear today that one counter-revolutionary ideology has gained supremacy. That ideology can be referred to as the specific Anglo-American form of Anarcho-Syndicalism.

Considering the petty bourgeois, opportunist nature of the movement, it is not surprising that it should embrace the outlook of syndicalism.

Syndicalism is a primitive, petty bourgeois, radical outlook that is based in that strata of society that has been recently pushed off the farm and into the urban proletariat--or recently hurled out of the petty bourgeoisie into the proletariat. This "revolutionary" outlook is based on the most casual and perceptual knowledge.

Syndicalism--2

Syndicalism has been the major trend within the American revolution for the past 100 years. The old Socialist Party, the Socialist Labor Party, the Syndicalist League, the Industrial Workers of the World, and the Communist Party have all been basically syndicalist.

Originally, syndicalism proposed that the trade union would grow bigger and more powerful until they took over the organization of industry and in fact became the government. Thus, the primitive revolutionaries could only see the question of individual capitalists that had to be struggled against. They never saw the capitalists as a class or understood the role of the capitalist state as the principle weapon of the capitalist class.

Inherent in syndicalism is the idea that the workers of each factory will have to liberate that factory and there was no such concept as responsibility of the class as a whole.

Under the present conditions of the general separation of the left from the working class and especially from the trade unions, this concept of individual emancipation was transferred to the social struggle. This explains the growth of organizations that organize women as women, blacks as blacks, chicanos as chicanos, etc.

How is it that such an ideology appears full blown in the United States just before and after the Civil War? The answer is that the working class in the United States was imported from the bastions of syndicalism--Germany, France and Ireland. Whereas the countries of Europe had to develop their proletariat out of

Syndicalism--3

the population of the countryside, the U.S. capitalists were able to import the proletarian class from Europe--and these proletarians brought their "revolutionary" ideologies with them. The truth is that the first native born proletarians in the U.S. arrived into the cities from the farms during the great depression. This continued and massive immigration from abroad accounts for the difficulties of developing a Marxism that is at once a universal scientific expression of the proletariat, and at the same time is expressed in terms of the concrete and national struggles of the proletariat in the U.S.

At the birth of the Communist Party U.S.A. a number of syndicalist groups federated, and in truth the syndicalism of the C.P.U.S.A. has never been defeated. From this point of view, it is not surprising that the "New Left" in their battle against the old foggies of the C.P.U.S.A. had to take up the weapons that history had handed them. In the history of the working class of the U.S.A. there is nothing but syndicalism. The "New Left" only added a few petty bourgeois deviations and in general headed it in the direction of fascism.

What is the perceptual knowledge of the new breed of Syndicalists? They see men oppressing women, whites oppressing blacks, bosses oppressing workers, and it is from these observations that the entire political program of syndicalism is constructed. And what is that program? Women will overthrow men, blacks will overthrow whites, workers will overthrow bosses, students will

Syndicalism--4

overthrow the administrations and so forth.

Marxism is militantly hostile to such programs. Marxism searches for the internal connections and oppositions and is never satisfied with the observation of external phenomena.

Capitalism is a system of oppression and exploitation. As with all class systems, a state apparatus is constructed to guarantee and perpetuate that system. Where modern syndicalism sees a future in which every grouping is doing "its own thing," Marxism sees that capitalism must be replaced with socialism, which is also a system, only a system under the control of the working class. This system must also have a state, a state that protects the majority against the minority. The syndicalists, by attacking everything except the system and the state that protects it makes a mockery of the concept of "revolution."

The general projections of the movement indicate how firm the syndicalist ideology is in control. The women's liberation movement, the student movement, the black left, the "New Left" all testify to this. Although the theoretical and political projections of the movement are syndicalist, the concrete applications transform it into its opposite--with which it is completely united. In practice, syndicalism (which comes from the left) is expressed as modern Populism (which comes from the right). The reason for this is that both of these bourgeois outlooks disregard the basic social motion, which is the class struggle.

