

DETROIT REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT RECORDS

BOX 12 OF 16

FOLDER 29

**CADRE SCHOOL PAPERS ON
MARXIST SUBJECTS**

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 such 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 shalt" 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 able 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 ot us:

1. The group marriage, wherein sexual intercourse is unrestricted, ie. 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)

7

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)

R.G.H.

Resolu
RESOLUTION ON PARTY ORGANIZATION

This Party Congress resolves to constitute a Multi-National, Marxist-Leninist Communist Party in the United States of North America based upon the general political and organizational principles for Communist Parties which were adopted by the Third International.

Whereas the Congress, the highest body of the Party, is mandated to elect a Central Committee, General Secretary and Organizational Secretary, the Central Committee is mandated by the Congress to set up the organizational apparatus for the Party. This should include:

1. A Political Bureau, to be formed consisting of the leading members of the Central Committee including the General Secretary and the Organizational Secretary. The job of the Political Bureau will be to lead the work of the Central Committee between Central Committee meetings and Congresses.
2. A Secretariat, to be formed of General Secretary of the Party and the Secretaries of the leading committees, to coordinate the work of the Party.
3. An Organizational Bureau, to be formed to transfer the work of the Center to the Organization and the work of the Organization to the Center.
4. A National Education Committee, to be formed to carry out education within the Party around the Outline for the Study of Marxism-Leninism.
5. A National Editorial Board, to be formed with the editor appointed by the Central Committee, to put out a Central Organ of the Party known as the Peoples Tribune.
6. A Network of District and Local Party Organizations and other Committees and Commissions to be appointed by the Central Committee, to be formed with the factory and street nuclei (unit) serving as basic units of the Party.

Further organizational work of the Party will follow the general principles outlined in The Communist Party Manual On Organization. These principles will be adapted to correspond to the present conditions of the class struggle in the USNA and to the needs of the Party.

R.G.

Rights of Party Members

All Party members enjoy the following rights.

1. To participate in the free and practical discussion at the Party meetings or in the Party press (internal) on theoretical and practical questions relating to Party policy.
2. To making proposals regarding the Party's work and give full play to their creative ability in their work.
3. To elect and be elected within the Party.
4. To criticize any Party organization or any functionary at Party meetings.
5. To attend in person when a Party organization decides to take disciplinary action against them or make an appraisal of their character or work.
6. To reserve their opinions or submit them to a leading body of the Party in case they disagree with any Party decision, which in the meanwhile, they must carry out unconditionally.
7. To address any statement, appeal or complaint to any Party organization up to and including the Central Committee.

The basis of the organizational structure is democratic centralism.

A.

1. The Congress, the highest body of the Party, elects the Central Committee, the General Secretary, and the Organizational Secretary, and the Central Committee is to construct the Party and direct its work between Party Congresses.
2. Every candidate must be voted on separately.
3. Every Party member has the right to object to a candidate and criticize a candidate.
4. The voting for all candidates is done by secret ballot.

B.

1. Decisions of the higher bodies are binding on the lower bodies.
2. Congresses, organizational membership meetings, will be called when needed to decide the direction of the organization according to major developments in the class struggle.
3. Plenary sessions, sessions of the elected officials and leading cadre will be held to discuss major political developments.
4. Lower Party organizations must present periodical reports on their work to the next higher Party organization.

D.

1. The Party acts by strict discipline and subordination of the minority to the majority.

R. Glotta

PARTY CONSTITUTION

Membership

1. Membership in the Party is open to any person in the USNA who does not exploit the labor of others, accepts the Party Program and Party Constitution, joins a Party organization and works actively in it, carries out the Party decisions, observes Party discipline and pays membership dues.
2. Applicants must be eighteen years old.
3. Applicants must undergo the procedure of admission individually.
4. Applicants must be recommended by two full Party members. The applicant must give his history, background and an honest explanation of his present ties and beliefs. Application is subject to approval by the next higher body.
5. Upon acceptance, the applicant must be assigned to a Party organization and have the constitution reviewed with him by a Party member.
6. Party members are free to withdraw from the Party. The Party organization to which the member belongs will decide the conditions for withdrawal and this will be reviewed by the next higher body.
7. When a Party member is cited for an infraction of any part of the Party Constitution, he is to be given a list of his offenses, and criticized through the highest body that he is a member of. Breaches of Party discipline by individual members may be punished by: 1) censure, 2) public censure, 3) removal from committees, 4) removal from all responsible work, and 5) expulsion from the Party.

Duties of Membership

1. To study Marxism-Leninism diligently and strive increasingly to raise the level of their understanding and the understanding of those around them.
2. To be bold in making criticism and self-criticism.
3. To safeguard the Party's solidarity and consolidate its unity, to faithfully carry out Party policy and decisions and to energetically fulfill the tasks assigned to them by the Party.
4. To serve the interests of the masses of the toilers with all one's energy, strengthen one's ties with them, learn from them, listen with open ears and open mind to their wishes and opinions and report these without delay to the Party, and finally to explain Party policy to them.
5. To be constantly vigilant to protect the Party from opportunists, careerists, police agents, and other degenerate elements who might slip into membership.
6. To uphold communist ethics.

utilized in practice for the needs of production. It is the demand for technical progress that stimulates the development of natural sciences and engineering directly connected with production.

Hence it is one of the features of natural science—the sum total of knowledge of the laws of nature, of physical, chemical and other properties of things—that, distinct from the superstructure it is connected with production and its processes not only through the basis, but also directly.

