

\$1.00

**A revolutionary
strategy for
gay liberation**

**Documents of the
Democratic Socialist
Party**

\$1.00

A revolutionary strategy for gay liberation

Documents of the
Democratic Socialist
Party

Introduction

The following document was adopted by the Democratic Socialist Party, then named the Socialist Workers Party, at its 7th national conference in January 1979.

The document reaffirmed, and elaborated, the analysis of homosexual oppression and the struggle against it adopted by the party five years earlier. A resolution adopted by the party in October 1973 stated, in part:

The oppression of gay people is firmly founded in the need for a class society to maintain the hegemony of its reactionary sexist ideology, upholding the virtues of the nuclear family. Homosexuals are regarded as pariahs, outcasts in a society which equates normality with heterosexuality. . .

The struggle of gays for their rights is a progressive struggle, one which is in the interests of socialism and the working class. This anti-capitalist dynamic is reflected in the struggle against the moral and ideological superstructure of class society. . .

At the time this document was written and adopted, the term "gay" was generally used to describe both male and female homosexuals. But with the emergence of an independent movement fighting for the rights of lesbians, the term has become restricted to male homosexuals only.

Doug Lorimer

May 1992

A revolutionary strategy for gay liberation

Origins of homosexual oppression

The oppression of homosexuals is one of the oldest evils of human society. Probably the only oppression which has lasted longer is that of women.

While of course direct evidence no longer exists, the origins of homosexual oppression are clearly connected with the rise of the family and of class society, which brought about the subjugation of women.

Marxists have traced the beginning of women's inferior place in society to the growth of the social surplus product, which made it possible for society to be divided into exploited and exploiters — those who produced and those who appropriated the greater part of the product. This rise of class divisions and individual ownership brought with it the overthrow of women from their former high status. In the new society in which accumulation of wealth was possible for the first time, women were transformed into little more than breeding animals whose function was to provide heirs to receive this accumulated wealth.

The importance attached to this function required that women be sexually exclusive, so that men could be certain they were passing on their property to their own, and not some other man's, children. Within the arising family, women essentially became the property of their husbands or fathers, who controlled their entire relationship to society in order to control their sexual behavior.

At first glance, it might appear that a society which regulates *heterosexual* behavior in order to ensure that parentage of children would not necessarily go on to proscribe homosexual behavior. The institutionalisation of homosexuality in some primitive societies and its toleration or approbation — at least within some social layers — in ancient Greece lend weight to this view.

However, few if any societies long justify social institutions solely in terms of their real function. Except in periods of revolutionary

crisis, most social institutions are maintained not by brute force of the ruling class but by ideological means. The institution is "natural," "god-given," necessary to ward off some natural or supernatural evil, etc. This ideological mystification is quite obvious in the case of the patriarchal family,¹ from its earliest origins to its modern form.

It is only a small step from regulating sexual behavior in order to ensure the legitimacy of children to asserting that procreation is the sole permissible reason for having sexual relations. Indeed, this assertion has remained a keystone of the ideological justification for women's oppression up to the present day.

Homosexuality was and is in contradiction with the ideological defence of the family and women's oppression. As such, defenders of early class society could not regard it as anything other than "unnatural," contrary to the commandments of their deity, etc.

The oppression and persecution of homosexuals thus arises as a by-product of the oppression of women, as a result of the need to portray the patriarchal family as necessary and inevitable. Of course, the precise connection between female and homosexual oppression has varied between different societies and at different times, as well as with the importance of the family, its economic function, and the presence or lack of a political/ideological challenge to it. Moreover, the ideological justification, whatever it may be, for homosexual persecution is capable of developing further according to its own logic.

The oppression of women in modern capitalist society is founded upon the indispensable economic functions of the nuclear family.² The unpaid labor of women within the family effectively increases the rate of relative surplus value³ by reducing the cost of reproduction of labor power. Socialisation of the tasks now performed within the nuclear family would inevitably result in a large reduction in the profits of the bourgeoisie.

The oppression of homosexuals is not a comparable source of direct profits (economic exploitation of gays as gays is confined to such areas as overcharging for rents in homosexual ghettos). Homosexuals are persecuted not for direct economic gain but as

part of the defence of the ideology which justifies the exploitation of women through the family.

The struggle for homosexual liberation is therefore a democratic struggle. This fact in no way prevents the struggle from developing according to a revolutionary, anti-capitalist dynamic. On the contrary, in the era of its death agony, capitalism is not only unwilling and unable to complete unfulfilled democratic tasks, but is also driven to attempt to roll back many of the democratic gains of the bourgeois revolutions. Attempts to win equality for gays therefore tend almost automatically to come into conflict with the institutions of the bourgeois state.

Moreover, the interconnection between the oppression of women and of homosexuals tends to inter-link the struggles for socialist and democratic tasks.

Both in the past and present, movements against female and homosexual oppression have tended to interact closely and reinforce each other. A struggle by one group against its oppression calls into question the legitimacy of the nuclear family, which in turn undermines the ideological justification of the other group's oppression.

Homosexuals in modern capitalist society

The oppression of homosexuals in modern capitalist society needs to be understood not only in terms of its origins but also in terms of the specific character of this society and the needs of its ruling class.

In capitalist society, for example, the oppression of lesbians takes on special features related to women's economic position. The family is an economic unit. This means that women who choose to live together are forced into an economic as well as a personal relationship. Given the lower wage rates for women, the choice of a lesbian lifestyle is almost automatically also the choice of a lower standard of living. This is reinforced by such things as discriminatory credit practices, which make it difficult or impossible for women lacking a male guarantor to obtain housing loans, for example.

For a lesbian who has children, the difficulties are further multi-

plied on the economic, social, and legal levels. The hardships of raising children in a situation where both partners in a relationship must work are compounded by bigotry, the myth that every child "needs" a male guardian for proper psychological development, and even the threat that the state may remove children from the mother's custody.

Because their oppression as gays interacts with their oppression as women, the psychological oppression of lesbians has an added dimension which is not felt by male homosexuals. For males in modern capitalist society, official ideology decrees that social standing and hence one's sense of personal identity are achieved primarily through one's job. For women, by contrast, status and personal fulfillment are supposed to come first of all through a relationship with a man and the raising of his children.

Capitalist society corrupts and distorts *all* human relationships by transforming social interactions into relationships between owners of commodities. This applies not only to human co-operation for production, but to the entire social and sexual superstructure as well. Marriage becomes only secondarily, if at all, an affectionate and sexual relationship — it is revealed as primarily a property relationship; children become primarily heirs and property; a neighbor is no longer someone near, i.e., a member of the community, but the owner of adjacent land. Marx and Engels pointed out this distortion as long ago as the *Communist Manifesto* (1848):

The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal⁴, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his "natural superiors," and has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous "cash payment." It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervor, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom — Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation.

