RZM

July 1, 1977

Dear Anny Brack

Somehow I expected to hear from you when Bessie Gogol and Mary Holmes told me of the meeting with you and that you had read Philosophy and Revolution at a moment when you were thinking of the integrality of feminism with Marxism. Perhaps the enclosed TW column will achieve that dialogue. When I wrote it as, more or less, a review of a bourgeois professor's "history of the Chinese Revolution mainly from the point of view of Comrade Chiang Ch'ing", I had not expected the reaction of our comrades who wanted it issued as a separate pamphlet on "Sexism, Politics and Revolution." Then I felt they were right, especially if added to it, was a reprint of "Alienation and Revolution", my interview with a refugee from Peking University in Hong Kong. (It's part of the chapter on Mao Tse-tung Thought in P&R, so you have that too.)

I had been impressed with your editorship of Spare Rib before I got an in-person report of you, and then too thought that if neither the feminists who are busying only with exposing male chauvinism, nor those concerned withproletarian revolution, ever work out this question that is so central for uprooting capitalism--masses, especially women in this case, as Reason as well as force, then we will really fail our historic responsibilities, not for "history" as past but for history-in-the-making. It is this which has sent me on many European and African and Japanese trips to get co-authors for P&R before it became one author plus collectivity of Marxist-Humanists, but not a collectivity that would have emerged from the movement from practice that was itself a form of theory.

You too must have thought and worked at these demanding as we face this sexist, exploitative, racist reality. Have you thought that it might, in one way, worked out as we related Rosa Luxemburg in the period she lived and the women theorists of our day that is not (is not) limited to the question of womeb's "role" but proceeds to the theory of social revolution for our day, very, very much belated? In any case, the reason I was and am anxious to start a dialogue with you is that my present work on Rosa Luxemburg turned my eyes to England and very sharp difference with Sheila Rowbotham who had written a 300 page work on Women and Revolution without once mentioning Rosa Luxemburg! Supposedly, it was because Rosa had never written directly on the "Woman Question", which, besides not being completely factual, says something of theoreticians of our day if Rosa's being woman is likewise totally disregarded once you talk of "general questions." In truth, of course, Sheila has as elitist an attitude to women as any of her leader-male chauvinist comrades (if she still is a member of IS)and therefore, it seems to me, she couldn't possibly "compete" on"theory"with her colleagues unless she simply once again willingly remained cooped in only the women's movement where she still feels sufficient kinship with Communists as to collaborate with CP leader, again on the "Woman Question." What do you think?

I'm looking forward to commentary from you both on the enclosed article and on matters in general, either those raised in this note, or any that you wish to raise.

Comradely yours,

15064