Unlike medieval handicrafts, modern big industry both in capitalist and socialist society, is based on the conscious application of natural science, of the fruits of science. It could not live a single day without employing science. This is particularly true of such industries as machine-building, electrical engineering, the chemical war, coal-mining oil and other industries.

16/17-start

Social sciences and the apprehension of the laws of social development enable the working class, as society's advanced class, to exert a conscious influence on the course of social development with the aim of achieving a socialist revolution and, subsequently, of building socialism and communism. Reflecting the laws of nature, natural science enables society to subjugate nature's elemental forces—the wind, heat, steam and electricity; to utilize atomic energy and the mechanical, physical and chemical properties of matter..

Natural science, including mechanics, physics, chemistry and agrobiology, has summed up the wealth of practical production experience accumulated by mankind. Marx called science the universal spiritual product of social development, or the product of general historical development as expressed in its abstract result. Whereas the practical labour experience of the artisan, or peasant, is very limited, primitive and routine, embodied in labour practices, habits and customs that are passed on from generation to generation, from father to son, science concentrates and scientifically generalizes the best achievements of the whole of mankind.

It is one of the features of advanced science based on theoretical thought, that it not only sums up mankind's past experience, but blazes new trails on the strength of this experience both in science itself, and in technology, and the productive forces as a whole. The discovery of steam-power, electricity, and atomic energy, of new chemical elements, new deposits of ores and minerals, and their useful physical and chemical properties--all this demonstrates the potency of advanced science and its part in the development of the productive forces.

Describing the development of capitalist production, Marx wrote: "Hand in hand with this centralization, or this expropriation of many capitalists by few, develop, on an ever-extending scale, the co-operative form of the labour-process, the conscious technical application of science." (K. Marx, Capital, Vol. I, Moscow 1954, p. 763)

Foot 10 Under monopoly capitalism, the monopolies place impediments in the way of scientific progress and obstruct the utilization of inventions that do not lead to the enrichment of capitalists. But large-scale production in the epoch of imperialism as well cannot exist without applying scientific data in industry and agriculture. The increase in the production of surplus-value also depends on the progress of science and technology. And the productivity of labour; Marx wrote, attends the progress of science and technology.

Especially great is the role and application of science under Socialism and in the period of transition to communism. All of society--from material production and the economic base to the superstructure--is built and developed with the conscious application of all the achievements of science, the laws of development of nature and society.

It is one of the features of the superstructure that it furnishes society with definite ideas and sets up corresponding institutions. Natural science also elaborates ideas and theories, studies and defines the laws and principles that reflect the actual relations and connections between things and phenomena. But natural science, applied technical sciences--mechanics, mechanical engineering, physics, chemistry, pedology and agrobiology--and all other science applied in production, give rise not only to ideas and theoretical principles, but help to design novel machines, new types of products, new varieties of plants and animals. Geologists survey and discover new mineral wealth, deposits of ore, minerals and precious metals, and place them at the service of man. According to Marx, every advance in the field of chemistry multiplies the number of useful substances and useful applications of substance already known.

With the aid of modern progressive science, constantly promoting its progress, Soviet scientists and engineers constructed hundreds of new type of machines, machine-tools and turbines; Soviet chemists discovered new types of raw materials (certain kinds of plastics), and substitutes not found in a natural state.

Modern chemistry succeeded in converting solid fuel (coal) to liquid fuel; hundreds of useful products are produced from petroleum. Mankind owes all this to progressive science.

15.

In the field of agrobiolgy the great Michurin, his pupils and followers, have evolved new varieties of plants, striving to increase the yields of agricultural crops. Promoting progressive science, Soviet soil experts seek to raise the fertility of soil.

quest 4 The transition from capitalism to socialism signifies maximum co-operation between science and production. The foremost Soviet scientists combat any isolation of science from production and practical experience, and strive for the closest possible all-round ties between science and production.

Any gulf between science and production is anomalous. Capitalism applies the laws of natural science in large-scale industry and partly in agriculture to intensify exploitation of the working class, but in virtue of its antagonistic nature and the ever-increasing antithesis between mental and physical labour, it constantly widens the gulf between the working people-society's principal productive force and science.

It is only socialism and communism that bridge this gulf by effecting a close alliance of science and labour and raising the cultural and professional level of the working people.

The development of production and the productive forces of socialist society, and the progress of natural science, have much in common: both aim at the subjugation of nature's elemental forces to the interests of social progress, and their utilization by society. In the capitalist antagonistic social formation, production emerges as the production of surplus value and natural science serves the capitalist and the cause of producing more surplus-value.

quest 9 Under socialism, however, where the antagonism and the antithesis between mental and physical labour are eliminated, the unity of science and production manifests itself to the full.

This direct bond of the natural sciences and engineering and production, reveals the distinction between these branches of science and the ideological superstructure, which serves the basis and is only indirectly connected with production through the basis.

Natural science and its laws can equally well serve both capitalist and socialist production; both the purposes of capitalist exploitation and pursuit of capitalist profits, and the object of raising the material well-being of the working people and satisfying their constantly rising material and cultural requirements; both the destructive designs of the imperialist aggressors and the creative, socialist work of the Soviet people.

quest 9 In the Soviet country Pasteur's great discovery serves to combat diseases and epidemics, and in the hands of the American imperialists preparing a bacteriological war, it is a means of exterminating thousands and millions of people.