The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation

hitherto honored and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage laborers.

The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation.

Having ripped off the family's sentimental veil, however, the bourgeoisie soon found it prudent to restore at least a fig leaf to cover the nakedness of the mere money relation. The more far-sighted of the capitalists began to realise that the wholesale conscription of women and children into the factories threatened to wipe out the nuclear family, and a large part of the next generation of wage-slaves as well. This prospect forcefully reminded them of the direct economic benefit of the family to the ruling class as a whole. Under the pressure of this realisation and of the rising working-class movement, women's hours of wage labor were restricted and the exploitation of child labor was restricted and eventually more or less abolished.

The bourgeoisie has a contradictory relationship to the modern nuclear family. On the one hand, it derives enormous economic benefit from this institution, which provides free of charge, primarily through women's unpaid labor, the next generation of workers, care of the aged and sick, the care and feeding of the present generation of workers, etc. Moreover, the nuclear family remains one of the primary institutions for instilling conservative values in the young.

On the other hand, the bourgeoisie cannot help undermining this institution from which it benefits so greatly. The ups and downs of the economic cycle, as well as events like wars, force them alternately to weaken and strengthen the family by drawing women into the workforce and pushing them out again.

Each shift in the capitalists' needs is, of course, accompanied by a shift in the ruling attitude towards women and the family, from the "feminine mystique" to approval of the woman worker and back again. In the long run, these continual shifts in the prevailing mythology are a profoundly subversive effect on the mystification of the family. It becomes increasingly difficult to believe that the

nuclear family and women's place in it are naturally determined eternal verities when the "eternal truth" changes every five or 10 years.

Because of the bourgeoisie's own activity in undermining the family and its ideology, it becomes both all the more important and all the more difficult for the ruling class to maintain the oppression of homosexuals. While tearing down the family with one hand, the capitalists try simultaneously to build it up with the other, in part through maintaining and reinforcing homophobic prejudices. At the same time, however, these prejudices are called into question by women's changing place in the workforce and the consequent changes in family role and structure.

But there is an important difference between the relationships of women and homosexuals to the changing nuclear family. Whereas the ruling class's economic needs cause it to modify frequently the projected image of the "ideal woman," the same is not true concerning homosexuals. The bourgeoisie has no economic motive to change the "image" of homosexuals — a "closet" gay can be exploited as easily, and perhaps more easily, as an open homosexual — while on the ideological plane continued anti-homosexual prejudice provides an element of stability, a second line of defence for the family even in periods when the capitalists are deliberately bringing more women into the workforce.

The forms of homosexual oppression are thus fairly constant in capitalist society. Changes in the general attitude toward homosexuality are not the direct product of capitalist economic interests but of changes in the level of working-class militancy, the efforts of homosexuals themselves, and similar political factors. It is thus not surprising that the struggle for homosexual rights has made its greatest progress when other oppressed layers are also in motion, and has declined in periods of reaction.

The early gay liberation movement

It is not widely realised, but the gay liberation movement did not begin with the New York Stonewall riots of 1969⁵, but a century earlier. The movement first arose as a response to a proposed new penal code in Prussia⁶ which included a clause outlawing male

homosexual activity. This code was adopted by the Reichstag⁷ in 1871 for the newly unified German state.

In 1869, a Hungarian doctor named Benkert wrote an open letter to the Prussian legislators, calling on them to reject the anti-homosexual Paragraph 175. Benkert correctly pointed out the connection between social reform generally and legal equality for homosexuals. The Napoleonic Code⁸, for example, had placed homosexuality and heterosexuality on the same legal basis, and subsequently three German states had made homosexual acts legal.

The most influential figure of the movement in this period was Karl Ulrichs. In their book *The Early Homosexual Rights Movement*, John Lauritsen and David Thorstad summarise his contribution:

The largest body of literature on homosexuality in the 1860s was produced by Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, a German homosexual who knew Benkert. In 1864, he wrote his first "social and juridical studies on the riddle of love between men": *Vindex* and *Inclusa*. As early as 1862 he coined the term "Uranian" ("Urnig" in German), based on the well-known myth in Plato's *Symposium*, to refer to homosexuals. This term, widely used for decades both on the continent and in England, embodied the notion that homosexuals were a "third sex" — a woman's mind in a man's body, and *vice versa* for women. Mistaken though this notion was, both gays and straight supporters saw in it justification for their argument against persecuting people whose sexual orientation could be considered as inborn, "natural," and as unchangeable as that of the heterosexual male and female... Yet, however antiquated Ulrichs' ideas may seem today, they were widely influential for decades and unquestionably represented a pioneering step a hundred years ago. He can quite properly be regarded as the grandfather of gay liberation.

The first and most influential gay rights organisation was the Scientific Humanitarian Committee, founded in Germany in 1897. The committee's goals were the repeal of Paragraph 175, the enlightening of the public about the nature of homosexuality, and the involvement of homosexuals in the struggle for their rights. In line with these goals, it published a scientific yearbook on homosexuality as well as a wide variety of propaganda material. One of the central focuses of its political activity was a petition for the repeal of Paragraph 175 which was signed by prominent people

not only in Germany but throughout Europe. The committee lasted for 35 years, until it was suppressed by the Nazis in 1933.

Although Paragraph 175 outlawed only male homosexuality, the Scientific Humanitarian Committee consciously sought to involve lesbians in its activities. Magnus Hirschfeld, the committee's founder, wrote in 1902:

We had first begun, at the beginning of 1901, to interest intellectually outstanding Uranian ladies in our work. They have subsequently become an almost indispensable and prominent component of all our events. Although the homosexual woman is not subject to any legal restrictions in Germany, she nevertheless suffers in the most varied ways because of the ignorance about her nature. The homosexual man and the homosexual woman are linked by a natural kinship with one another, and in fact belong to a third sex to which they are both equally entitled to lay claim, even though it does not affect them in the same way.

Female homosexuals generally concentrated their efforts in the women's liberation movement. In a speech to a Scientific Humanitarian Committee meeting in 1904, lesbian feminist Anna Rühling commented:

When we consider all the gains that homosexual women have for decades achieved for the women's movement, it can only be regarded as astounding that the big and influential organisations of this movement have up to now not raised one finger to secure for their not insignificant number of Uranian members their just rights as far as the state and society are concerned, that they have done nothing — and I mean not a thing — to protect so many of their best-known and most devoted pioneers from ridicule and scorn as they enlightened the broader public about the true nature of Uranianism.