Syndicalism has a most destructive effect on the Negro peoples

Syndicalism--5

movement. Here, it becomes expressed as an exceptionally rotten form of white chauvinism.

Throughout the history of the Left in the United States, the Syndicalist intellectuals have seen to it that the division of labor is that the blacks fight, get their heads busted, go to jail or get killed while the white intellectuals do the thinking. They have seen to it that the concept of black-white unity actually means unity of the white petty bourgeois intellectuals in the leadership, with the black toilers. In this formulation the ideals of unity of the working class is effectively set aside and the strength of the Negro Masses is sapped in futile reformist struggles.

In the Communist Party of the U.S.A., this has been and is obvious, but the heirs of syndicalism in the "left" go even further. Everywhere they have constructed organizations of blacks who fight and get killed and white intellectuals who call themselves thinkers. Whites are allowed to join the groupings who pretend to study "Marxism," while the revolutionary blacks that are attracted to them are sent to this or that black grouping whose struggles guarantee the existence of the white "Left." These syndicalists are saying what the FBI and the master class has always said, that "blacks are good enough to fight but are not capable of thinking." Twist and squirm as you may, Mr. Bourgeois--social development is beyond the wishes and wills of people. An objective law of the class struggle against capitalism is that the complicated science

Syndicalism--6

of Marxism-Leninism will unite with the concrete struggles of the proletariat. This unity of opposites will guarantee the success of the revolution. The very living heart of the U.S. proletariat is black and brown. Black people will fight Marxism despite the concealed efforts of the white so-called revolutionary syndicalists.

From the standpoint of syndicalism--it is easy to see the theoretical rationale for this rotten white chauvinism. Since whites oppress blacks the thing to do is to separate them, to build black movements, in the confused and reactionary image of the white syndicalists. In this manner the unity of the class is prevented and the slavery of the Negro toilers is guaranteed--all under the banners of revolution.

It would seem that the most casual examination would show that the emancipation of any exploited class or group is impossible without the overthrow of the system that exploits it. More yet, it is clearly seen that the proletariat cannot emancipate itself without emancipating every oppressed class and group within the country. Therefore, it would seem that every oppressed grouping, every exploited class, right think of all for the unity of the proletariat. That is the overriding condition for its own emancipation.

The line that the syndicalists are following, far from fighting for the unity of the proletariat, is fighting to maintain its disunity. The history of this country shows us that whites organized as whites means only one thing--fascism.

Syndicalism--7

The fascist danger is increasing rapidly. The resistance against fascism is also growing. The fascists have penetrated the left, and through the apparatus called the C.P.U.S.A., have connected fascism and revolution as never before. However, the God-children of the C.P.U.S.A., the "New Left" Syndicalists, cannot escape their responsibility for the lack of unity on the left and in the class.

The Communist League wants to clearly point out the counter-revolutionary and white chauvinist character of syndicalism. We call upon the masses of honest revolutionaries to elevate the concepts of women fighting men, of black fighting white, of students fighting administrators, of workers fighting bosses to the level of the class struggle.

It is time to raise the banners of solidarity of the working class, the banners of the proletariat as the vanguard and liberator of all the progressive and suffering humanity.

People's Tribune, Nov.-Dec., 1971,
pp. 1-2,9.

ON PROLETARIAN MORALITY

Several years ago the Politbureau, in response to inquiries from the comrades, held a discussion on the question of proletarian morality and issued a memorandum summarizing the discussion. Since that time the League has grown and expanded. We are at the threshold of forming a new Communist Party in the USNA. Hence, once again the question of morality becomes a very important factor in carrying out our work. In order to facilitate the struggle for a Marxist-Leninist party, and in order to assist the comrades to steel themselves, I would like to reissue and update the essentials of the memorandum.

Firstly, What is morality?

The bourgeois dictionaries state, "Morality - the doctrine of moral duties; morals; ethics; the practice of the moral duties; the quality of an action as estimated by a standard of right and wrong.