Euclid's geometry, evolved in slave society, equally serves both capitalist and socialist production. In this respect natural science to some extent resembles engineering and machinery. Under capitalism natural science, like machinery, confronts the workers as a hostile force, a force wielded by capitalists. Marx said that the division of labour into deadly foes: "...As in the natural body head and hand wait upon each other, so the labour-process unites the labour of the hand with that of the head. Later on they part company and even become deadly foes." (K. Marx, Capital Vol. I, Moscow 1954, p. 508)**(it should read, Marx said that the division of labour under capitalism turns mental and physical labour into deadly foes.)

Large-scale industry isolates science from labour as an independent potential of production, and makes it serve capital. Accordingly, Marx describes science as one of the forces of production, one of its potentials set apart, in virtue of the antagonistic nature of the capitalist mode of production, as an independent force hostile to the workers. H6

Capital employs machines, engineering, scientific inventions and science as means of subjugating the working class, as instruments of exploitation and domination.

Science is intended to lighten the labour and living conditions of millions of people, to extend their sway over nature and its elemental forces, and broaden their intellectual scope. Under capitalism, however, science in the hands of the bourgeoisie has become a force of subjugation, exploitation and destruction.

Marx wrote ".....At the same place that mankind masters nature, man seems to become enslaved to other men or to his own infamy. Even the pure light of science seems unable to shine but on the dark background of ignorance.....This antagonism between modern industry and science on the one hand, modern misery and dissolution on the other hand; this antagonism between the productive powers, and the social relations of our epoch is a fact, palpable, overwhelming, and not to be controverted." (K. Marx, and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. I, Moscow 1955, pp. 359-60.)

The momentous discoveries in the domains of natural science should serve for creating and developing the productive forces, to augment to the maximum the wealth of mankind.

quest 9 Today bellicose imperialism is attempting to utilize great scientific discoveries, made by the genius of man, as a means for destroying the achievements of world culture. The reactionary imperialist camp, headed by the United States, threatens the nations with the atom bomb. It is the duty of the peace-loving peoples of the world to curb the warmongers and fash such social relations that would place the supreme achievements of human genius, the great scientific discoveries, at the service of the people for the production of material wealth for peaceful purposes.

It is only under socialism that science serves the entire people. Only in socialist society is the antithesis between mental and physical labour abolished and science lights the way to a cultural and professional upsurge of tens of millions of people.

On the strength of the socialist relations of production the forces of nature are subject to the will of free men. The profound prophecy of the founders of Marxism is coming true that people would become the real masters of nature only after they became masters of their own social relations.

In the U.S.S.R. the latest achievements of science and engineering are utilized in the construction of further giant hydroelectric stations supplying cheap electric power to industry and agriculture.

quest 9 Science--the captive and slave of capitalism--is relieved of its fetters in socialist society and for the first time in history it is a free and vigorous force reunited with physical labour. Consequently, the role of science has increased enormously and is to grow still greater. In the U.S.S.R. science is introduced on an ever-increasing scale into all spheres of production and into all fields of social life.

The future of socialist industry lies in the conversion of factories

17

and plants into huge scientific laboratories where millions of workers of communist society, having risen to the level of engineers and technicians, will apply the best achievements of human knowledge to operate vast systems of highly-productive machines; they will produce an abundance of material wealth and simultaneously blaze new paths in science and engineering. Even at present we can observe numerous infant shoots of communism, and they multiply from day to day.

But not only the socialist plants and factories, collective farms and state farms, will assume new proportions. Physical, chemical, biological and other laboratories will likewise turn into large-scale enterprises equipped with complex machinery operated by an army of scientists who will wrest from nature ever new secrets and discover more and more of its laws.

In bourgeois society, where production facilities are used only in part, where factories and plants close down, the acreage under cultivation shrinks and crops are destroyed, the capitalists are interested in developing science and constructing new machines and machinery of greater productivity only to the extent that augurs profit; if, reversely, new machinery does not give promise of increased profits, capitalism opposes innovations and resorts to hand labour. In bourgeois countries it is primarily the pursuit of capitalist profit that engenders and stimulates the progress of science.

Today the development of science in capitalist countries is determined by the basic economic law of modern capitalism. The major features and requirements of this law are the securing of the maximum capitalist profit through the exploitation, ruin and impoverishment of the majority of the population of the country in question, through the enslavement and systematic robbery of the peoples of other countries, especially backward countries, and, lastly, through wars and militarization of the national economy, which are utilized for the obtaining of the highest profits.

Socialism has created limitless opportunities for the all-round development of science and the productive forces. In socialist society science serves the people. It is inseparably connected with the people, and all the people are interested in its progress. For this reason in the U.S.S.R. not only professional scientists but millions of workers and collective farmers take part in developing science.

Under socialism, the progress of science, like all social development is subordinated to the basic economic law of socialism whose essential features and requirements are the securing of the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society through the continuous expansion and perfection of socialist production on the basis of higher techniques.

Insomuch as natural science supplies the knowledge of the objective laws of nature, which are independent of man's will, it does not contain any class or partisan elements. There is nothing suggestive of such elements in, say, the terms of Euclidian geometry, or in the laws discovered by Lomonosov or Mendeleev.

However, besides objective laws and objective truths verified and proved in practice, science also contains their theoretical interpretation and general philosophical deductions drawn from these laws—in short, there are also the philosophical and ideological principles of science. These general theoretical and philosophical deductions, as well as the interpretations of laws, express directly the world outlook of the classes, and may be either materialist and scientific, i.e., true, or idealist and metaphysical, i.e., non-scientific.

