The importance of the Woman Question must be deeply grasped by Marxist-Leninists. It is an integral part of the general strategy and tactics which must be developed to deal with the growing offensives of the bourgeois. The success of the revolution depends upon the participation of the masses of women in their struggle.

The women's movement in the United States is presently dominated by bourgeois ideology. The main responsibility for this bourgeois character is the failure of Marxist-Leninists to give leadership to the women's movement.

In the communist movement historically, there has been oscillation as to the very importance of the woman question. This is expressed by the failure to take up the struggle for political clarity and political line adequate to the needs of the revolutionary movement, but which amounts to a bourgeois and opportunist stance.

In this light, it is of special importance to take a good look at the positions that have been presented this year on International Women's Day. The positions we analyze are far from identical, but there is an underlying and decisive conflict common to them all. It is their failure to approach the Woman Question with the same view point and method of dialectical and historical materialism.

There are two main types of errors. One is the ideolist approach which fails to see the source of women's exploitation and oppression in class society. Instead, it blames other women, or men, or male chauvinism, or other ideological sources.

The second error is philosophically based on vulgar materialism. It fails to analyze women's exploitation and oppression in its all-round and historical development, necessarily reducing them to mere workers and then resort to idealism to justify them. This is the same error that led to the fallacy of the revisionist position of the CPAUS, which has dominated the communist movement for over 30 years.

The current positions of the communist movement are revisionist. The same error is made in the stand, viewpoint and method, and as a result the revisionism line is the result, whereas the correct position is vulgar materialist starting point.

**CPUSA on the Woman Question**

The CPUSA's line on the Woman Question historically has been an integral part of its tactics. It was officially put forward by the party in the COMMUNIST in 1943, in a pamphlet, MARXISM AND THE WOMAN QUESTION, in 1943. The authority is none other than A. Landy, National Educational Director for the party, who played an important role in the building of Broader-Revisionism.

Landy's line was published in opposition to the book WOMAN POWER, by Mary Inman, which in fact, represented the Marxist-Leninist presentation of the Woman Question. The struggle continued between Landy and other Marxists on the question of revisionism and revisionism within the party resulted in Mary Inman's line being accused of attacking the party, and of taking "the road to right opportunism". Landy's revisionist position held the official party position on the Woman Question.

There are two main aspects to this revisionist line.

1. After World War II and the subsequent growth of industry, women became "integrated" into industrial life. Industrialization is seen as the material basis for undermining women's inequality.

2. On the part of a larger picture, for Landy had already developed a revisionist position on the same line. Their pamphlet, the following tradition of Kauffsky during the First World War. Landy believed in the ultimate justification of the trade unions of the CCW has transformed bourgeois society into a socialist one, as well as good as socialism.

In this context, there was no need to mobilize the masses of women, or anyone else, to struggle against socialism. Moreover, women now had no special problems outside being proletarians.

The finishing touch was the liquidation of the party's women's organizations and publications. 2. The other aspect of this line regards the role of women in the family. The family under capitalism is regarded as a socialist unit only. It is the theory inverted by all Marxists, and in 1937 had already been shot as counter-revolutionary by the Soviet government. According to this, women's labor in the home is not productive labor. The production of the commodity, labor-power, is denied. The family is not seen as an "economic" or "industrial" unit of society as Engels puts forward. In fact, whatever is not productive in the home is not connected to production at all, except the consumption of its products.

This is the basis for the revisionist denial of domestic slavery as a form of exploitation and oppression. Clearly, such a view analysis provides the perfect points for liquidating the Woman Question as a question of special exploitation and oppression.

The CPUSA today upholds the same line. Their views are presented on the Woman Question, WOMEN ON THE JOB, by Judy Beilen, focuses on women's oppression in the house and the production of the home. Women's roles are not analyzed by the party, but the role of the family is taken for granted.

The line of women's roles is historically connected with the appearance of private property and the revisionist SUPPLEMENT on Women, 3/28/86, p. 2).

Private property is also the same basis for their exploitation and oppression of the working class as a whole. The question, then, is why private property determines the special exploitation and oppression of women, which is different from that of the class as a whole. Workers' Congress explains this in detail:

"Within the monogamous family the social status of women was degraded and became production rights reduced to that of being an instrument to produce a man's legitimate heirs and a domestic slave responsible to the tasks of a private house hold economy. Based on private property the bourgeois family arose as the subjection of one sex by that of the other. By this line, establishing a family system entirely dominated by the private property of bourgeois society. In bourgeois society sex oppression of the monogamous family is the property is the source of the woman's exploitation and the second class status of women's labor is established.

"In bourgeois society sex oppression in the monogamous family is the property is the source of the woman's exploitation and the second class status of women's labor is established. However, the role of women in the production of the commodity labor-power in the service of the bourgeoisie is not grasped, the Workers' Congress, based to try and explain it through a mis-analogy of national oppression. In the STUDY GUIDE FOR RESOLUTION, the Workers' Congress states that the role of the family plagues the family outside the realms of social production. It states that the Resolution shows how private property determined a family system, and exploitation of women from social production, their restriction to the petty domestic slavery of the private household economy as the basic economic units of society should be a subject of reunion of women to men." (Ibid., p. 3)

**Women's Congress**

The Women's Congress places private household economy outside social production, and therefore, the comrades sees the family to being a consumption unit only. They have reached Landy's position on the family by a different path, because they have failed to analyze the role of women in the family as domestic slaves in the service of capitalism. However, they also failed to see women's labor as a necessary part of the capitalist mode of production.

Women in the working class are responsible for the production of the commodity labor-power. The "labor of the woman in the home to satisfy and the laborers is a service to the (cont. p. 18)"
capitalist, unless we say that this particular form of labor is exempt from the laws of private property. That, however, is a direct contradiction: to have a capitalist system of production and at the same time to separate the social relations of production in a state of private property is impossible. The economic and social structure of capitalist society is the source of its political structure.

The question of the class character of the movement is important. For example, the class character of the movement of the working class is essentially different from the movement of the petty bourgeoisie.

The working class movement is essentially a protest against the existence of private property, while the movement of the petty bourgeoisie is essentially a protest against the domination of capital in the economic life of society.
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proletariat as a whole, contributing to the absolute importance of the working class. As such, it is not and cannot be the basis for the special exploitation and oppression of women, as this fact is a manifestation of women's exploitation and oppression. It needs to be emphasized that the fact that women and national minorities make up the great majority of the unemployed is not, therefore, the basis of either women's or national minorities' oppression. Rather, it is a product of a more basic aspect of capitalist society. This is, in fact, the real basis for the question of women's position under capitalism and the way in which the image of women's exploitation and oppression is presented in the works of the workers' movement. The question of the exploitation and oppression of women is as fundamental to the development of a scientific and revolutionary position on the role of women in society as it is widespread in the U.S. communist movement. That is, the failure to connect it with the division of labor in society or the material basis of society is a major failure. The first step is to define the division of labor in society, taking into account all forms of oppression, i.e., slavery, of women, as a social and economic phenomenon. This leads to the definition of the division of labor in society, and to the conclusion that the division of labor in society is in the service of the proletariat. The division of labor in society is in the service of the proletariat. The division of labor in society is in the service of the proletariat. The division of labor in society is in the service of the proletariat. The division of labor in society is in the service of the proletariat. The division of labor in society is in the service of the proletariat. The division of labor in society is in the service of the proletariat.