We consider the Los Angeles Research Group's article from the Guardian's Radical Forum and the introduction by the Bird staff to be an unprincipled attack on Marxism-Leninism and its revolutionary line on the woman question, an attack on the working class and on the proletarian family.

The October League was labelled a sexist organization. We would like to show that neither as soon as we said, our position on the homosexual question is part of a revolutionary line on the woman question. We stand with communists and revolutionaries the world over in fighting for the emancipation of women through the complete overthrow of class society, in which women's oppression is rooted. The struggle to abolish class society is founded on the principled unity of the multinational working class, men and women, and based on a consistent fight against all forms of national and sexual oppression. These are some of the conditions for revolution.

We have put this line into practice. We have played a leading role in building a national campaign around International Women's Day for the past three years, in the fight against the ERA, in building Black Women's United Front, Coalition Of Labor Union Women, the welfare rights movement, community struggles, Joan Littlejohn and Todd-Woods Defense, and many, many more.

Organizationally, we have taken up the woman question through the formation of local and national women's commissions and special attention to training and recruiting women cadre, particularly working class and national minority women. Through the pages of our theoretical journal, CLASS STRUGGLE, we have concretely put forward our view of women and party-building (see CS, No. 1). The Chicano Resolution, CS 1-2, puts forward the first Marxist-Leninist line on the question of the Chicana. Our new resolution on the Woman Question, passed at our Third Congress (see September 1975), was a major victory in gaining a revolutionary position on the woman question. These gains were lost for the most part after Lenin died and Stalin took power, but were the original intention of the Bolsheviks.

1) If the Los Angeles Research Group's article is "an unprincipled attack on Marxism-Leninism" why did the Guardian, the nation's leading Marxist-Leninist publication, run the article in its "Radical Forum," and give its readers the address from which a longer L.A. Research Group pamphlet on the same subject could be obtained? (The L.A. Group is composed of gay Marxist-Leninist women.)

2) The word sexist refers to a person or group which discriminates against people on the basis of their sex or sexual orientation. The October League, in baring gags from membership, clearly fits this definition. The October League protests that its struggles for women's causes prove it is not sexist toward women. But in the next breath, it refers to the Bird's "bourgeois, decadent, and feminist line" and says, "(Homosexuality) unitizes with feminism in viewing men as the enemy and in reforming capitalism rather than overthrowing it."

The bourgeoisie attacks homosexuality at the same time it promotes it—"but these are hypocritical attacks on the victims of their system, just as it hypocritically attacks drug pushers and street prostitutes." In conclusion, homosexuality far from being revolutionary, and far from being non-class, is a bourgeois threat to the working class, women and national minorities: there is no way it can be reconciled with revolution. Its promotion is part of increased fascist attacks. As Lenin said:

I mistrust the sexual theories of the articles, dissertations, pamphlets, etc., in short, of that particular kind of literature which flourishes luxuriantly in the dirty soil of bourgeois society. I mistrust those who are always contemplating the sexual questions, like the Indian saint his navel... There is no place for it in the Communist Party, in the class-conscious, fighting proletariat.

Lenin, THE WOMAN QUESTION

We would like to speak finally to the Bird's new advertising policy which discontinues free movement ads to organizations which exclude homosexuals and labels paid advertising with the so-called "sexist nature of the organization." This is blatant anti-communism and out and out hypocrisy. In the very same issue there are paid ads with naked women riding bicycles (p. 14) and ads for capitalist rock entrepreneur Alex Cooley (p. 14 and many comment or label whatsoever. That regards paid advertising; we think the OL deserves the same rights as other movement organizations, to receive such advertising. Further, the OL and the Georgia Communist League before it have long been supporters of The Bird and have contributed to it financially.

We hope that this letter will put an end to the struggle on the Bird staff on this question and that the staff will see fit to unite with revolutionary groups around the world on a true Marxist-Leninist stand on the woman question.

In Struggle,

Women's Commission, Atlanta District Octo­ber League, Marxist-Leninist

3) We agree with the OL that "(homosexuality) has been widespread in all decaying societies." We would add that it has also been widespread in all non-decaying societies, along with heterosexuality. Homosexuality is a natural form of human sexual expression, which has existed throughout the ages and also occurs throughout nature. It existed among the early Iroquois and Mohaves, and exists in revolutionary Portugal today. Gay people must march under open banners with the workers to fight for socialism.

4) In saying that Hitler's fascism promoted homosexuality, OL turns history upside down and slanders all gay people. Hitler's regime glorified the "Aryan" family, one designed to raise the birth rate. Hitler justified the slaughter of his SA followers in 1933 with charges that many of them were homosexuals. In Hitler's death camps, all homosexuals and other "undesirables" were murdered. We consider the Los Angeles Research Group's article "an unprincipled attack on Marxism-Leninism" why did the Guardian, the nation's leading Marxist-Leninist publication, run the article in its "Radical Forum," and give its readers the address from which a longer L.A. Research Group pamphlet on the same subject could be obtained? (The L.A. Group is composed of gay Marxist-Leninist women.)

6) The OL says, "We do believe that reproduction is the material basis for sex." In reply, we'd like to quote a recent letter to the editor we received: "Dear Bird: Have we regressed so far in the 70s that you have to use up five column inches to argue that people should have the right to fuck for some purpose other than making a baby? Really!"

The Bird's position is that gay people are a natural part of our society and any society, and groups which discriminate against gays are by definition sexist. The Bird has a longstanding policy against accepting sexist advertising, and we will reiterate our recent clarification of that policy.

Free Advertising: No free advertising space will be granted to any movement organization which excludes gays. Paid Advertising: We will still accept paid advertising from movement organizations which exclude gay people. However, we will accompany any such ad with notice of the sexist nature of the organization.

-the Bird staff

We hope that this letter will put an end to the struggle on the Bird staff on this question and that the staff will see fit to unite with revolutionary groups around the world on a true Marxist-Leninist stand on the woman question.

In Struggle,

Women's Commission, Atlanta District October League, Marxist-Leninist