Behind this gibberish are some plain statements. The learned asses of the bourgeoisie are really saying morality is what upholds and uplifts the social system. Morality is what stabilizes and makes permanent the existing class relationships. Where does morality come from? How do people go about choosing one morality or another?

In the introduction to the Critique of Political Economy Marx states, "In the social production which men carry on, they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material forces of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure- the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production in material life determines the social, political and intellectual life process in general." What Marx is saying here is that our social codes, including the various aspects of our morality, rises out of the conditions of our lives and the fundamental conditions of our lives are dependent on the modes of production. Hence, every change in the mode of production and the class struggle that results from it is bound to be reflected in the shifts in our morality, and other aspects of our philosophy. Marxism, of course, is dialectical. Many "new" Marxists ignore that fact. The dialectics here is that just as man's morality is ultimately determined by the economic relations, we recognize the massive impact of man's thoughts and morality on the objective aspects of life. Mankind dreams, and these dreams become goals and react on the objective world. If this were not true, humanity would simply become one more aspect of a mechanical world and there would be no reason to struggle for a better life.

Further, Stalin states, "Hence, the practical activity of the party of proletarian must not be based on the good wishes of 'outstanding individuals.' not on the dictates of 'reason', 'universal morals,' etc, but on the laws of development of society and on the study of these laws." (L & H Mat) Engels says, "... the economic structure of society always furnishes the real basis, starting from which we can alone work out the ultimate explanation of the whole superstructure of juridical and political institutions as well as of the religious, philosophical and other ideas of a given historical period, Socialism etc." (Socialism, Utopian and Scientific)

Further, Marx says, "Does it require deep intuition to comprehend that man's ideas, views, and conceptions, in a word, man's consciousness, changes with every change in the conditions of his material existence in his social relations and in his social life?

"What else does the history of ideas prove, than that intellectual production changes its character in proportion as material production is changed? The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class." Communist Manifesto p 29)

It is possible to quote reams of Communist literature that would all add up to show that morality in the epoch of capitalism cannot help but be bourgeois morality. In the main, every hippie who withdraws from bourgeois society understands this. But Hippies do not and cannot understand where morality comes from. Therefore, they have an excuse when they reject bourgeois morality on the one hand, and reinforce and extend it on the other. The Communists have no such excuses.

Morality is what accords to the various social systems. Thus we have a slave morality that is different from capitalist morality. And, of course, socialist morality is different from bourgeois morality. In our political struggles as in our struggle for revolutionary morality, we Communists are at a disadvantage inasmuch as there are no Socialist production relations against which to test our activity. In capitalist society, the bourgeois is quick to note what is 'moral' or 'immoral', because it is immediately or over a period of time reflected in the profit ledger. But we are pulled, on the one hand by the 'natural' flow that cannot help but be bourgeois morality - ie, male supremacy, taking advantage of people who are at a disadvantage, selfishness, etc.,. On the other hand, our consciousness demands that we reject bourgeois morality and orient our lives - public and private - around proletarian morality. However, proletarian morality is precisely the reflection of consciousness. What is consciousness? There is "social consciousness" which recognizes the existence of social injustice, of rich and poor, of humble and mighty. But a much higher form of consciousness is class consciousness, which recognizes the exploiters as class enemies and unites the workers on the basis of the struggle against and overthrow of the enemy class. This difference was expressed in the development of the First International in which Marx fought to have the slogan changed from "All Men Are Brothers" to "Workers of the world - Unite"

Class consciousness is expressed as class hatred, the recognition of the brutal enslavement and destruction of our class around the world. The class conscious Communist realizes that he or she is a soldier in the proletarian army. The main ideological attribute of such a soldier is discipline, which is expressed by never giving aid or comfort to the enemy. It is expressed by being an example of steadfastness and marked by not working at cross purposes with ones self - ie, fighting the enemy in public but living a private life that erodes and destroys or disorients the will to struggle. The higher our consciousness, the less our tendency to hold back the struggle for socialism. The higher our class consciousness the more readily we integrate our personal activity with the general flow of the movement.