In 1910, a new draft penal code proposed to extend the outlawing of male homosexuality to include lesbians. This threat produced an increased co-operation between the homosexual and women's movements. This particular penal code was not adopted, and a new draft introduced in 1919 no longer referred to lesbians, although it still provided five years' imprisonment for homosexual acts between males.

In the reactionary atmosphere of the First World war, the homosexual rights movement could make little headway. "The

Committee itself," Lauritsen and Thorstad write, "though political-ly independent, appears to have taken a rather social-patriotic attitude toward the war. It combined social-patriotic references to the German cause with earnest expressions of its desire for peace and 'active love for those of our brothers who are out there in the field.' Many of the early fighters for gay liberation died on the imperialist battlefield.

"Despite the prevailing social-patriotism, the Committee did not strike off its list its members in 'enemy' countries like England. Indeed, it continued to publish articles by them during the war and to remind its readers of the need for solidarity among gays.

"Its foremost goal during the war was to keep the gay rights struggle alive so that it could blossom again once the hostilities had ceased. In its April 1915 issue it wrote: 'We must be, and are, of course, prepared for any eventuality. What is necessary, however, is that the Committee be able to hold out and be there when — after what is hoped will be a quick, victorious end of the war — domestic efforts for reform are again stirred to activity, and when, therefore, the struggle for the liberation of homosexuals, too, picks up again.'"

The gay movement welcomed the German revolution of November 1918⁹ as providing the conditions in which full homosexual equality could be won. Magnus Hirschfeld, addressing a rally of 3000 to 4000 people on November 10, concluded:

In addition to a true people's state with a genuinely democratic structure, we want a *social* republic. Socialism means: solidarity, community, mutuality, further development of society into a unified body of people. *Each for all and all for each!* And yet a third thing we want: The community of peoples, struggle against racism and national chauvinism, removal of limitations on economic and personal communication between peoples, the right of peoples to self-determination regarding their relationship to a state and their form of government. We want people's courts and a world parliament. In the future it should no longer be "Proletarians," but "People of the World, Unite!"

Before our eyes pass the great pioneers of the Social Democracy¹⁰ who are no longer in a position to experience this day: Ferdinand Lassalle¹¹, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, August Bebel¹², Wilhelm Liebknecht¹³, and Paul Singer¹⁴, and

with them socialists from other countries, above all our French friend Jaures¹⁵. His death at the beginning of the world war shows that not only in Germany but elsewhere too nationalism attempted to destroy internationalism, and militarism attempted to destroy socialism.

Citizens! Let us thrust in the new republican government; let each person help to keep calm and order. Then we will soon be able to again lead a life of human dignity.

But Social Democratic betrayal and the mistakes of the young Communist Party resulted in the revolutionary opportunities of 1918-23 being lost, and restabilised German capitalism soon demonstrated that bourgeois society is incapable of providing a "life of human dignity" for anyone, let alone for homosexuals. While the Scientific Humanitarian Committee expanded its work and influence (it had 25 branches throughout Germany in 1922) and re-established the international contacts that had been broken off by the war, the gay movement was one of the first targets of the fascist reaction. As early as October 1920, a meeting in Munich was physically attacked, and in 1921 Hirschfeld had his skull fractured by anti-Semites. In February 1923, Nazi youth opened fire on a lecture which Hirschfeld was addressing in Vienna, wounding a large number of the audience.

One of the factors contributing to the decline of the movement was the attempt by the Social Democrats and the Stalinised Communist Party to gay-bait the Nazis. The writer Kurt Tucholsky attacked the left for this self-defeating approach in the following terms:

For some time, the radical left-wing press has been running accusations, jokes, and cutting remarks about Captain Rohm, a functionary of the Hitler movement. Rohm is, as is known, homosexual. The carryings on against him take as their starting point material published by the *Munchner Post*, which revealed this fact about him. The *Munchner Post* also published a letter in which Rohm wrote about his tendency to a friend. Rohm's letter might just as well have appeared in *Psychopathia sexualis*; it was not even distasteful.

I consider these attacks against this man to be rather indecent. Apparently, any means, fair or foul, can be used against Hitler and his people. Yet anyone who so mercilessly deals with others

in this fashion is entitled to no consideration whatsoever — Let him have it! In this connection, too, I haven't let the personal life of the parties concerned keep me from doing what had to be done — I have always gone after them with might and main! But this present business is going too far. Above all, one should not go searching out one's adversaries in their beds.

The only thing that might be permissible is the following: To point to those remarks by the Nazis in which they deal with the "eastern vices" of the post-war period as if homosexuality, lesbian love, and such things had been invented by the Russians and then infiltrated into the noble, unspoiled, pure German people. If a Nazi says this kind of thing, then — and only then — is it permissible to say: You have homosexuals in your own movement who admit their proclivities, who are indeed proud of them — so shut up!

Homosexuals and socialism

In attempting to gay-bait the Nazis, the Social Democrats and Stalinists turned their backs on a long tradition of socialist support for the rights of homosexuals.

After the death of Ferdinand Lassalle in 1864, he was succeeded as head of the General Association of German Workers by J.B. von Schweitzer, a lawyer who had been tried and disbarred in Mannheim in the early 1860s for homosexual activity. Befriended by Lassalle, he joined the General Association of German Workers in 1863. When some members of the association objected, Lassalle replied:

What Schweitzer did isn't pretty, but I hardly look upon it as a crime. At any rate, we can't let ourselves lose someone with such great ability, indeed a phenomenal person. In the long run, sexual activity is a matter of taste and ought to be left up to each person, so long as he doesn't encroach upon someone else's interests — though I wouldn't give my daughter in marriage to such a man

When Oscar Wilde was put on trial in a witch-hunt atmosphere in 1895, virtually no one in England came to his defence (Wilde himself was a socialist of sorts, though not a Marxist. George Bernard Shaw later wrote that Wilde was the only literary figure in London willing to sign a petition which Shaw tried to organise on

Behalf of the Haymarket martyrs¹⁶).

But Wilde was defended in Germany by *Die Neue Zeit*, published by the Social Democratic Party. In a two-part article, Eduard Bernstein¹⁷ attacked the hypocrisy of bourgeois sexual "morality" and argued that it was the responsibility of the socialist movement to provide rational and scientific leadership on sexual questions.

Bernstein emphasised the materialist view that "moral attitudes are historical phenomena," and pointed out that "... previously the Romans, the Greeks, the Egyptians and various Asiatic peoples cultivated homosexual gratification. ... we must be satisfied with the statement that same-sex intercourse is so old and so widespread that there is no stage of human culture we could say with certainty was free from this phenomenon."