Progressive, true science has always been materialist and radically opposed to idealism and religion. Due to the decay of capitalism, the dominant trend in the science of present-day bourgeois society is reactionary and proceeds from reactionary principles of idealist philosophy. The bourgeoisie and its learned lackeys infuse science with mysticism and idealism.

It is commonly known that such an outstanding discovery in physics as the electron stands as one of the countless substantiations of the infinity of human knowledge. This discovery furnishes additional proof of the trueness and authenticity of dialectical materialism. Bourgeois reactionary physicists, however, sought to curry favour with the clergy by drawing on Machism—an idealist philosophical system—for unscientific, idealist conclusions from this great scientific discovery. They made out that it testified, as it were, to the subjectivity of knowledge, the non-existence of objective laws, the "disappearance of matter," and the like. Equally idealistic in their interpretation of Einstein's theory of relativity, bourgeois reactionary physicists crown their folly with assertions about the finitude of the universe and the electron's freedom of will, etc.

Analyzing the crisis of physics in bourgeois society, Lenin wrote:

"In a word, the 'physical' idealism of today, just as the physiological idealism of yesterday, merely means that one school of natural scientists in one branch of natural science has slid into a reactionary philosophy, being unable to rise directly and at once from metaphysical materialism to dialectical materialism. This step is being made, and will be made, by modern physics; but it is making for the only true method and the only true philosophy of natural science not directly, but by zig-zags, not consciously but instinctively, not clearly perceiving its 'final goal', but drawing closer to it gropingly, hesitatingly, and sometimes even with its back turned to it. Modern physics is in travail; it is giving birth to dialectical materialism. The process of childbirth is painful. And in addition to a living healthy being, there are bound to be produced certain dead products, refuse fit only for the garbage-heap. And the entire school of physical idealism, the entire empirio-critical philosophy, together with empirio-symbolism, empirio-monism, and so on, and so forth, must be regarded as such refuse." (V.I. Lenin, Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, Moscow, 1952, pp. 325-26)

At the same time Lenin stressed that the crisis in physics was not only a consequence of the advance of science and the breaking up of old concepts; but that it was also a crisis brought about by the decay of capitalism and the pernicious influence of the reactionary, idealist philosophy dominant in capitalist society.

Where the working class and socialist society nonetheless utilize discoveries made by bourgeois scientists in the spheres of physics and chemistry, they cast away every alien, reactionary and metaphysical element introduced into science by the bourgeois scientists. Lenin wrote: "Not a single one of these professors, who are capable of making very valuable contributions in the special fields of chemistry, history, or physics, can be trusted one iota when it comes to philosophy." (V.I. Lenin, Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, Moscow 1952, p. 357.)

As we see, Marxism teaches us to distinguish in bourgeois science, and particularly in bourgeois natural science, the specific data, verified and proved in practice, the objective knowledge of the actual law-governed natural phenomena, from idealistic philosophical principles pervading that science.

19

There is no inner connection between true science and its discoveries, on the one hand, and idealism, on the other. They are antipodal. Only bourgeois reactionaries and obscurantists try to establish an inner bond between scientific discoveries in, say, physics and idealistic nonsense. True science has been, and always will be, internally connected with materialism only: intrinsically it can be nothing but materialist.

By virtue of its philosophical and ideological principles, natural science, and not only social sciences, is of a class and partisan nature in a class society. Modern physics, chemistry, physiology, biology and even such an exact science as mathematics, have, therefore, become the field of embittered battle between progressive and reactionary science and their respective representatives, a battle of materialism against idealism, of dialectics against metaphysics. In the final analysis this struggle reflects the struggle of classes.

The struggle of Soviet Michurinist biologists headed by T. Lysenko against the Mendeliev-Morganists, of the followers of I. Pavlov against reactionary, idealist schools of physiology, of Soviet physicists against the idealistic vacillations of some of their colleagues, and the struggle against the idealistic theory of resonance in chemistry--all this is a fight against the influence of the reactionary bourgeois ideology, a fight to uphold the socialist ideology, and progressive science.

Dialectical materialism is the only reliable, stable and authentic philosophical foundation of modern natural science. Only this scientific philosophy shows the right way of scientific progress. This is proved by the outstanding discoveries of Soviet physicists, biologists, microbiologists and physiologists. They conclusively confirm the profound truth of the infinity of human knowledge.

The Communist Party, which inspires Soviet scientists to daring revolutionary exploits in science, teaches that progressive, Soviet science should serve the people, and not shut itself off from the people.

Soviet progressive science, aware of the significance of time-honoured traditions, skilfully utilizes them in the interests of developing science. At the same time, following the example of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, those great men of science, Soviet scientists are not slaves of these established traditions. They boldly break up obsolete traditions, injunctions, formulas and postulates, and blaze new trails in science. This is also testified by the discoveries made by Soviet scientists in physics, biology and agrobiolgy.

What conclusion can be drawn then about science as a form of social consciousness?

Natural science emerges from the requirements of production, practice and technology. It develops along with production, it is connected with production and directly influences its progress. This science can equally serve both capitalist and socialist production. It is not destroyed with the disappearance of the old basis and the emergence of a new basis. It is necessary, therefore, to combat all simplifiers and vulgarizers alleging that both Euclid's geometry, and mechanics and engineering, bear a class character, and that a proletarian geometry should replace slave and feudal geometry, and proletarian physics replace bourgeois physics. This was propagated by the Machian Bogdanov and his followers, who denied the objective truth and believed truth to be nothing more than organized and harmonized social experience; and that since the experience of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat differed, their truth and science also differed.