Our Communist League is a youthful organization and one which in its formation was influenced by the moral attitudes of preceding movements. This is natural since morals and morality are part of and drawn from history.

We cannot spend much time analyzing the morality of the CPUSA or the various movement groups, a left-wing petty-bourgeois morality which in no way contributes to the development of the revolution. For example, morality in the CP was what suited the short-range political goals of the Party. It is well known that the women in the CP were, from time to time urged to use their sex to assist them in recruiting, just as the men handed out jobs to those workers, particularly among the minorities, who would join the Party. Overall, the concepts of sexual morality flip-flopped

in the Party. During periods of rapid expansion sexual looseness was encouraged under all sorts of "freedom" slogans. At other times the pendulum swung to the opposite end and if one did not treat women as if they were men charges would surely follow. The reason behind the flip-flops on this question was that the CP was and is a set of malcontents. We are revolutionary Marxist-Leninists and therefore we start from objective reality and not from subjective desires.

Even in the POC, which really tried at first to rectify the twisted morality of the Party, ended up with a Catholic morality smeared over with Marxist phrases.

Engels once said, "Life asserts itself." He meant that the dialectical laws of social development cannot be done away with and no matter what the blocks put in the way, no one can for long deny life, the natural laws of social development and the assertion of these laws. The CP, on the other hand, like the Catholic Church, had a set of laws governing all aspects of conduct, and this is one of the reasons that the people in the CPUSA never learned how to think.

The slightest effort shows us that it is impossible to draw up a list of "Thou shalts" and "Thou shalt nots". What is moral today might very well be immoral tomorrow when political conditions change. The moment we begin to view all moral demands from the point of view of class and class struggle we see how absurd are the categorical demands set forth hypocritically by the bourgeoisie. For example, we demand "peace," but we are really demanding civil war. We want peace only in the sense of workers not fighting each other. We demand an end to "killing"- but we are also demanding the head of every slave driver and butcher of our class.

A political activity such as engaging the police in a fight would be adventurism and anti-class, hence immoral, if the revolutionaries were isolated and unable to get the support of the masses. But failing to carry out a temporary and ruthless assault when the masses are demanding it and participating in it is also anti communist and immoral. So we see that our estimates of morality and immorality are strictly limited to the needs of the revolution. We have condemned and will continue to condemn as immoral every social or political act that in any way harms the revolution.

Comrades sometimes make the mistake of falling into the trap of formal logic. What is formal logic? It is "the systematic study of the structure of propositions and of the general conditions of valid inference by a method which abstracts from the content or matter of the propositions and deals only with their logical form." (Britannica, 1965, vol 14 p 209) Of course, here is the rub. Dialectical materialism recognizes the natural and objective unity and struggle between form and content. The impossibility of discussing form without content is apparent once we admit to motion. Logic says, Dead is not alive- if you are alive you are not dead, if you are not dead you are alive. Real life, however, shows us that all living organisms begin to die at birth and that the exact moment of the death of anything is very difficult to establish, as any lawyer will testify. As Marx points out, "All that exists - all that lives on earth and under water, exists and lives only by some kind of movement." Engels applies this concept of motion to morality. He writes, "We therefore reject every attempt to impose on us any moral dogma whatsoever as an eternal, ultimate and forever immutable moral law on the pretext that the moral world too has its permanent principles which transcend history and the differences between nations. We maintain on the contrary that all former moral theories are the product, in the last analysis, of the economic stage which society had reached at that particular epoch. And as society has hitherto moved in class antagonisms, morality was always a class morality; it has either justified the domination and the interests of the ruling class, or as soon as the oppressed class has become powerful enough, it has represented the revolt against this domination and the future interests of the oppressed. That in this process there has on the whole been progress in morality, as in all other branches of human knowledge, cannot be doubted. But we have not yet passed beyond class morality. A really human morality which transcends class antagonisms and their legacies in thought becomes possible only at a stage of society which has not only overcome class contradictions but has even forgotten them in practical life." (Anti-Duhring, Int. Pub., p. 105)

* * * *

The bourgeoisie has scored an important victory amongst the post - WW II generation. It has managed to twist the question of morality into a question of sexual conduct.

