CONCLUSION FOR CHAPTER

to chis

The years 1910 and 1911 were the transition point wheth The reason the question has to be asked is that it is actually those years, especially the Morocco incident, which test theoretical work, whereas she claims sends RL upon her that it is just economics and the school and her not being able to answer certain questions which sent her towards this "scientific" work. "Scientific" or otherwise, it is just impossible to enter that stage without first grappling with Marx's philosophy of revolution, not only as it arose as a process, 1848-49, which did become the ground for the Great Divide between Kenshevism and Bolshevism 1905-1907, but also as the conclusion Marx drew from its failure in the Address to the League, 1850, which and the state of the stat or Trotsky, or Luxemburg, though it was in that Addres Marx developed the theory of Permanent Revolution. becomes especially important now because it is the concept of the permanent revolution, rooted this time (i.e. 1881, in the anthropological research he was doing, which Marx uses in the 1881 Preface he wrote for the Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto. Man It's in that Preface where he predicts the possibility of revolution in Russia. And it's on the basis of those studies that Marx wrote to Zasulitch, and now ***** 100 years later, when we have the EN, we can see the question (role?) of women the very subject RL tried to evade, that reappears. In a word, hat appears unconnected is so only because the Notebooks were unknown and not because the THETHER whole question of Women's

14751

Liberation is not of the essence. Therefore, we will now turn to WL, not only as it appeared in what we may call a truncated form in 1910—11. but as the is central to our age and these have the advantage of hindsight one that we are trying to second guess what would have been, but because.

whichh is why we are entitling the next chapter, "Return to the Source and Forward to the Future"

want to find the cause of imperialism. I'm following up the economic aspects of this concept...it will be a strictly scientific explanation of imperialism and its contradictions, the transference where the contradictions that manifested themselves were not just in imperialism and not just in the "economic aspecta" but in the fact that she always returning to the contradictions at the contradictions of the contradictions in this stage of imperialism, will turn out to be an attack on the "contradictions" in Marx's formulae of capitalist expanded production.

Consciously or otherwise, the dialectic of the development both objectively and subjectively was not what she considered to be the truly original contribution by herself.

That which was truly original when you consider the totality, the intensity, and the genuine relationship of the political economic social and socialist goal of a new society

even when it is directly inter-related with effect is not the totality in the Marxish sense, both of second negativity and Subject of philosophy and revolution.