The Machians are enemies of socialism. The Communist Party waged a relentless and irreconcilable fight against them. At present there are no Machians in the Soviet Union, but vulgarizers and Talmudists, dogmatists and simplifiers are not yet extinct. It is against them that the Communist Party carries on an ideological struggle.

The problem just discussed, of science and its relation to production, the basis and the superstructure, and its role in social life, is of cardinal theoretical and practical significance. The attitude to the scientific heritage of the past depends on a correct theoretical appraisal of the connection between science on the one hand, and production, the basis and superstructure, on the other. This attitude can be either anarchist, nihilistic, Machian-Bogdanovite, or Marxist-Leninist.

Socialist society inherits, assimilates and preserves the great achievements of mankind in the realm of science and effects their further development. Every science, however, including natural science, has its philosophical and ideological foundation, its theoretical interpretations of existing laws, and conclusions drawn from them. This theoretical, philosophical foundation can be either materialist and progressive, or idealist and reactionary. This aspect of science is of a superstructural and class character.

Soviet science accepts Newton's law of gravity, but discards his assertion about the divine primary impulse. Soviet science defends Darwin's theory from attacks by obscurantists, American and British reactionaries and the clergy, but rejects those elements of it that are infused with bourgeois ideology (elements of Malthusianism, etc.)

The present-day Morganist-Mendelist biological theories are far from being a science; they are nothing but idealistic and metaphysical conjectures of bourgeois obscurantists. These conjectures and self-styled theories are rejected by Soviet science as pseudo-scientific.

The force of Michurin's discoveries lies in their benefit to practice, production and the development of the productive forces. The Weismannist-Morganist-Mendelist theory, meanwhile, is absolutely sterile.

It is vital duty of Soviet scientists to combat uncompromisingly all bourgeois reactionary idealistic and metaphysical theories and influences.

Let us now consider the problem of aesthetic or artistic views, of art and literature. Firstly: are the concepts "artistic views" and "art" identical? As a matter of fact, they are not quite identical, nor coincident. Artistic views are primarily embodied and expressed in art, but they also exist in the minds of millions of people. Artistic views are at the same time a definite attitude towards art itself, towards works of art, and a definite attitude towards the beautiful, towards the relation of art to reality, and its role in social life. Brought into being by a definite economic system, artistic views are a superstructure on this system. They are cultivated in the people by works of art and literature, book reviews and aesthetic theories.

quest
11

Aesthetic views are in varying degrees inherent in everyone, although not all people, by far, create works of art. Naturally enough, however, the aesthetic views, ideas and principles dominant in a given society are most fully expressed and embodied in works of art and literature. In this

sense, art and literature, the embodiment and expression of the aesthetic views reigning in a given society, constitute a superstructure.

The aesthetic views, ideas, theories and principles fostered by a definite economic basis, exercise a guiding influence upon the development of art and literature in a given society. Aesthetic, or artistic, views can be either progressive or reactionary, realistic or formalistic. They can be either optimistic and sanguine, like those of socialist realism prevailing in the U.S.S.R., or decadent and pernicious, like those in the U.S.A. and other capitalist countries.

The aesthetic ideas dominant in modern bourgeois society are reactionary, decadent and anti-realistic, viewing art as a means of spiritually subjugating the working people and nurturing obedient slaves. These "aesthetic" bourgeois views are anti-democratic and misanthropic in character.

Modern bourgeois art is pseudo-art. In an effort aimed at destroying the will of the working people to fight capitalism, demoralizing them, and diverting their attention from the urgent tasks of the revolutionary struggle for socialism, peace and genuine democracy, it plays the part of a vehicle of imperialist reaction.

Decadent modern bourgeois art, including literature, propagates, reactionary, anti-democratic, anti-scientific ideas and superstitions; it preaches predatory war, cosmopolitanism and individualism; it sows seeds of contempt for man and life, inculcates beastly instincts, and proclaims being to be accidental.

A great many progressive men of culture in the capitalist countries oppose the forces of reaction which are ready to engage the nations in an atomic war. To them Soviet literature and art are sources of inspiration in the struggle for a progressive development of their national cultures. On the other hand, Soviet men of culture develop the best traditions of world literature and art.

The classical 19th century art of critical realism brought home the truths of life and cultivated the spirit of humanism and lofty moral principles. But the banner of modern bourgeois art is amorality. The classical, realistic art championed reason, science and enlightenment. But modern bourgeois art is an apology of irrationalism, of the "sub-conscious" and the instinctive. According to surrealism—the current vogue in bourgeois art—the more meaningless the work, the higher its "merits".

This bourgeois art is an expression and reflection of the capitalist basis and its superstructure. The meaningless, misshapen decadent art and literature are a counter-part of the senselessness and ugliness of capitalism.

Actively opposed to the degrading art of the ruling classes in capitalist countries are such progressive workers at art and literature as Howard Fast, Jack Lindsay, Louis Aragon, James Aldridge, Pablo Neruda and many others who are ideologically bound with the liberation movement of the working people and the struggle for peace and democracy, and uphold realistic, national people's art.

Decadent, reactionary aesthetic views were widespread in tsarist Russia, finding expression in the reactionary, decadent and anti-realistic "art" of formalists, cubists and symbolists.

22

With the abolition in the U.S.S.R. of the capitalist basis and its replacement by the socialist basis, aesthetic, or artistic views also underwent a radical change.

Gone forever are the decadent bourgeois ideas and degenerate, sterile music and painting (outside of some survivals in this sphere that still have to be combated). They have been replaced by the aesthetic views of socialist realism which, firmly rooted and widespread, find expression and embodiment in works of Soviet art and literature.