From this materialist standpoint, Bernstein also attacked the psychiatric theories which treated homosexuality as an illness:

... it is a certainty that [homosexuality] is by no means always a sign of a depraved disposition, decrepitude, bestial pleasure-seeking and the like. Anyone who comes out with such epithets takes the standpoint of the most reactionary penal laws.

The Scientific Humanitarian Committee also won early support from prominent Social Democrats, among them August Bebel, who signed the committee's petition and urged other Reichstag deputies to the same. In a January 13, 1898, speech to the Reichstag, Bebel ridiculed the government's law-and-order approach to homosexuals:

The number of these persons is so great and reaches so deeply into all social circles, from the lowest to the highest, that if the police dutifully did what they were supposed to, the Prussian state would immediately be obliged to build two new penitentiaries just to handle the number of violations against Paragraph 175 committed within the confines of Berlin alone.

In May 1905, the Reichstag divided on party lines in a debate on gay rights, with the Social Democrats supporting the petition and the capitalist parties opposing it.

In a 1907 speech, Bebel recalled how shocked some Reichstag members had been by his estimate in 1898 of the large number of homosexuals. If that estimate had been wrong, Bebel now said, it was because it underestimated rather than exaggerated, the number

of gays. He concluded:

. . . gentlemen, you have no idea how many respectable, honorable, and brave men, even in high and the highest positions, are driven to suicide each year after year, one from shame, another from fear of the blackmailer

The contrasting attitudes of the working-class and bourgeois parties was perhaps encapsulated by an advertisement that appeared in several newspapers shortly before the 1912 German elections:

REICHSTAG ELECTIONS! 3rd sex! Consider this! In the Reichstag on May 31, 1905, members of the Centre, the Conservatives, and the Economic Alliance spoke *against* you; but for *you*, the orators of the *Left*! Agitate and vote accordingly!

The Bolshevik Revolution

Within two months of taking power, the Soviet government abolished all laws against homosexual acts. This reform was an integral part of the Bolsheviks' social legislation designed to wipe out the medieval and even earlier oppressions perpetuated by capitalism for its own purposes. "It was necessary, it was said," Wilhelm Reich wrote, "to take down the walls which separated the homosexuals from the rest of society."

In a 1923 pamphlet, *The Sexual Revolution in Russia*, Dr Grigorii Batkis, director of the Moscow Institute of Social Hygiene, outlined the thinking behind the Soviet government's social legislation:

The social legislation of the Russian communist revolution does not intend to be a product of pure theoretical knowledge, but rather represents the outcome of experience. After the successful revolution, after the triumph of practice over theory, people first strove for new, firm regulations along economic lines. Along with this were created models governing family life and forms of sexual relations responding to the needs and natural demands of the people. . .

The war set in motion the broad masses, the 100 million peasants. New circumstances brought with them a new life and a new outlook. In the first period of the war, women won economic independence both in the factory and in the country — but the October Revolution first cut the Gordian knot, and instead of mere reform, it completely revolutionised the laws. The revolution let nothing remain of the old despotic and in-

finitely unscientific laws; it did not tread the path of reformist bourgeois legislation which, with juristic subtlety, still hangs on to the concept of property in the sexual sphere, and ultimately demands that the double standard hold sway over sexual life. These laws always come about by disregarding science. . .

The relationship of Soviet law to the sexual sphere is based on the principle that the demands of the vast majority of the people correspond to and are in harmony with the findings of contemporary science. . .

Now by taking into account all these aspects of the transition period [to socialism], Soviet legislation bases itself on the following principle:

It declares the absolute non-interference of the state and society into sexual matters, so long as nobody is injured, and no one's interests are encroached upon.

About homosexuality, specifically, Batkis wrote:

Concerning homosexuality, sodomy, and various other forms of sexual gratification, which are set down in European legislation as offences against public morality — Soviet legislation treats these exactly the same as so-called "natural" intercourse. All forms of sexual intercourse are private matters. Only when there is use of force or duress, as in general when there's an injury or encroachment upon the rights of another person, is there a question of criminal prosecution.

The Bolsheviks' attitude was not merely a formal one, for incorporation into law but violated in practice. For example, the poet Mikhail Kuzmin, the first important Russian writer to make homosexual love a central theme of his work, published *Zanaveshannye Kartinki*, a collection of erotic verse illustrated with homoerotic drawings, in 1920. He continued publishing until 1929, well after the Stalinist bureaucracy had consolidated its hold on political power.

As late as 1930, the work of Magnus Hirschfeld provided a large part of the basis for the entry on homosexuality in the first edition of the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia*. This edition said that "in the advanced capitalist countries, the struggle for the abolition of these hypocritical [anti-homosexual] laws is at present far from over. In Germany, for example, Magnus Hirschfeld is leading an especially fierce and not unsuccessful struggle to abolish the law against

homosexuality. Soviet law does not recognise 'crime' against morality..."

But the bureaucracy had already begun to prepare the groundwork for reaction on sexual and family questions. As Trotsky wrote, the family cannot be abolished, it has to be replaced. That is, only a socialist society, which has developed the productive forces to the point that it is possible to perform socially the functions now handled by the family, will be able to do away with the family. Prior to the war, Russia was the most economically backward of the major European powers. The world war and the civil war following the revolution further devastated the Soviet economy. The Soviet Union was materially incapable of replacing the family.

But this fact in no way justifies the counter-revolution in sexual and family matters carried out by the Stalinists. A revolutionary leadership would have explained frankly that Soviet society lacked the material wealth to replace the family immediately, but that this remained the ultimate goal. Although it remained necessary for functions like the caring for the young, washing, cooking, etc., to remain within individual households, this would be regarded as a necessary evil, not a virtue, and to the extent possible these functions would be performed socially through such things as childcare centres at factories. Until it became possible to perform all such functions socially, a revolutionary leadership would have consciously sought to undermine the mythology of the family and the sexist prejudices associated with it, would have encouraged an equal division of labor within the family, etc.

The Stalinist bureaucracy, however, was not a revolutionary leadership. On the contrary, it was both a result and a cause of a conservatisation in Soviet society following the failure of the revolution in Europe, particularly in Germany. In this environment of isolation and demoralisation, Soviet officialdom became transformed into a bureaucratic layer concerned primarily with maintaining and expanding its own material privileges.

The bureaucracy was opposed to socialising family functions not only in terms of its material interests (provision of such services by the state would have reduced the social surplus on which the

bureaucracy feeds parasitically). In order to maintain its power, the bureaucracy needs to keep the working class divided and demoralised. The mystification of the family is ideal for this.

The Stalinists thus had both economic and political reasons for restoring the nuclear family — and with it oppression of homosexuals — to its status in bourgeois society.

