El Comité-M.N.P. has consistently (based on the principles of its Political Statement) been supportive of the Puerto Rican liberation struggle in terms of solidarity movement—particularly among the working class—in support of Puerto Rico's national liberation and, within that context, raised the principle of the political independence of the people as one of the central themes of the struggle. This understanding has guided our relationship to the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee and its task of developing a solidarity movement.

Recently, after two years of existence, the PRSC celebrated its second National Conference (see article on page 7). During those two years, the PRSC has grown into a nationwide organization, with chapters in twenty or more cities in the U.S. Although not forming part of the PRSC during the period just ended, we have recognized the political significance of the PRSC and its serious efforts of solidarity with Puerto Rico. On the other hand, we have been consistently critical of its errors and shortcomings. At all times we have attempted to be principled and aboveboard in our criticisms. This did not result magically but as consequence of the debates that took place within the PRSC itself, and as recognition of its errors and shortcomings. This did not result magically but as consequence of the debates that took place within the PRSC itself, and as recognition of its errors and shortcomings. At all times we have attempted to be principled and aboveboard in our criticisms.

The discussions around the original draft statement led to a number of amendments which strengthened its weak points, and resolved some of the points of debate. The final document will recognize, among other things, the centrality of armed struggle; the need to expand the PRSC relations to other forces in the Liberation Movement; the strategic significance of the oppressed national minorities and the US working class (including the Puerto Rican national minority); as well as present a clearer definition of the character and nature of imperialism in Puerto Rico.

El Comité-MINP and the PRSC

In the process of waging political struggle on the divergent perspectives, there was not always respect given by some comrades toward those whose practice has shown serious commitment to independently support the Puerto Rican people's struggle for national liberation but who may lack a consistent class perspective. In particular this was the attitude assumed toward members of the San Francisco Chapter of the PRSC Conference. On the other hand, there were some among the latter comrades who did not practice principled ideological struggle and who substituted obtuse conduct, which at times hindered the work of the conference, for ideological struggle. Both these attitudes are in our view incorrect and must be corrected. We hope that in the process of implementing the objectives established by the Conference these shortcomings are rectified; as the conference demonstrated, ideological struggle, when properly carried out, is in the interest of all the participants.

In Latin America the participation of women is apparent in the popular movements and struggles for national independence. Among the most recent examples we find: Tamara Burke, Monica Erti and Rita Veldivia in Bolivia; Nora Paz Carcamo in Guatemala; Livia Gourvenin in Venezuela; Blanca Luz Brum in Peru; Maria Luisa Vera in Mexico; Vilma Espín and Haydee Santamaría in Cuba; Lolita Labron in Puerto Rico. They are examples of the thousands of fighting women within the Latin American process. Many others have participated and participated from the trenches of anarchy; still others suffer the jailings and tortures of the dictatorial regime.

In North America we are witnesses to the combustion strength of the women through their participation in the garment and textile industry strikes and in the hospital and public sector struggles. We have also seen their fights for the right to a better education, public assistance and equal pay. It is not hard to find some of the reasons for which the women have been excluded. But even within the internal functioning of the organizations we find that women are delegated to the secretarial, mechanical and clerical tasks and in the mass activities they are assigned to daycare and kitchen work. In this regard, the women are among the most excluded. In the revolutionary process it is not only to be defined within a socialist society. It can be said that here, in the United States, and definitely in Puerto Rico, the left has changed itself by its incapacity to recognize the revolutionary potential of women. In fact the question has been delegated to a secondary level where commissions and "phantom" federations are created to appease certain preoccupations or to create a new front for the parties or organizations.

Lenin observed that: "There can be no socialist revolution without the participation of large numbers of women workers." Women constitute more than half of the population, many of whom are incorporated into the labor force and subject to the most brutal exploitation and oppression. Due to this material condition they possess an immense revolutionary potential to be developed by the proletarian consciousness.

This potential has fully developed, repeatedly showing itself in revolutionary action throughout history. Women have demonstrated their strength, capacity, commitment and desire to struggle. It is within this context that we believe the role of women should be given the attention it deserves.

Women in the Revolutionary Movement

The Family: Questions of Bourgeois Morality vs.
Proletarian Morality

Engels demonstrated that the family, as we know it today, is oriented toward the involvement of the woman in the household and the production of children. This corresponds to the capitalist society. Engels could not state how the social class of the family; it could only be defined within a socialist society. However, he did point out that the monogamous couple constituted a superior form of family relationship which was not present in the bourgeois society of the 19th century. Engels observed that the monogamous couple was superior to the polygamous system of the slave society and that it could be found in the nations of Europe and the United States. Living in a capitalist society we find ourselves in an
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