Soviet socialist art and literature express the most advanced ideas of our time, the ideas of socialism and communism. Born of the socialist basis. Soviet art and literature reflect it and serve its consolidation and development. They constitute an integral part of the socialist superstructure.

Soviet socialist art and literature are the exact opposite of the whole of modern bourgeois literature and art.

Hence, we can see that art belongs to the superstructure, being the utterance and embodiment of the artistic views of the ruling class at a definite historical period, of views originated by a given basis.

With the abolition and disappearance of the basis of a definite historical period, its superstructure is likewise abolished, and disappears. The reactionary, decadent aesthetic views widespread in bourgeois society and expressed in reactionary bourgeois art, views born of the rotten capitalist basis, will disappear together with this basis, much like the aesthetic views of the Russian feudal-serf society pervading the works of Bulgarin, Kukolnik, Grech and other advocates of tsarist autocracy. But far from disappearing with the feudal-serf society which gave it birth, the remarkable classical, realistic art of the past epoch, is imbued with new life under socialism, and comes within reach of the masses for the first time in history.

The art of Renaissance and the works of Pushkin, Lermontov, Gogol, Tolstoy, Repin, Surikov, Glinka and Chaikovsky not only survived the abolition of the old basis that gave them life, but after the socialist revolution these masterpieces have for the first time in history become the possession of millions and live to be the source of unending aesthetic delight. In some ways the momentous works of Russian 19th century classical art remain artistically unsurpassed even to this day, particularly in music, painting, and partly in literature.

In his article L.N. Tolstoy, Lenin wrote that in tsarist Russia Leo Tolstoy was known only to an insignificant minority of the population. "To make his great works really accessible to all, it is necessary to fight and fight against the social system which has condemned millions to ignorance, oppression, slavish toil and poverty; a socialist revolution is needed." (V.I. Lenin, Articles on Tolstoy, Moscow 1953, p. 17)

Lenin's prophecy saw fulfilment in the victory of the proletarian revolution in Russia.

What Lenin said about Tolstoy's works is true of the whole of the magnificent Russian fine literature, of the entire Russian classical art, as well as the works of the art of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., of the treasures of world classical art, the art of Shakespeare and Balzac, Beethoven and Bizet, Chopin and Liszt, Goethe and Heine. Only the socialist revolution and the socialist system has made the great immortal treasures of classical art accessible to hundreds of millions of working people, placing art at the service of the people.

23

How can it be explained that the great works of Russian and world art survived the abolition in the U.S.S.R. of the old basis and its corresponding superstructure, the abolition of the old, obsolete bourgeois and pre-bourgeois aesthetic views and their replacement by new, socialist aesthetic views, and that these works, far from disappearing, are imbued with new vital force, become accessible to the masses, and play a tremendous role in Soviet social life?

This is chiefly explained by the fact that say, the Russian classical literature and art of the first half and middle of the 19th century did not serve the feudal-serf economic system or basis, though they arose on it. On the contrary, the great Russian classical literature and art were permeated with an anti-feudal and critical revolutionary spirit. They did not serve the cause of consolidating the feudal base; they enlisted fighters against that basis.

The creative effort of Pushkin and Lermontov, Glinka and Surikov was an enunciation of the same social forces as the Decembrist movement. In the realm of philosophy these views were represented by Radishchev and Herzen.

Both Russian classical literature and art, and the materialist philosophy of Radishchev, Herzen and, later, Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov, developing on the feudal basis, or, more exactly, out of the conflict between the new, growing productive forces and the moribund feudal relations of production, by no means represented the superstructure serving the feudal basis, though they were a phenomenon of a superstructural nature which blazed the path to the new society that was on its way to replace the feudal society.

The works of Grech, Bulgarin, Kukolnik and similar apologists of the serf system represented the superstructure on the feudal basis.

How can one and the same basis give birth to such greatly differing phenomena in the realm of ideology, literature and art? This occurs because both the feudal-serf and the capitalist basis are sustained by the antagonism of opposing classes. In the sphere of ideology, for this reason,

there arise opposing trends, some defending the given basis, others directed against it, and undermining it. This occurs when the new productive forces come into contradiction with the obsolete relations of production; an advanced art and literature appear on the scene to represent and give expression to the new, progressive social forces.

"Out of the conflict between the new productive forces and the old relations of production, out of the new economic demands of society, there arise new social ideas; the new ideas organize and mobilize the masses; the masses become welded into a new political army, create a new revolutionary power, and make use of it to abolish by force the old system of relations or production, and to firmly establish the new system." (J. Stalin Problems of Leninism, Moscow 1954, p. 743)

What has been said here concerning the appearance of advanced social ideas, is equally true of aesthetic views and ideas expressed in art and literature.

It is precisely out of the conflict between the new productive forces and the obsolescent feudal-serf relations that there arose the advanced Russian classical literature and art of the 19th century, imbued with the lofty spirit of serving the country and the people.

The secret of the efflorescence of Russian classical literature and art in the 19th century lay in the profound contradictions of feudal-serf

society, in the contradiction between the productive forces and the obsolescent feudal-serf relations, and in the profound social-economic and political contradictions of tsarist Russia. The Russian literature and art of the 19th century were called into being by the needs of developing the country's material life and to help in solving urgent political issues, and economic, social and political contradictions. This underlay the creative effort of Pushkin, and Lermontov, Gogol and Turgenev, Nekrasov and Saltykov-Shchedrin, Surikov and Repin, Glinka and Chaikovsky.