Already in 1928, the changing situation became evident at an International Congress of the World League for Sexual Reform, when the Soviet delegate referred to homosexuality as a potential “social peril” and abortion as an “evil,” even though homosexuality and abortion were both still legal in the Soviet Union.

The following year, the Soviet delegate to the congress did not mention homosexuality, and he concluded his presentation, “Demand for Abortion in Soviet Russia,” with the words: “We are deeply convinced that the best foundation of society necessitates the consciousness of motherhood.”

Foreign Stalinist parties took a little longer to follow Moscow’s lead. In 1931, the German Communist Party agreed to the organisation of the German Association for Proletarian Sexual Politics, which was based on the ideas of Wilhelm Reich, then a party member. In the following year, however, the party repudiated Reich and ordered his works be removed from its bookshops.

In January 1934, in several Soviet cities there were mass arrests of gays, who were sentenced to prison or exile in Siberia. In March, all the Soviet republics were required to adopt a statute punishing homosexual acts with imprisonment. The Soviet press denounced homosexuality as the “degeneracy of the fascist bourgeoisie.”

As already noted, this anti-homosexual campaign was part of a general reactionary offensive by the bureaucracy, designed to bolster its own position. In 1936, legal abortion was abolished. A *Pravda* editorial discussed this move in the following reactionary terms:

The *elite* of our country, the best of the Soviet youth, are as a rule also excellent family men who dearly love their children. And *vice versa*: the man who does not take marriage seriously, and abandons his children to the whims of fate, is usually also a bad worker and a poor member of society.

Fatherhood and motherhood have long been virtues in this country...

At the end of 1935 and beginning of 1936 the French homosexual writer, Andre Gide, visited the Soviet Union and was profoundly disappointed by what he saw. Pierre Harbart, who accompanied Gide, wrote in his diary that he was:

... so sick of virtue that I could throw up. I learned that boys no longer kiss girls without first having gone before the mayor; that homosexuals are mending their ways by reading Marx in concentration camps; that taxis must be lit up at night so as not to harbor sin; that the bedsheets of Red Army soldiers are inspected in order to shame those who masturbate; that children have no need for sex education because they never think about dirty things like that; that the fee for divorce is about to be raised, thereby putting it out of the reach of the poor; that it is unhealthy for people to enjoy themselves sexually without reproducing. This has all been proven by science, and everybody bows down in awe before its decrees.

Rise of the modern movement

Between them, Stalinism and fascism destroyed the gay liberation movement for a generation. Only small, cautious groups survived in a few countries.

It was not until the development of the modern youth radicalisation in the 1960s that the opportunity again opened for the development of a militant and mass homosexual rights movement. Beginning with anti-imperialist issues, this radicalisation has gradually broadened to effect oppressed nationalities, women, homosexuals, and now, increasingly, the organised working class. The June 1969 Stonewall riots, announcing the birth of the gay liberation movement, proved the truth of the observation that in this period of radicalisation, there is no group that is too oppressed to struggle.

Our party has long recognised the importance of the homosexual liberation movement and its relationship to the radicalisation. In October 1973, the Political Committee¹⁸ adopted a memorandum which stated:

Basic to the development of the gay liberation movement has been the chipping away at the traditional moral and sexual

attitudes engendered by the radicalisation. The sexual mores and roles associated with upholding the nuclear family have been increasingly thrown into question by radical youth, creating an atmosphere more conducive to the growth of a radical movement of homosexuals. While we understand that the ingrained prejudices against homosexuals still exist in all their depth, there has begun to be a greater acceptance of homosexuals in this society.

This process of a growing movement among gays was heralded by the development of the feminist movement which was the first to confront sexual oppression, describe its effects and produce theories to explain it. Along with other movements of the oppressed, it provided an inspiration to join together and organise in struggle. This is brought out in the concept of gay pride. . . We support the independence of the gay movement as we do the independence of the women's liberation movement.

The same document went on to outline the revolutionary dynamic of the gay liberation struggle:

The oppression of gay people is firmly founded in the need for a class society to maintain the hegemony of its reactionary sexist ideology, upholding the virtues of the nuclear family. Homosexuals are regarded as pariahs, outcasts in a society which equates normality with heterosexuality. This oppression finds its form psychologically, in general social attitudes and practices, and it is institutionalised by law in the overwhelming majority of countries throughout the world.

The struggle of gays for their rights is a progressive struggle, one which is in the interests of socialism and the working class. This anti-capitalist dynamic is reflected in the struggle against the moral and ideological superstructure of class society, which invariably leads to a direct confrontation with capitalist institutions — the police, the courts, and the church.

The total elimination of the oppression experienced by gay people can only be achieved after the overthrow of capitalism creates the material pre-conditions for a society where every last vestige of discrimination and its roots are removed. The existence of the gay liberation movement will play an essential role in the elimination of gay oppression.

In short, as revolutionary socialists we welcome and encourage the entry into struggle of still another layer rebelling against the

oppression maintained by capitalist society. We take this attitude for two reasons:

1. We recognise that homosexuals, like women, blacks, migrants, etc., will contribute through their own struggles to the weakening and eventual overthrow of capitalism.

2. We understand that the ruling class uses homophobic prejudices, just as it uses chauvinism, racism, and sexism, to divide, disorient, and demoralise the working class as a whole. By entering into struggle, the gay movement directly confronts and begins to weaken such prejudices.

Reformists and sectarians alike call on homosexuals — and other oppressed layers — to subordinate their own struggles in order not to “divide the working class.” But there is only one progressive way in which divisions within the working class can be overcome: *This is by other layers of the class championing the cause of those who are specially oppressed.* It is not for homosexuals (or women, Aborigines, etc.) to hold back their struggle, accommodating to backward prejudices for the sake of a fictitious unity within the working class as a whole. Rather, it is the obligation of the organisations of the working class to unite *with the oppressed against their oppressors.* “Unity” based on a catering to reactionary prejudices is in reality a form of working-class subordination to the bosses.

The gay movement *can* win the support of organised labor. Alliances with the unions *are* desirable, provided only that they are based on support for the gay liberation movement and its demands. This support is not a gift that can be offered or withheld by trade union leaders; it will come from the rank-and-file as the independent activity of the gay movement convinces them of the justice of its cause.

In attempting to win allies, the homosexual liberation movement needs to maintain its organisational and political independence. Only such an independent movement can guarantee that the interests of homosexuals will not be subordinated to other considerations. We favor an autonomous homosexual movement, in which gays make their own decisions and organise their own actions, which can form alliances with other forces when this is possible, but

which doesn't require anyone else's permission in order to act.

