

??

CONCLUSION FOR CHAPTER

272 CH 3 73 top

The years 1910 and 1911 were the transition point. ~~but so~~
~~what?~~ The reason the question has to be asked is that it is
 actually those years, especially the Morocco incident, which
 sends RL upon her ~~greatest~~ ^{most original} theoretical work, whereas she claims
 that it is just economics and the school and her not being able
 to answer certain questions which sent her towards this
 "scientific" work. ~~It~~ "Scientific" or otherwise, it is just im-
 possible 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
 Menshevism and Bolshevism 1905-1907, ~~but~~ also as the conclusion
 Marx drew from its failure in the Address to the League, 1850,
 which ~~was not cited~~ ^{the propagator of this idea was called the Herrings} by Mensheviks, Bolsheviks,
 or Trotsky, or Luxemburg, though it was in that address where
 Marx developed the theory of Permanent Revolution. ^{100 - the 1900s} This
~~becomes especially important now~~ ⁽¹⁹¹⁰⁻¹⁹¹¹⁾ 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. ~~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 Zasulich, 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,~~
~~what appears unconnected is so only because the Notebooks were~~
~~unknown and not because the whole question of Women's~~

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 ^{it is} ~~it~~ is central to our age and ~~ages~~ ^{we are now in the position of} ~~we~~ have the advantage of hindsight, ^{not that we are trying to} ~~not~~ second guess what would have been, but because ^{we}

which is why we are ^{entitling} ~~entitled~~ the next chapter, "Return to the Source and Forward to the Future".

10/11/1911
When, in Nov. 1911, RL wrote Konstantin Zetkin: " I 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," ~~trans-~~
~~mission-~~ ~~ing~~ the contradictions that manifested themselves were not just in imperialism and not just in the "economic aspects" but in the fact that she ~~was~~ ^{was} always returning to ~~the~~ ~~same~~ ~~old~~ ~~causality~~ "causality" and at the same time, it is certainly not clear that "scientific" explanations, far from ~~being~~ ~~con-~~ ~~centrating~~ ~~on~~ ~~capitalism~~ ~~and~~ ~~its~~ ~~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

~~causality~~ Causality was always RL's methodology, but causality even when it is directly inter-related with effect is not the totality in the Marxist ⁱⁿ sense, both of second negativity and Subject of philosophy and revolution.

14753