It is one of the most important features of realistic art that it represents a specific form of an objective, true apprehension of reality-apprehension through artistic images. This makes art kindred to genuine science, and constitutes the everlasting significance of great, progressive realistic art.

It was Engels who wrote that from Balzac's Human Comedy he had learned more about the history of France than from the writings on the same period by all the historians taken together. And this, in spite of Balzac's reactionary political views, in spite of his legitimism. Such was the strength of realism. What Engels said about Balzac equally applies to the works of Shakespeare, and the great Russian art and literature.

Russian realistic art and literature were a faithful mirror of the old life, a reflection of its contradictions, an artistic expression of the historical tasks and aspirations of the progressive anti-feudal forces and also of the hopes and ideals of the broad popular masses.

One of the major features of the progressive art and literature that come into existence at the turning points in world history and the history of nations, is their national character and their close ties with folk art.

The great Gorky said that real art is always linked with folk art, that it draws inspiration from the people and makes use of its images, airs, melodies, fables, etc. Prometheus, Don Quixote, Faust and others, had lived in the popular imagination long before the time of Aeschylus, Cervantes and Goethe. ".....No individual genius has produced any generalization that was not based on the creative effort of the people, or any world type that had not existed before in popular fairy-tales or legends." (M. Gorky, Critical Articles on Literature, State Publishing House of Fine Literature, Moscow 1937, p. 27)

These ties with the popular creative effort account for the vital strength of classical art and literature. That is the reason why they have outlived their own epoch and will live on as long as the peoples, live, whose ideas, emotions, aspirations and thoughts they express in their different ways. Obliterating and destroying all that is superficial, insignificant, morbid and reactionary, ruthless time is impotent against the great works of the human spirit, intellect and artistic imagination.

Glinka's operas Ruslan and Lyudmila and Ivan Susanin originated on the feudal-serf basis, and yet today they are as beautiful as at the time when they were composed. The magnificent overture to Ruslan and Lyudmila continues to be an inspiring summons to feats of daring, heroism and courage, rousing lofty emotions and noble ardour. Ivan Susanin kindles a deep, powerful sense of love for the homeland and the Russian people, a sense of patriotism.

It goes without saying that the Soviet audience appreciates Ivan Susanin, Ruslan and Lyudmila and the other classical works of music

25

quite differently than the audience of the time when they were composed. The same should be said of the time when they were composed. The same should be said about the works of Pushkin, Lermontov, Surikov, Repin and Tolstoy. This different appreciation of the masterpieces of the art and literature of the past is shaped by the new social conditions of material life, by the new ideology dominant in Soviet society, by the new aesthetic views firmly established in the U.S.S.R.

Thanks to the genius of Lenin who disclosed the essence of Tolstoy's creative effort, Soviet people understand the works of the great writer more profoundly than Tolstoy did himself. And this is true of all the classical art.

We speak of the Russian nation as the nation of Lenin and Plekhanov, Glinka and Chaikovsky, Surikov and Repin. The giants of Russian science, art and literature embody the genius of the Russian nation. Their creative effort gave expression to the progressive national traits of the Russian people. The same applies to the classical art of other nations.

Lenin said that within every nation there are two cultures—progressive and reactionary. "There are two nations in every modern nation.". Lenin wrote in 1913, "There are two national cultures in every national culture. There is the Great-Russian culture of the Purishkevichs, Guchkovs and Struves—but there is also the Great-Russian culture that is characterized by the names of Chernyshevsky and Plekhanov. There are the same two cultures among the Ukrainians, as well as in Germany, France, England,...." (V.I. Lenin, Critical Remarks on the National Question, Moscow 1955, p. 29)

Imbued with a love for the people, with democratic ideas and a hatred for serfdom and tsarism, classical art belongs above all to the democratic culture of the past.

The works of Pushkin and Glinka, Gogol and Tolstoy, Mussorgsky and Chaikovsky, Surikov and Repin, are the priceless cultural legacy which we rightfully inherited and preserved from oblivion, a legacy that for the first time in history has become accessible to the people. It is only socialism and the forces of socialism that really protect and preserve the treasures of world art.

When creating the socialist culture, Marxism-Leninism teaches it is essential to preserve all that is best of the progressive culture of the past, to learn from its choice masters in the spheres of music, art, literature, dramaturgy, etc., in order to be able to surpass their artistic mastership as well.

Since it expresses and embodies aesthetic views, art, therefore, belongs to phenomena of a superstructural nature. The art of the ruling class is part and parcel of the superstructure of a given basis. Artistic views are abolished and disappear along with the moribund basis that gave rise to them. By no means, however, does this contradict the fact that the great classical, realistic art offering an appreciation of the artistic values of a definite epoch, not only survives, but becomes the treasured possession of the broad popular masses. In new conditions this art of the past is differently appreciated, however, and its social mission is quite different to what it was in the preceding social formations.

This explains why the great art and literature bear an undeniably superstructural character, and yet, unlike reactionary art and literature, not only survive, but flourish long after the conditions that engendered them cease to exist.

