

11

Resolutions for the 23rd delegation conference of the SDS  
proposed by the action committee of the women's liberation:  
Berlin September 1968

1. The reproduction of the bourgeois separation between private life and collective life in the SDS has paralysed its political work long enough.
2. The SDS defines political activity one-sidedly by tabooing the reflection of problems of personal development (which are not identical with the bourgeois ideas about them).
3. SDS campaigns can be made understood rationally to women but they lack the conditions to concern the women's subjective needs. The oppression of these needs is experienced directly and most intensively in the "private sphere" excluded from the political fight. The women in the SDS are frustrated in a double way when they want to do more than take part in demonstrations, when they want to write papers, make a speech, participate in discussions! They are denied any feeling of success because nobody refers to their contributions.
4. These initiatives of women are taken as frontier-trespasses and must be paid by them with the acknowledgment of the rules of an efficiency/productivity society which is constructed to compensate male frustrations. The perversion of the men's social compensation possibilities covers the talks in the pubs, to the making of speeches until the instructing bed whispers.
5. The class division of the family between the man as the bourgeois and the woman as the proletarian - master and servant - implies the man's objective function as a class enemy. The denial of the authoritarian principle in the SDS is sheer mockery as each married SDS member or one living in a relationship is a leader and simultaneously an exploiter of a family or a family-like group. The terms class, class enemy, and exploiter are auxiliary constructions which serve the women to make their situation clear, i.e. to achieve a measure of sex-specific solidarity and allow to turn the sensual experience of this patriarchal society against this society in the political fight.
6. This does not imply the "politicising" of private life but the end of the bourgeois separation between private and public life. It is necessary to see the oppression in private life not as a private one but as created by political-economic conditions. It is necessary to change the private life in substance and to understand this change as a political action. This cultural-revolutionary action is part of the class struggle.
7. Hence follows that revolution as the aim of the class struggle is not so much a question of overtaking power as a question of the realisation of what starts to show itself in anticipation as a counter-society inside the existing bad society. This includes that the demand for happiness - now confined in isolation to the private sphere, but even there not satisfied - must be responded to in collective action.



8. Therefore personal development must become identical with a practice anticipating the moments of a future counter society which are already now possible, of a society erotising the whole life as well as making aggressions productive.

9. This claim of the SDS is contradictory to both its individual and official practice.

10. This claim can only be put into practice if it is accepted in the organisation.

11. It is important for all women in the SDS not only to acknowledge these theses but to transfer them into binding activity. Only the women are ~~in the SDS, that at least here the authoritarian principle of~~ "interested" enough, only they guarantee that something is going to change in the SDS, that at least here the authoritarian principle of reason of the patriarchic society is broken.

For this purpose isolation is necessary at the present. This is no isolation linked with the illusion that emancipation independent from men is possible, but the necessary first step to articulate one's own needs. We are going to take up the fight against uncritical resistance based upon suppression.

We do not allow ourselves to prescribe our methods of fight.