Reactionary offensive

In the past year, there has been an important upsurge of the gay movement on an international scale. This upsurge is a response to an international reactionary offensive to force homosexuals back into the closet, to roll back the gains which the movement has won in its first nine years.

Anita Bryant's campaign for the repeal of gay-rights laws in the United States, police raids on the newspaper *Body Politic* and gay bars in Canada, Mary Whitehouse's successful prosecution of *Gay News* in England and her tour of Australia, unprovoked police attacks on gay-rights demonstrations in Sydney — events like these make it clear that homosexuals, like workers, women, and oppressed nationalities, are the target of a ruling-class offensive which aims to take back as many as possible of the gains that have been won since the beginning of the radicalisation.

The capitalist rulers have chosen quite deliberately to make homosexuals one of the first targets of their offensive. The vice-president of the US National Organisation for Women had it right when she said, after Anita Bryant and her crew of bigots had overturned Miami's gay-rights ordinance:

In attacking gay people and lesbians in Dade County they are attacking a very vulnerable section of society. They attack them first, get them first. . . It's not very far from that to attacking abortion. . . These are the same people who are against busing¹⁹, the same people against affirmative action.

The economic situation confronts the capitalists with the necessity, from their standpoint, of rolling back the standard of living of working people. This is true in all the capitalist countries, and in fact the international nature of the economic crisis, by intensifying competition, increases the need for each national capitalist class to reduce the real wages of its workers. This, for example, is why they threw out the Whitlam government and brought in the Liberals — they didn't think a Labor government could do the job as reliably as Fraser.

But the capitalists don't *begin* by launching a direct frontal assault

on wages. From their standpoint, that would be self-defeating, if not suicidal. They begin, instead, by trying to undermine the ability of the workers to fight back.

This is done in a variety of ways — anti-union legislation, restrictions on the democratic rights of workers and other oppressed, the fostering of divisions within the class, the nurturing of reactionary ideas.

The first attacks are directed not against the main trade union organisations, but against those layers of the working class and its allies who are considered most vulnerable, least able to defend themselves — the unorganised, women, blacks, migrants, homosexuals.

Every ruling-class victory in one of these areas is a defeat for the entire working class just as much as is a wage cut or a rise in unemployment — and prepares the way for such defeats. The bosses understand this; that's why they back reactionary, anti-homosexual groups like the Festival of Light. If the unions fail to understand this in time, they will learn it the hard way, from bitter experience.

Strategy for gay liberation

A strategy that can defeat the anti-homosexual offensive and win real victories for gays has to proceed from such an understanding of the function of homosexual oppression, of who benefits from it, and of what layers are the actual or potential allies of the gay liberation movement.

While homosexuals are a minority, the most authoritative studies indicate that they are a very large minority. There are hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of people in Australia whose sexual behavior includes some homosexual activity. This represents a vast potential base for a gay liberation movement which can demonstrate that it knows what it wants and how to get it.

As already indicated, the natural allies of the gay movement are the organised working class and those layers of the population which, like homosexuals, are specially oppressed in Australian society. The struggle for the democratic rights of homosexuals directly influences the ability of others to struggle against their

oppression. The collaboration of gay and women's liberation groups to oppose the Mary Whitehouse tour provides an example of united struggle that we can expect to see repeated and expanded in the future.

A program that can really build the gay liberation movement therefore has to fulfill two conditions. It has to meet the real needs of homosexuals in Australian society. And it has to be readily understandable and acceptable both to gays not yet involved in the movement and to the movement's potential allies. Such a program can be summarised as the demand for the complete legal, economic, and social equality of homosexuals.

Repeal of anti-homosexual laws

The homosexual movement should demand the repeal of all laws limiting homosexual behavior. The only sexual activities which should be prohibited are those, whether heterosexual or homosexual, in which someone is coerced.

In some parts of the country, e.g., South Australia and the ACT, sodomy between consenting adults (i.e., persons over 18) has been eliminated as a criminal offence. There have also been a number of attempts at reform of this particular law in other States. However, reform has been at best piecemeal and quite unsatisfactory.

Most prosecutions of female and male homosexuals occur under other legislation such as soliciting, inciting, indecent assault, and indecent acts.

Most importantly, the laws give excuses for individual cops to prey on gays. Most "arrests" go unrecorded.

It is quite clear that the only course for the homosexual movement is to fight for the repeal of all these laws and to replace them with a law covering coercion.

Along with this, regulations covering homosexuals in the armed forces, prisons, schools, mental hospitals, and "welfare" homes should be repealed. All those in prison or psychiatric hospitals because of their sexuality should be released and compensation paid to them.

Legislation should be introduced banning the use of aversion

therapy, chemical castration, and brain surgery designed to eradicate homosexual behavior.

Anti-discrimination legislation

At this time there is no legislation in Australia covering discrimination against homosexuals. In NSW the FoL and other reactionary religious groups forced the State government to drop the clause relating to homosexuality from its Anti-Discrimination Act.

Lesbians and male homosexuals frequently face discrimination in employment. In particular, teachers are often faced with the sack or non-employment because of their sexuality. A number of glaring examples stand out:

- In NSW, Penny Short lost her teacher scholarship because she was a lesbian, and Mike Clohesy was sacked for appearing publicly as a homosexual.

- In Queensland, Greg Weir was refused a teaching position even though he had fulfilled the conditions of his teaching bond. He was later refused work in NSW and South Australia.

There are certainly many other unpublicised examples of teachers sacked for their homosexuality.

After the Weir case, the Queensland minister of education gave instructions to education authorities to fail students who were not going to be employed. This was the most blatant example of victimisation of gay students.

Discrimination also occurs in the education process. Homosexuality is not discussed in schools. It should be treated on the same basis as heterosexuality in sex education courses.

Lesbians and homosexual men should be written back into history and literature books.

In the Public Service, many gays have to keep their sexuality secret for fear of losing promotion. There are countless other examples of workers who have been sacked for their homosexuality or have had to live double lives to avoid discrimination and victimisation.

In Newcastle in 1977, hundreds of male homosexuals were questioned by the cops — many at their workplaces. A number were sacked on the spot.

Homosexual relationships do not receive legal, social, or economic recognition as do heterosexual relationships. All these should be placed on an equal footing.

Lesbians and male homosexuals are seldom allowed to keep their children in case of divorce — and never allowed to adopt children. Equality should be fought for in this area.

Homosexuals also face discrimination in housing, immigration, and in other areas. The only way to end this is a full-scale public campaign in favor of anti-discrimination legislation in all the above areas.

End police harassment

The most overt oppression of lesbians and male homosexuals comes from the cops — the weapon the state uses against the working class and all the oppressed. The movement should project a campaign against the sort of police brutality and harassment that occurs daily in the lives of many homosexuals in all parts of the country.

