

10/20/77

Dear Com. Honeycut:

May I engage you in correspondence on the subject of Rosa Luxemburg since the attempts to get a dialogue going once I read your work on Clara Zetkin didn't work out? Far from the my greater interest in Rosa being the reason for my disappointment in your barely mentioning her, I was actually wondering how you could separate the two great revolutionaries. Surely, it wasn't academia requiring that your subject, Clara, be the whole, and surely you wouldn't think that because Clara was directly involved in Women's Liberation would exclude consideration of Rosa. That is to say, your decision to do what you did must be grounded dialectically, and it is this which I would like, if may, probe.

The greatest gap, it seems to me is in the very differing attitudes to philosophy and revolution. The other day, in rereading something on Rosa, I noted that the Women's Movement had decided to have a special celebration for Clara and disregarded Rosa's suggestion that, since Clara loved Greek philosophy, a certain work be given to her; they decided, instead, on a medallion. At the same time writers like Roland-Host think that because Rosa was the greater theoretician, that she felt Clara's friendship a burden. Both attitudes are entirely wrong, and where we could make the greatest contribution would show a dialectical relationship between the two on the question of theory to revolution, and theory to Women's liberation, and theory to "organization", be it Party or autonomous group. It appears inconceivable to me that either Clara would bring up only the question of Women's rights, or Rosa would be interested only in theory, or only in proletariat, and not at all in women. Take the person that all had thought was so great on the "Woman Question"--Bebel--and how male chauvinistic he became once Rosa had her on views on general strike, on revolution, on imperialism. Surely, Clara both learned a lot from Rosa, and Rosa a lot from her. Why, then, did the deeper relations between the two not interest you sufficiently to do more than mention it, very nearly in passing?

My work on Rosa is not only on her. The topic will probably be: SEXISM, POLITICS AND REVOLUTION: Rosa Luxemburg and her age; Women's Liberation and our age. The Movement in each case will be as great a determinant as philosophy; in fact I consider reason and revolution inseparable; when they are separated they bring about aborted revolutions and stultified thought. The fact that Marx's "New Forces, New Passions" has always been interpreted only as proletariat instead of concretizing them as youth, women, Black dimension--or whatever the minority happens to be in whatever country, cannot mean that we must forever remain at the abstract level. Collectivity, too, has been completely misunderstood as if it relate to property only instead of self-determination of ideas.

Where have you gotten with your work in respect to formulating it in form of book? Do you ever get to Detroit? I will probably be in NY on my lecture tour in Feb., but I would like to hear from you now. I do not have your address, so will send this via Anne in NY, but here is my home address:

Yours,

15072