It is interesting to note that neither Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin nor Mao has much to say specifically about sexual morality. The reason for this is that never before has sexual morality been separated from morality in general. Before now sex was simply assumed to be an indispensable part of life and a reflection and integral aspect of a general class orientation. To Communists, sexual morality is an integral part of and a minor part of our morality. This formulation has been stoutly resisted by some comrades and such resistance only proves how deep a moral grip the bourgeoisie has on us. Can any one equate sexual questions with the slaughter of the peoples of Mozambique or Chile? Can anyone make a decision on sexual conduct apart from the overwhelming demands of the revolution? Mao sums up the answer to such questions with his advice, "Put politics in command."

The bourgeoisie places the question to young revolutionaries in a very contradictory way. The latter are allowed to carry on militant social activity and on the other hand are encouraged to lead a dispiriting, male supremacist, hedonistic sexual life. The bourgeoisie knows perfectly well that hedonism grows at the expense of politics.

We have demanded, and shall continue to demand, that in the moral and political sense League members be communists 24 hours a day, seven days a week. A comrade who is a communist leader in the factory and after 10 PM turns into a bourgeois is not a communist at all, but a fraud and a double dealer.

We will give one example of how a libertine and undisciplined personal life can and generally will react politically. It happened during the trial of the so-called "second-string" group of CPUSA leaders in 1953. One of the key stool pigeons was an agent by the name of James Cummins. Although there was plenty of evidence to discredit this stoolie, it could not be presented because one of the leading Party women on trial had on several occasions very casually slept with the pig and was afraid of a counter-exposure. It goes without saying that this comrade had also had such casual affairs with almost all of the local Party leadership, a fact that was known to Cummins and provided him with protection.

Such cases were numerous in the Party, chiefly because certain "communists" were said to inject petty bourgeois pleasure-seeking attitudes into the movement under the guise of "freedom" and rejection of bourgeois morality. Our Communist League, as opposed to the Party, is a political revolutionary group. We demand that comrades think things through and be capable of making decisions based on Marxism-Leninism. As Stalin and Dimitroff point out, cadre, individual comrades capable of finding their own way, are the most valuable asset the revolution possesses.

In describing our outlook in the League on sexual morality, we should understand a few things from the thinking of Lenin. One, we instinctively distrust people who are constantly and totally absorbed in sexual matters. Such an attitude might appear to be very free and revolutionary, but really it is quite bourgeois and quite decadent. Such absorption and prying into sexual matters goes beyond the normal and healthy curiosity of youth and becomes a substitute for normal and healthy performance. Two, sex is a part of our lives and is therefore political. To be one-sided on this particular question is just as serious as to be one-sided on any other political matter. Above all we are organized to attack the class enemy, to emancipate the proletariat and to create the conditions for the happiness of mankind. Only people who organize their lives around this struggle are eligible for membership in the League. Three, Lenin railed against the so-called "new sex life" or, as it is called today, the "sexual revolution." What difference is there between a person, whether man or woman, staggering from one loveless sexual encounter after another and one staggering from one whore house to another?

Fifty years ago there was a popular left-wing theory that sexual gratification under socialism would be no more important or difficult than taking a glass of water when one is thirsty. It is implied that the theory applies mostly to the desires of men. Because historically women have struggled for stable sexual relationships (see Engels, Origin of the Family), we should understand that the object of communism is to humanize, not dehumanize, mankind. There is nothing in the historical development of sexual relations to suggest that sex will ever again become an animal urge to be satisfied as one satisfies thirst. Let us proceed from the concrete. Sex is the basis for the continuation of humanity. Because

it is a necessary, pleasurable and common experience for all, it is open to exploitation and to being bent to the political and social needs of the class struggle. To deny the sexual side of our lives is to pervert sex and our lives. But to take the free and easy attitude of the lumpen is also a perversion. We communists are serious people and we extend our serious outlook to the question of sex.