The most visible examples recently were the cop attacks on peaceful marches in Sydney on June 24 and August 26. The cops thought they saw an opportunity to teach gays a lesson and force them back into the closets. These attacks were only the tip of the iceberg compared to individual attacks on isolated homosexual women and men that occur daily.

The repression must be exposed and fought against. Any cops who engage in "poofter" or "dyke-bashing" must be prosecuted.

Gay bars

Over the last few years, male homosexuals and lesbians have gained a number of victories. This has occurred particularly in the sphere of social activities. There are now gay bars in most cities where lesbians and male homosexuals can go without fear of being bashed.

However, these are very limited, if still significant, gains. They have allowed a much larger degree of social activity for homosexuals and assisted the development of a greater consciousness of oppression. But they have occurred within the limits of

capitalism. Thus many of the bars are fire-traps, charge exploitative prices, discriminate against women and blacks, and ban the distribution of political literature.

The gay movement should seek to organise the customers and workers of these bars to force the owners to lift the bans, to introduce fire safety, and to cut their prices. This is a concrete area for co-operation with the trade union movement, but it will require a long-term propaganda campaign on the issue.

Methods of struggle

In defending gay rights a variety of tactics have been adopted. The method that has been most often used in the past is putting faith in such liberal reformers as NSW Labor Premier Neville Wran. Various Australian groups, such as CAMP in NSW and Society Five in Melbourne, have relied on lobbying such liberals for reform of the laws.

These politicians come back and say: "Just play things quiet and I'll see what I can do next year. At the moment I have this conservative upper house (or back bench), but next year things will be different."

Of course, next year never comes, because they are always under vocal right-wing pressure from such groups as the FoL or the police force. An example of this occurred in NSW in 1977. Just after he told CAMP he was seeing what he could do for homosexuals, Neville Wran sent greetings to a Festival of Light rally in Sydney.

The most glaring failure of this lobbying technique happened in Miami last year. The council had passed a gay rights ordinance after lobbying by gay groups. The right wing, led by Anita Bryant, had repeal of the ordinance placed on the ballot in the middle of the year. The leaders of the gay movement in Florida accepted the advice of the liberal capitalist politicians in playing things quietly. Instead of mobilising gays throughout the city, they paid for respectable TV advertisements. They did not actively seek the support of the women's movement, blacks, Latinos, or the trade unions. They even prevented gays from handing out leaflets. The result was a minimal turnout in areas of gay supporters and strong voting in conservative areas. Most of the movement in the US has learned its lesson from

this defeat and similar defeats in Wichita, St Paul, and Eugene, Oregon.

The homosexual movement must reject this approach for Australia.

Another tactic supported by some groups, such as the anarchists and the International Socialists, involves the use of what they call "militant tactics." These "militant" actions range from such macho performances as challenging the cops to a physical confrontation, to the the puerile "unplanned" flour-bomb attack on Darlinghurst police station at the end of the July 15, 1978 gay rights march in Sydney.

To think that a successful takeover of a police station, even one as brutally oppressive as Darlinghurst, would halt cop harassment of homosexuals for even one hour shows an amazing lack of understanding of the class character of oppression in this society.

In fact, the motivation of the ultralefts is similar to those who advocate lobbying liberal politicians. Instead of *relying* on liberals to end oppression, they think that they can be *physically scared* into ending it.

The effect of these sorts of tactics can be just as disastrous for the cause as relying on the liberals. In a situation where the homosexual rights movement has gained more and more support as gay oppression becomes known to society and when more and more homosexuals are willing to come out publicly for gay rights, the ultralefts threaten the support that has been gained. They place the movement in the position of not being taken seriously.

The liberal and ultraleft approaches ignore certain key features of homosexual oppression. Essentially, the liberal approach fails to recognise the important function that oppression of homosexuals fills for the capitalists. Persecution of gays is seen as incidental to capitalist society, as a basically accidental survival of medieval prejudices. To the liberals, therefore, it is logical to rely upon "enlightened" politicians whose ultimate loyalty is to the capitalist system, since capitalism and homosexual liberation are seen as perfectly compatible.

Ultraleftists, on the other hand, may realise that gay liberation can

be definitely achieved only when capitalism has been overthrown. But they underestimate both the potential to mobilise large numbers of homosexuals in action and the revolutionary thrust of mass struggle by gays for their democratic rights. Consequently, they try to substitute their more "militant" demands for those which really concern most homosexuals, and to substitute themselves for the masses whom their infantile rhetoric cannot draw into action.

The strength of the homosexual movement lies neither in influential "friends" nor in terrifying cops with flour-bombs, but in the power of masses of people determined to struggle for their rights. The gay movement can win only by relying on its own strength — the hundreds of thousands of homosexuals who want to end their oppression and the hundreds of thousands of "straights" who can be persuaded to support gay rights.

The Socialist Workers Party therefore favors a strategy of mass action, of mobilising as many people as possible in demonstrations focused on specific and uncompromising demands.

Such mass actions are the best way to demonstrate and to increase the strength of the gay liberation movement. The visibility of mass actions can break down the isolation of homosexuals not yet involved in the movement and draw them into its activities. At the same time, a growing mass movement, outside the control of the reformist politicians, can force the latter to grant concessions, thus further increasing the attractive power of the movement.

The mass-action perspective is also the most effective method for the necessary task of taking the issues of gay liberation into the working class. Unlike reformists and sectarians, Marxists understand that the struggles against the various forms of oppression created or perpetuated by capitalism are an inseparable part of the class struggle.

The effort to build a class-struggle left wing in the labor movement, to transform the unions, is not at all a matter of merely demanding more militancy in economic struggles. It is an effort to transform organized labor into a social movement, to make the unions fighting organizations of *all* the oppressed. Support for gay liberation, women's liberation, the rights of Aborigines, etc., are as

much a part of a class-struggle program in the unions as are the fight for jobs or better wages.

One of the obstacles to united mass action is the division that frequently exists in the movement between lesbians and male homosexuals, a division based on the often sexist attitudes of gay males. As a result of this division, lesbians are usually organised separately from male homosexuals — either in completely separate groups or as caucuses in an organisation which includes both male and female homosexuals.

It must be kept in mind that such separate organisation is not a *cause*, but a *result* of division in the movement. Just as all gays have the right to organise in homosexuals-only organisations, lesbians have the right to organise separately to combat their double oppression — for their sex and their sexuality. This is especially so when past or present behavior of male gays has oppressed lesbians.

The movement should strive for *political* unity, i.e., common action in support of a common goal. Unity on this basis requires recognition of the rights of all who participate, including the right of organisational independence.