Russian classical literature and realistic art, sculpture and music, reflect in artistic images the history of the Russian people, their heroic past, the history of the struggle for national independence, and against feudal and capitalist oppression. That is why classical progressive realistic art survives the abolition of the obsolescent basis and its superstructure, and thrives in the new, victorious socialist society.

quest 12 (The course of the development of Soviet society offers eloquent confirmation to the Marxist precept that the collapse of capitalism signifies an end to mankind's prehistory and the prime of its real history, of conscious, planned social development based on perceived objective laws consciously applied. The development of Soviet society is not attended by economic catastrophes, class conflicts, anarchy of production and the destruction of the already existing social wealth, including the social productive forces.)

quest 9 The abolition of the antagonistic capitalist basis built upon the exploitation of man by man, the effectuation of a full conformity of the modern productive forces and the socialist production relations, as well as the rise of the socialist superstructure, have paved the way to a gradual planned socialist development, effected without explosion, on the initiative and under the leadership of the socialist state and the Communist Party.

This new mode of development, this new law-governed historical process revealed itself in collectivization—the great socialist revolution in Soviet agriculture—although the antagonistic contradictions were still being resolved at the time between the working class and the working peasantry, on the one hand, and the kulaks, on the other.

The revolution in agriculture was carried out in the struggle against the kulaks, the most numerous capitalist class. After the elimination of this last remaining class opposing socialism, after the victory of the socialist mode of production, no hostile class forces remained to oppose the onward march of society. The victory of socialism brought the U.S.S.R. to a new phase of historical development, the phase of completing the construction of socialism and gradual transition from socialism to communism.

The remaining hostile elements and inert forces are incapable of seriously impeding the gradual transition of society to communism.

The transition from socialism to communism is a development within one and the same social-economic formation, the communist formation; it is a development from its first, or lower, phase to its higher phase. This transition occurs on the one and the same economic basis—the socialist relations of production—and through the overcoming of non-antagonistic contradiction between the growing productive forces and the relations of production that lag somewhat behind these forces. The transition occurs in the process of struggle with hostile elements, remnants of routed classes and groupings, and in the process of further consolidating the moral and political unity of Soviet society, of fostering fraternal co-operation and friendship among the peoples of the Soviet Union, and cultivating the vivifying Soviet patriotism. An extraordinarily active role in this process falls to the socialist superstructure. The transition does not involve abolition of the existing power. To the contrary, on the strength of further consolidation Soviet power, the socialist state organizes, promotes and directs this transition. It is bound up with the development of the dominant socialist ideology—socialist political, legal, aesthetic and philosophical views—and to struggle to stamp out the survivals of capitalism in the minds of Soviet people.

towards communism. Its wise leadership stimulates the energy of millions., impelling them to a creative effort, to heroism and unexampled exploits. It discloses new laws governing the developing socialist society and demonstrates how to utilize the laws of social development in the interests of communism, including the law of the determining role of the basis in relation to the superstructure, and how to employ the active role of the superstructure in the struggle for communism.

End.

BASIS AND SUPERSTRUCTURE

QUESTIONS

FIRST CLASS

- 108 2
1. What is the basis? How does it arise? What changes it?
 2. What is the superstructure? - how does it arise?
 3. After the basis changes, how in turn does the superstructure change? give historical examples.
 4. What is the relationship (or dialectics) of the superstructure effect on the basis? (pushes it forward -- holds it back).
 5. How is the basis different from the process of production?
 6. What is white chauvanism? What is the basis? Why is it part of the superstructure?
 7. How does white chauvanism protect the imperialist basis?
 8. How was racism part of the superstructure of capitalist chattle slavery? Why must all ideologies have a material base. How is racism part of a hangover from old economic relations?

SECOND CLASS

- 111
1. What is the difference between natural and social sciences? Like any other social science, political economy is partisan from beginning to end. Explain.
- 113 ✓
2. How did Marxism come into being, what are its component parts? Why or how was it possible for Marx to develop dialectical materialism upon a capitalist basis?
- 113
3. What is the relationship of social science to the base and superstructure?
- 113
4. What brought society forward scientifically? Why is it this that plays a decisive role?
- 113
5. Describe the connection between natural science and production. What is the origin and development of science due to?
- 113
6. Why can't science and idealism be reconciled?
- 113
7. Does the D.O.P. emerge before the establishment of the Socialist economic system? What were the peculiar features of the socialist revolution in regards to base and superst.? Why can't the Socialist basis arise spontaneously in the bosom of capitalism?
- 113
8. What role does the D.O.P. have in the Socialist basis? see quote, "leaned upon the economic law that the relations of production must necessarily correspond to the state of the productive forces -" What does this law mean?
- 113
9. How will Socialism, then Communism "bridge the gap" between science and the productive forces?
- 113
10. What are the attitudes towards science in the capitalist states - positive and negative - the socialist state maximum cooperation between science and production. How does natural science serve the capitalist? How does capitalism infuse science ~~and~~ with mysticism and idealism?
- 113
11. How does bourgeois art arise? What is it an expression of How does proletarian art arise? Why are attitudes towards art part of the superstructure? How or why are there artists who don't represent the ruling class? ?
- 113
12. How do economic laws operate under capitalism, socialism? How was ^{p. 26} the superstructure a lever in creating a new socialist economy? ^{p. 27}
- ?

Three Extracts on Communist Fractions from THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL 1919-1943 DOCUMENTS
Edited by Jane Degras

1. Volume II - p. 66-68; "Extracts From Instructions For Communist Fractions In Workers' Organizations and Bodies Outside The Party" January 1924
2. Volume II - p. 268-271; "Extracts From A Resolution On The Organization And Structure Of Communist Fractions In Trade Unions Passed By The Second Organization Conference And Endorsed By The Sixth ECCI Plenum" 11 March 1926
3. Volume III - p. 203-208; "Extracts From A Resolution Of The ECCI Presidium On The Work Of Trade Union Fractions" July 1932