Since sex is a common experience, the question cannot be posed as "to be or not to be." Sex, as they say, is "here to stay." Therefore, it would seem that other factors are the ones we have to deal with. Marxists sum up these other factors as "conditions, time and place," and we might also add, "results." Here again we are faced with another dialectical problem. As we have noted, individual activity has little effect on the general historical class struggle. Nonetheless, everything we do changes us. Ill-considered, bourgeois-oriented activity is bound to undercut our consciousness. And so it is with our sexual lives. It is clear that we cannot carry on a principled political life and a hedonistic sexual life. One is bound to destroy the other and hedonism is bound to end up removing the comrades from the League. The study of conditions, time and place are fundamental to Marxist discipline and that extends to sexual activity.

It is clear that the form of the relationship between men and women is developing to higher and higher levels. When we say men or women as such we mean sexual beings. When women appear as bricklayers or weavers or what have you they and the men in such occupations are identified as such. Therefore, the relationship of men as men and women as women is a purely sexual one. When the two sexes appear as communists, on the contrary, we have an equality that does not take the respective sexes into consideration. Let us examine this difference a little more closely.

There is a deviation in the League which declares that marriage is political. Nothing could be further from the facts. Subtract sex from any marriage and it ceases to be a marriage. Marriage is a sexual relationship no matter what form it assumes. Within the League we fight to keep the form of marriage political. However, any marriage has to be based on sexual attraction and consummation, or else it is a partnership, not a marriage.

Part of the confusion on the question of form and content in marriage is based on the misconception that the struggle against male supremacy does away with the differences between men and women. Of course, this outlook is itself male supremacist because it excludes the possibility of equality between men and women. We should recognize and emphasize the differences between men and women because it is the only way we can fight against inequality. Equality is based on the recognition of differences. If there were no differences there would be no inequality.

In what way are men and women universally different? Only sexually. We want to emphasize this in order to guarantee that there can be no other legal difference. In this sense we demand that men be men and women be women, and we insist on equality. In the CL there is no room for the betwixt and between elements.

It is clear, or should be, that men and women have carried on sexual relations since their beginning. What is not always so clear is that the form of these relationships is constantly changing. In order to preserve the sexual content, the form the sexual relation takes is constantly sublated—that is, the form is overcome in order to preserve the real content. The form of marriage is a more or less legal institution and is a part of the superstructure, which in turn is based on the productive relations of classes. These productive relations are in the final analysis determined by the productive forces by which society wrests a living from nature. Therefore it is only natural that every development of the productive forces historically allowed for or demanded a greater concentration of people with corresponding changes in the forms of their relationships, including marriage. A brief summary of the forms of marriage presents to us:

1. The group marriage, wherein sexual intercourse is unrestricted, i.e. promiscuous in its real sense. At this stage the productive forces are at a very low level, consisting mainly of sticks and stones. Social organization consists of small groups of gatherers wandering over a fairly wide territory.

2. The consanguine family. Here intercourse is restricted to generations, and thus prohibits intercourse between mothers and sons and fathers and daughters. Economically, tools begin to be produced; hunting develops and the population increases. Group marriage is sublated with a resulting increase in the mental and physical well being of the tribes.

3. The Pululuan family. Here marriage exists of several sisters with each other's husbands, or of several brothers with each other's wives. However, intercourse is prohibited between brothers and sisters and eventually between more distant relatives. Tools are further developed. Bow and arrow, sling and spear are used. Hunting, fishing, are male tasks, and women control agriculture and the home.

4. The pairing family. Here we leave the legal group marriage and develop the gentile constitution with a resulting leap forward. Herding and animal husbandry begin.

5. The patriarchal family, the marriage of one man and several wives. Mother right is lost. Man takes control of the house and subjugates women. Animal husbandry turns toward private herds.

6. Monogamy. This is the enslavement of the women and children. Private property exists in slaves and cattle, and civil society develops.

