

## ON PROLETARIAN MORALITY

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

Firstly, what is morality?

The bourgeois dictionary states, "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 that 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, rise out of the conditions of our lives and that the fundamental conditions of our lives are dependent on the mode of production. Hence, every change in the mode of production and the class struggle which results from it is bound to be reflected in shifts in our morality and other aspects of our philosophy. Marxism, of course, is dialectical, although many "new" Marxists ignore that fact. The dialectics here is that just as man's morality is ultimately determined by the economic relations, there is also a massive impact on these objective aspects of life created by his thoughts and morality themselves. 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 the proletariat 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. (Dialectical and Historical Materialism, International Publishers, New York, 1940, p 19) 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: Utopian and Scientific, Karl Marx: Selected Works, International Publishers, N Y, Vol 1 p 163\*)

Further, Marx states, "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, International Publishers, N Y, 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 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. We Communists have no such excuses!

Morality is what accords to the given social system. 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 in as much as there are no socialist production relations against which we can test our activity - that is, we cannot know, many times, in any immediate way the consequences of our actions - whereas in capitalist society the bourgeois is quick to note what is "moral" or "immoral" from his point of view because it is immediately or over a long 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. Which consciousness? Is it simply social consciousness, which recognizes the existence of social injustice, of rich and poor, of humble and mighty? No, that is insufficient. Proletarian morality is the reflection of a much higher form, namely, class consciousness, which recognizes the exploiters as class enemies and unites the workers on the basis of the struggle against and overthrow of that enemy class. The difference between social and class consciousness was historically expressed in the development of the First International whose slogan Marx fought to have changed from "All men are brothers!" to "Workers of the world, unite!"

\*This reference contains a different translation of the passage than the one in the text, whose exact reference I do not have before me. -Ed.

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, expressed in never giving aid or comfort to the enemy, in being an example of steadfastness and in never working at cross purposes with oneself - that is, 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 do we integrate our personal activity with the general flow of the movement.

Our Communist League is a youthful organization 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 CPUSA was whatever suited the short-range political goals of the Party. It is well-known that women were, from time to time, urged to use their sexuality to assist them in recruiting, just as the men handed out jobs to those workers, particularly from the minorities, who agreed to 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 in the opposite direction and if one did not treat women as if they were men charges would surely follow. The reason for these flip-flops on this question was that the CPUSA was and is a set of malcontents. We on the other hand are Marxist-Leninists and therefore we start from objective reality and not from subjective dreams.

Even the POC (the Provisional Organizing Committee), which really tried at first to rectify the twisted morality of the CPUSA, 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 no matter what blocks are put in their way. No one can for long deny life, the natural laws of social development and the assertion of these laws. Denying this, the CPUSA, like the Catholic Church, had one set of laws governing all aspects of conduct, and this is one of the reasons why 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 not." 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 the 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 between the proletariat and bourgeoisie. We want peace only in the sense of workers not killing each other. Similarly, we demand an end to "killing" - but we also demand the head of every butcher and slave-driver oppressing our class.

A political activity such as physically engaging the police in a fight would be adventurous 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 themselves 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." (Encyclopedia Britannica, 1965, volume 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 dead you are not 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, International Publishers, New York, 1939, p 105)

To proceed. The bourgeoisie has scored an important victory among the post-World War Two 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 and minor part of our morality. This formulation has been stoutly resisted by some comrades. 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 these and similar questions in his advice, "Put politics in command."

The bourgeoisie places the question to young revolutionaries in a very contradictory, treacherous way. The latter are allowed to carry on militant social

activity but at the same time 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, on the contrary, have demanded and will 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 an example of how a libertine and undisciplined personal life in general will have political repercussions. 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 separate occasions very casually slept with the pig and was afraid of 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 which was known to Cummins and which 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 CPUSA, 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 Dimitrov point out, cadre, individual comrades capable of thinking and 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 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. Aside from noting that implicitly the theory applies mostly to the desires of men, 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 necessary, a 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 both 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.

