

1976 (?)

Dear Comrade Isobel do Carmo,

There is no doubt that a developing revolution, especially when at its every step, it is dogged by counter-revolution and when, in your case, you're facing also a state suit against you, allows no free time for international correspondence on any other subject but that concrete situation. ~~Though we sent you~~ ^{Though we sent you} ~~my article on Portugal after the military coup, and you may have seen it, I am enclosing a copy here too.~~ Naturally we, as a Marxist-Humanist organization, have been following events very closely and participated in all matters of international solidarity. I had hoped to receive material from you directly from PRP/BR, but thus far we haven't. ~~xxxxxxx~~ This letter, however, is on a different subject that I felt would interest you, and naturally I would greatly appreciate your view. It is about Rosa Luxemburg and the WLM of today.

THE WLM that considers itself Marxist had not been paying any attention whatever to RL since she's not supposed to have been the least interested in that movement. Not only is this not true, even though she correctly refused to be confined to any single ~~force~~ force, the point is that for revolutionaries to fail to work out a relationship of the thoughts of such great revolutionaries as ground for ~~looking at the~~ looking at the situation today is, to me, completely wrong. Two quotations from you that I came across clearly showed an interrelationship of the two subjects. In one, you stressed the independence of thought of the PRP/BR, that is to say, that you did not follow any single Marxist, but considered all the views of Lenin, ^{Luxemburg} and [?] Trotsky, Mao and Che, and those only as foundation for what is concrete and needed in the 1970s in Portugal, and that in any case the most important element was to work out a new relationship of theory to practice. The other remark was the most recent interview I saw in APOIO, where on the one hand, you said the woman question was not a question in the PRP since you're a revolutionary organization, but on the other hand, you did deal concretely with some questions that were most definitely women's questions, and most certainly had to be considered both

14404

2 Isabel

a force of revolution and Reason of it. Indded, you are an expression of exactly what is new in the revolutions of our era. Whereas there was only one Luxemburg in the period that culminated in the Russian and German revolutions, 1917-1923

You will see from ~~the~~ one of my works that I'm sending you that I was quite ~~shocked~~ ^{sharp (pp.)} with RL and considered her Accumulation of Capital from Marxian theory. It isn't that I have changed my mind wither on that question or on the question that was most deliterious, the National Question. What I have ~~felt~~ felt as urgent for our day is the relationship of spontaneity to organization, and what Rosa had done both on the question of the general strike and her break from Kautsky 4 years in advance of Lenin's break, have inestimable value for us today. I give some idea of that period 1910-13 in a talk I gave on th3 question of today's women ~~theorists~~, and I'm enclosing that to give you an indication of the book I'm planning. as well as the series of 6 lectures that I've given on the subject.

What I would like to ask you are the following questions: (1) is there any specific theory or writings of RL that influenced you in your work, especially after you broke with the Communists? (2) In your activities as an independent tendency, in what way did Rosa's theories relate to any of the other revolutionary theoreticians in formulating your theories? (3) Is either the MDM, MLM or the actual strikes, proletarian and peasant, in which women participated actively, effect the course of the revolution in Portugal? (4) Do you see that as a new feature of revolutions, not just as a force for revolution as in Feb 1917 but as Reason, that is to say, in the manner in which RL, CZ, in Germany or Kollontai in Russia, or Angelica Bobanoff in Italy, these revolutionaries functioned? (5) Internationally, the fact the petty-bourgeois women are likewise active in raising questions that challenge patriarchy

as for example in Portugal, Maria Isabel Barreno of the 3 Marias insisted that it was the international women's movement rather than the April 24th 1974 revolution that freed them.

14405

3 Isobel

Finally, what are your views relating to the present situation on the validity of an independent women's liberation movement as a determinant for social revolution. We in America for example have singled out four forces of revolution—proletariat, Black, youth, women. Naturally the class struggle is always central, but it is not the only one, and no one knows in advance of a developing revolution which is impulse, which is pivotal, which is new but keeps it from degenerating. Insofar as we (I am Chairwoman of News and Letters Committees) are concerned, we feel that what has left a philosophic void ever since the death of Lenin has yet to be filled, and that we cannot but continue to have aborted revolutions unless we work so new a relationship of theory to practice, that the movement from practice is recognized not only as impulse, but as itself a form of theory. That does not mean there is no role for theoreticians. Quite the contrary. It means that we cannot separate philosophy from action, theory from practice, nationalism from internationalism.

* * * * *

I am sending you the Spanish edition of M&F, not only because I think it may be easier to navigate in than the American edition, but also because I'm proud of the fact that the translator^{Dr. Navarra} of the work was the Secretary to Hortensia Bussie (Mrs. Allende), and this gave me the opportunity to express the solidarity of American revolutionaries with the Latin Americans against U.S. imperialism

14406