The point we are making is that the form of sexual relations have changed with every real change in the economic and social environment. However, the sexual contact has remained throughout. In fact the reasons the forms had to be changed was to preserve the sexual content.

It seems that the proletarian marriages in the USNA are the most advanced in the capitalist world. It is here that the people are the least constrained by religion, national sentiments and so on. In other words, bourgeois monogamy as a form of marriage is close to dissolution before the onslaught of capitalist pressures. Women are more free. Over 30% (NOTE - Check this. The figure should be 40%-JA) of the work force are women with the result that as their economic dependency on men decreases the development of marriage based on sex love increases. This is clearly seen in the gigantic growth and development of common law marriage. This is very good and progressive. For example, in Los Angeles County the bourgeois marriage is especially unstable - 3 out of 4 end in divorce within 2 years. We are not arguing for instability but we are saying that sex love is the only acceptable basis for marriage. It is the only possible basis for proletariat and consequently for the Communist League.

(the)
The growth of the proletariat and the ever-shifting emphasis of the class struggle brings about ever-changing concepts in the revolution. We should take note of these changes because they affect our moral conduct. Sex involves our attitudes toward women; more so than a decade or so ago sexuality is more openly linked with the fight against male supremacy. For example, what can the puritanical attitude be but male supremacy? To the puritan, the sex relationship exists without women. It is an act between man and God and fully denies the possibility of women or men enjoying sex. All we have to do is see how the Christians have taken the beautiful love poem "The Song of Solomon" and attempted to pervert it into a love between man and the church. Or take the situation where the church attempts to explain to the nun that her sexual urges are an expression of her love for God. By this ethic pleasurable sex between men and women becomes dirty and criminal. Or take the Don Juan idea. What is that but male supremacy? Here the attitude is one of conquest. The more the conquest, the greater the warrior. Actually such an attitude is loaded with homosexuality. Male supremacy itself, in fact, as an expression of hatred for women, cannot help but express homosexuality. What is there for Don Juan to prove to society? He is trying to prove to himself that he is a man and not a neuter.

On the question of sexual freedom, how can we communists pretend that anything is "free", is unfettered, under capitalism? There is no such thing as free sex because we are human beings and not commodities to be exchanged.

The concept of freedom is a very important category of Marxist philosophy. Freedom for the Marxist, far from being freedom from natural laws, is on the contrary the recognition of just these laws. Engels writes, "Freedom does not consist in the dream of independence of natural laws, but in the knowledge of these laws, and in the possibility this gives of systematically making them work toward definite ends. This holds good in relation both to the laws of external nature and to those which govern the bodily and mental existence of men themselves- two classes of laws that we can separate from

(this section continued on page 8)

Today, every question of sexual morality can be brought down to the level of the struggle against male supremacy. And it is from this point of view that we concretely discuss our morality.

In the relations between men and women, it is obvious that the trend is toward a higher and purer form of relationship. That corresponds to dialectics, which teaches us that things develop from lower to higher stages. Therefore, we have left the group marriage situation forever. We are developing a higher and higher form of individual sex love. This means that the sex act is becoming more and more tightly connected with individual love. Now it might seem contradictory to state that love is changing also. There is no way to have a love under socialism that is the same love as under capitalism. Love is bound to become a social expression just as sex is bound to become more and more pointed to specific individuals.

In relations between husband and wife we insist on fair play and reject any attitudes that say that the wife belongs to the husband or vice versa. Both belong to the revolution and have to conduct their lives accordingly. Communist marriages are not property relationships. It is a special relationship between comrades and it is not exclusive like a feudal relationship where the woman is trapped in the tower for the remainder of her life. Communist marriages are a form of agreement between the comrades and it is impossible to be "free" where there is an agreement. In the most liberal strata of bourgeois society part of the price of marriage that a woman pays is to give up her male friends. It is blatant male supremacy to imagine that a man is such a superhuman that all the social and cultural needs of his wife are going to be perfectly satisfied by him alone. The male supremacy lies in the assumption that women by nature are shallow creatures. We must take into account the objective conditions of our lives and not pretend that married women are single women, or that married men are single men. What we are saying is that we do not want marriages in the League that tend to restrict the development of the woman simply because she is married. The husbands should realize that the very property relations that we fight against are the basis for jealousy. Jealousy is male supremacy and we should fight against it. A woman should stay with a man because she wants to and will tolerate no other pressures.

