

And she both kills and devours Achilles.

Whether or not ~~IMXKZXX~~ during the war she had seen women as something distinct or unique, the point is that they were, in fact, as movement, central in the anti-war and she herself remained as a genuine beacon for the revolutionary movement man and woman.

Or is this an alternative?

When I was thinking of the EN as coming in only at the end, I renamed it "Return to the Beginning and Advance to the Future". The point was that 100 years following Marx's Notebooks, they first get published and not by a Marxist. In fact, neither the revolution nor philosophy were mere theory, and the Marxist scholar during the RR should have grasped philosophy. Instead, Ryazanov, who had published the 1844 Manuscripts thus opening a new stage, but continued digging to the end (I'm not referring to Stalin's displacement of Ryazanov, but of Marx's last writings

which Ryazanov discovered, in part. But he superciliously dismissed them as less than They all seemed to act as though the most Marx did after the Paris Commune, was the Gotha Programme and they act as if he died after that.

And yet what we have involved here is not only the 1917 RR which could have learned a lot, but future revolutions that are by no means called for just by the economy. When you add to that what occurred the year following Marx's death, when ~~EMMIXEMXX~~ Engels published his Origin, you can see that none, beginning with his closest collaborator really grasped Marx's thinking as a new continent of thought. In truth, it's precisely at that source, i.e. not at all the criticism but the thought that he thought he was following out the bequest that both returns us to the difference at the very beginning in 1844 and to the end 1882, or four months before his death.

(Now it may be that though I change the EN to Ch. 2, I would reconsider them also at the end within this context.)

14785

Paris Commune as ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ both force and Reason of the very first ~~XXXXXX~~ classless society in history; when ~~XXXX~~ the Asiatic mode of production was not only a designation of what had been ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ made a category which designated nothing short of a whole ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ historic development of humanity itself in the 1850s, but ~~XXXXXX~~ as ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ such opposition to any concept of unilineal development as to conclude that "The Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation" ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ has been meant for the West only.

In a word, just as the Civil War in the U.S. brought the Black dimension onto the historic stage, both as a force for freedom and for labor, and for theory which led at one and the same time to the restructuring of Capital and as a new passion for restructuring the whole of society on truly humanist beginnings, so the Absolute Idea got concretized ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ as, on the one hand, "Absolute General Law of Capitalist Accumulation" and on the other hand, "the new passions and new forces for reconstruction of society." For that matter, it was precisely Marx's greatest theoretical work, Capital, which also concretized "freely associated labor" as the ~~XXXXXX~~ one and only force for stripping the fetishism from commodities, and it was,

precisely, Marx's final ^{work} on Ethnology - which led to the projection of permanent revolution not just "forward" but one that must emerge in Russia ahead of the West. 14786

Because Marx had discovered a new continent of thought as well as revolution, and because both concept and fact have ever been rigorously tied together in Marx's Marxism, his works carry a ^{and because we live in a 70-year-old world since 1919} ~~special~~ urgency for our age ^{It is more relevant than today's endless} ~~as~~ as that of Rosa Luxemburg. Thus, more relevant than today's endless questions of private vs. collective property (or state property that calls itself Communism) is Marx's articulation of the Man/Woman relation as a most fundamental one, saying that at the very moment (1844) when he first laid the philosophic foundation for what became known as historical materialism. Both these questions -- Man/Woman, and property relations -- we will leave to a future chapter that will relate it to the Women's Liberation Movement. For the present, what is relevant is that Marx

Suddenly Marx found it difficult to answer a simple question from Vera Zasulich on the future of the Russian commune in the manner in which it was debated between the Narodniks and the Marxists -- that is to say, whether it could lead to communism without needing to go through capitalism and evidently without a revolution! He wrote no less than four different versions of his answer, the first of which was fully ten pages long. From that first draft until the very much abbreviated one that he finally sent, what is clear is that his preoccupation is not "the commune" but the "needed Russian Revolution": "In order to save the Russian commune a revolution is needed."²⁹

The second draft manifests also what he had developed with the Asiatic mode of production: "The archaic or primary formation of our globe contains a number of strata of different ages, one superimposed on the other . . . (isolation) permits the emergence of a central despotism above the communities . . . I now come to the crux of the question. We cannot overlook the fact that the archaic type to which the Russian commune belongs, conceals an internal dualism."³⁰

The third draft, which in part was quoted above on the question of the historical environment being the crucial point, was a conclusion Marx reached as he emphasized "the dualism within it (the commune) permits of an alternative: either the property element in it will overcome the collective element, or the other way."

This is always the key to the whole. It isn't/a question ^{just} of what he wrote in 1844, or in the Address to the Communist League in 1850. Rather it was an actual revolution of the 1850s -- ^{mid-} ~~the~~ Taiping -- which led Marx, at one and the same time, to his probing of pre-capitalist forms