So, since sex is a necessary and common thing, 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 activity is bound to undercut our consciousness. This applies to 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 comrade from the League. The study of conditions, time and place is 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 as sexual beings. When women appear as bricklayers or weavers or what have you they as well as the men doing the same things are identified as bricklayers, or weavers, or whatever, period. 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 - just as in the case of the bricklayer or weaver. Let us examine this difference a little more closely.

There is a deviation in the Communist League which declares that marriage is political. Nothing could be further from the facts. Take sex away from marriage, abstract marriage from sex, 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, not the content, political. However, any marriage has to be based on sexual attraction and consummation; otherwise 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 the two. We should recognize and emphasize the differences between the sexes because it is the only way we can fight for equality, which is based on the recognition of differences. If there were no differences there would be no inequality or equality.

In what way are men and women universally different? Only sexually. We want to emphasize this in order to guarantee that there be no other legal difference. In this sense we demand that men be men and women 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 in history allowed for or demanded a greater concentration of people with corresponding changes in the forms of their relationships, including marriage. A brief summary of marriage presents to us:

- 1) The group marriage, wherein sexual intercourse is unrestricted, that is, 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 sexual intercourse is restricted to generations; that is, it is prohibited 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 punuluan family. here marriage consists 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 developed further. The bow and arrow, sling and spear are used. Hunting and 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. Here one man has several wives. Mother right is lost forever. The man takes control of the house and subjugates the woman. 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 content has remained throughout. In fact the reasons the forms had to be changed was precisely to preserve the sexual content.

It seems that the proletarian marriages in the USNA are the most advanced in the capitalist world. It is in them 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 within the proletariat because of the onslaught of bourgeois pressures themselves. Women are more free. Over 40% of the workforce are women with the result that their economic dependency on men decreases and the development of marriage based on sex love alone increases. We clearly see this in the gigantic growth and development of common law marriage. This is very good and progressive. For example, in Los Angeles County 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 basis for the proletariat and consequently for the Communist League.

The growth of the proletariat and the ever-shifting emphasis of the class struggle brings about ever-changing concepts regarding the revolution. We should take note of these changes because they affect our moral conduct. Sex involves our attitudes towards women; more so than a decade ago sexuality is 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 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 sex when it is enjoyed 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 conquests, the greater the warrior. Actually such an attitude is loaded with homosexuality. Male supremacy itself, in fact, being an expression of hatred for women, cannot but express homosexuality. What is Don Juan trying to prove to society and 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," 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 precisely these very 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 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 deems 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, p 125)

Can this profoundly true 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 actions.



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 that love is changing also. There is, however, 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. They are a special type of relationship between comrades and not exclusive like the 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. But isn't it blatant male supremacy to imagine that a husband is such a superhuman that he alone and by himself can satisfy all the social and cultural needs of his wife? The male supremacy further 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 which tend to restrict the development of the woman simply because she is married. The husbands should realize that the very property relations that we are fighting 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. We 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 one 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. It is an escape. However the sexual side of bourgeois love (as opposed to the romantic, which is the "spiritual" side) 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 bourgeoisie, 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, ie, 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 heart of the question that the comrades are asking is this: Is it anti-communist to have sexual relations with other than husband or wife, is it anti-communist to have sexual relations before marriage? 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 wing of the Victorians. Feudalism and its morality could rest in part on the preceding slave ideology, just as capitalism inherited and to a great extent could remold the ideologies of feudalism. This was possible because slavery, feudalism and capitalism are all exploiting systems. "The Communist revolution," however, as Marx points out, "is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations; no wonder that its development involves 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 or the direction of the class struggle; therefore, we have no way of directly evaluating them. 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 must at all times and under all circumstances reflect credit on the Communist League and on our class. We must obliterate the phony bourgeois "idea" that we can separate our so-called "personal" from our political lives and willingly accept the responsibility of being Communists twenty-four hours every day. Nothing political is personal, but everything personal is political.

In summary, we can only say that collectives must hold comrades responsible for all their acts. In the Communist Party USA the members constantly found someone else to blame for their own individual shortcomings and 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.

Nelson P., Chairman