As we approach the revolution, and more so under socialism, it is clear that there is going to be a separation between love and sex love. The dialectic is that love is going to become a social outlook. People will feel a love and a responsibility for society and will express it concretely in labor and in the militant defense of society. Then, sex will become an individual aspect of this social attitude. In bourgeois society there is a romantic love where emotions are directed toward an individual to the exclusion of society. But the sexual side of bourgeois love is directed toward groups. Marx noted this when he stated that "the financial aristocracy, in its mode of acquisition as well as in its pleasures, is nothing but the resurrection of the lumpen proletariat at the top of bourgeois society." (Class Struggles in France, Handbook of Marxism, p. 99) Further, Marx and Engels state in the Manifesto, "Our bourgeois, not content with having the wives and daughters of their proletarians at their disposal, not to speak of prostitutes, take the greatest pleasure in seducing each other's wives."

"Bourgeois marriage is in reality a system of wives in common and thus, at the most, what the Communists might possibly be reproached with is that they desire to introduce in substitution for a hypocritically concealed, an openly legalized, community of women. For the rest, it is self-evident that the abolition of the present system of production must bring with it the abolition of the community of women springing from that system, i.e., of prostitution both public and private."

We cannot pretend that we live in an ideal communist society. We live in a real world with real people and with real problems.

The real question that is being asked by the comrades is this: Is it anti-communist to have sexual relations before marriage, and is it anti-communist to have sexual relations with other than husband or wife? These questions are too personal for us to comment on. Decisions by communists are made by summing up the total of the objective and subjective factors and then making the decision in favor of the revolution. We cannot and will not

start from bourgeois foundations and then construct a morality that is simply the left opposition of the Victorians. Feudalism and its morality could rest in part on the preceding slave ideology, just as capitalism inherited and could remould the ideologies of feudalism. This was possible because slavery, feudalism and capitalism are all exploitative systems. "The communist revolution," as Marx points out, "is the most radical rupture with traditional ideas." No, we communists take individual responsibility for every breath we take, and so it is with our personal lives. Most of our individual acts have no or very little influence on social development of the class struggle, and therefore, we have no way of evaluating these acts. But those actions which harm the struggle are obviously immoral.

Stalin once wrote, "Communists are people of a special mold." This is entirely true in regards to the overall concepts of revolutionary morality. We are of a special mold because we are responsible to the working class, and our conduct at all times and under all circumstances must reflect credit on the League and on our class.

In summary, we can only say that collectives must hold comrades responsible for all their acts. In the Communist Party the members constantly found someone else to blame for their individual wrongdoings. In the CL we want to train our comrades to think out every action so that in a real sense of the word we represent communism to ourselves, as well as to our class. We must never forget that although political relations are never personal, personal relations are always political.

Continued From page 6

each other at most only in thought but not in reality. Freedom of will therefore means nothing but the capacity to make decisions with real knowledge of the subject. Therefore the freer a man's judgement is in relation to a definite question, with so much the greater necessity is the content of this judgement determined; while the uncertainty, founded on ignorance, which seems to make an arbitrary choice among many different and conflicting possible decisions, shows by this precisely that it is not free, that it is controlled by the very object it should itself control. Freedom therefore consists in the control over ourselves and over external nature which is founded on knowledge of natural necessity; it is therefore necessarily a product of historical development." (Anti-Duhring, Int.p.125)

Can this profound statement by Engels in any way be equated with the bourgeois concepts of freedom, especially as regards sexual morality? The only "freedom" we can have in our sexual lives is the recognition of the "restrictions" that are placed on us by our mission in life and a full assessment of the emotional and physical results of our action.

(return to top p 7)