Tasks of the party

Our support for the rights of homosexuals is unconditional. This is, we support complete equality for homosexuals regardless of whether the gay liberation movement is following what we consider to be the best course.

Although the complete liberation of homosexuals can come only with the socialist revolution, many important gains can be wrenched from the capitalists along the way. Our party should be in the forefront of explaining and fighting for the rights of homosexuals and the kind of movement and program that can win significant victories. This cannot be done from the sidelines. Even in past periods of relative quiescence of the gay movement, our party has had members consistently involved in the struggle for gay rights. Now, with the upsurge of the movement, it is possible and necessary for us to participate more actively.

As with all areas of party activity, our work in the gay liberation movement is decided by the party, directed by the party, and

receives the support of the whole party.

Our goal is to build the largest possible gay liberation movement on a clear program. We want to help build a movement that is constantly reaching out to new layers and drawing them into action in support of demands that really meet the needs of homosexuals.

Homosexuals, of course, come from all classes. Moreover, even working-class gay activists are subject to pressures of bourgeois society. The influence of gay groups centred on churches is one indication of this.

But the gay liberation movement cannot insulate itself from bourgeois and petty-bourgeois pressures by adopting a full socialist program or excluding people on the basis of their class origins. That would be a means of destroying the movement, not of protecting it. The real class line will be drawn in the gay movement just as it is in the women's movement and as it was in the anti-war movement on the basis of program, i.e., of strategy, tactics and demands. It will be drawn between those who favor and those who oppose a program of uncompromising and specific demands fought for by mass-action, class-struggle methods. Our party will be the most consistent proponent of such a program.

Footnotes

1. The term *patriarchal family* was used in the early years of the second wave of feminism to refer to the family in general, which since its origin has always consisted of a father standing at the head of his wife or wives and their children.

2. The *nuclear family* is the modern urban family characteristic of industrial capitalism, consisting of a household made up of husband, wife, and children.

3. Surplus value is the monetary form of that part of the workers' labor which they surrender to the capitalist employer without receiving anything in return, i.e., it is the difference between the value of the commodities produced by the workers and the value of the labor-power they sell to the capitalist employer. By increasing working hours without any increase in real wages the capitalists can increase the absolute amount of surplus value. However, there is a physical limit to the increase in absolute surplus value — without a certain amount of rest-time the worker's capacity to produce declines rapidly toward zero. But by reducing the value of labor-power through cheapening the cost

of production of the commodities necessary to maintain and reconstitute the workers' labor-power the capitalists can increase *relative surplus value* without destroying the workers' capacity to produce.

4. *Patriarchal* relations were the form of human community transitional between the maternal clan system of primitive collectivist society and the family system of class society. The patriarchal household community consisted of several generations of the male descendants of one father, together with their wives and children, who lived together in one homestead, cultivating their fields in common, feeding and clothing themselves from a common stock, and possessing in common the surplus from their labor. The community was under the supreme direction of the head of the household community (the patriarch), who was appointed and accountable to the household assembly, consisting of all its adult members, women as well as men. Such household communities continued to exist among the peasantry well after the emergence of class society — in parts of France until the great bourgeois revolution of 1789-93, for example.

5. The *Stonewall riots of 1969* refers to the physical resistance against a routine police raid on a New York gay bar, the Stonewall Inn on Christopher Street, on June 27, 1969.

6. *Prussia* was the name adopted by the German kingdom established in 1701 with Berlin as its capital, and which expanded over all the territory of northern Germany and western Poland in the 18th and 19th centuries, and which unified Germany under its leadership in 1871.

7. The *Reichstag* was the name of the German national parliament under the German Empire (1871-1918) and under the Weimar Republic (1918-1933).

8. The *Napoleonic Code* was the civil law code enacted by Napoleon Bonaparte, first consul of the French Republic and, then, Emperor of France, in 1804.

9. The *German revolution of November 1918* began on November 3, 1918 when a mutiny in the German fleet at Kiel spread to the workers and soldiers. The revolution toppled the monarchy and led to the formation of mass-based councils of workers' and soldiers' delegates. Rather than creating a government resting on these councils, the Social Democrats formed a provisional government committed to preserving the existing capitalist state. In January 1919 the Social Democratic government unleashed right-wing military units against the revolutionary workers of Berlin. Resistance to this counter-revolutionary attack was led by the Communist Party of Germany (KPD), founded only a month before. However, the resistance was crushed by the Social Democrats, who murdered the two central leaders of the KPD — Rosa Luxemburg and

Karl Liebknecht — in the process.

10. *Social Democracy* was the name of most of the socialist parties prior to the First World War. Until 1914, when most Social Democratic parties supported the war, it was synonymous with revolutionary socialism or Marxism. After the Russian Revolution of 1917 and the formation of the Communist International in 1919 the term "Social Democrat" was used by revolutionary Marxists to designate pro-capitalist reformist "socialists."

11. *Ferdinand Lassalle* (1825-64) was the founder and first president of the General Association of German Workers. After his death in 1864, his followers continued this organisation, and in 1875 it fused with the Marxist Social Democratic Party (SPD).

12. *August Bebel* (1840-1913) was a collaborator of Marx and Engels, and a founder and central leader of the German SPD.

13. *Wilhelm Liebknecht* (1826-1900) was a collaborator of Marx and Engels, and a founder and central leader of the German SPD.

14. *Paul Singer* (1844-1911) was chairman of the SPD executive committee from 1890 until his death, and a close collaborator of Bebel.

15. *Jean Jaures* (1859-1914) was a long-time leader of the French socialist movement, associated with its reformist wing. A prominent anti-militarist he was assassinated by a French nationalist on the eve of the First World War.

16. The *Haymarket martyrs* were members of an anarchist organisation who were convicted in a police frame-up following a police attack on a trade union meeting in Haymarket Square, Chicago, in May 1886, in which seven cops and four workers were killed.

17. *Eduard Bernstein* (1850-1932) was Engels's literary executor. He became the leading advocate of the "revisionist" (reformist) wing of the German SPD with the publication of his *Evolutionary Socialism* in 1899. He adopted a pacifist stand during World War I, and was briefly a member of the pacifist Independent Social Democratic Party, before rejoining the SPD in 1918.

18. The *Political Committee* was the original name for the National Executive of the Socialist Workers Party, the body elected by the National Committee to provide political leadership for the party between meetings of the National Committee.

19. *Busing* is a term used in the United States to refer to the practice of transporting schoolchildren by bus to counteract racial segregation of schools, i.e., of Black schoolchildren from predominantly Black neighborhoods to schools located in predominantly white neighborhoods, and *vice versa*.