

FORM FOR WL CHAPTER: THEN & NOW

to follow chronologically RL 1902 to the outbreak of WWI and a little beyond, ~~perhaps~~ <sup>post-</sup> 1918. ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> WIM that was emerging in WWII, whether from an intellectual like Simone deBeauvoir, or the Black women workers who came from the South, ~~that~~ who were not heard, but I tell the incident with them.

Transition point to mid-1960s. What has to be stressed here is that the Marxists of all varieties except ourselves were using the fact that the German movement had been both a ~~mass~~ mass movement and mainly proletarian, against the newly emerging, seemingly ~~middle-class~~ <sup>WIM</sup> middle-class, in the U.S. What they failed to see ~~was~~ was that one great dimension--the Black, which seemed to be totally absent in the European movement--was not only present here, but it is the precise characteristic that at once reconnected it with the 1st WIM (1848), which likewise ~~was~~ not only arose <sup>from</sup> and was related to the Black dimension, but the latter had actually preceded it. Q Maria Stewart and relate it to Nat Turner. P That is not

1916 can't be

1906 1917 1918

1912 1914

1915 1916

1917 1918

1916 1918

Richard  
1848

Now, the short-minded men who called themselves Marxist of our era were ~~not~~ totally bereft of Marx's own philosophy, thereby not only confusing Marx and Engels as one and not only knowing nothing at all about the EN, but seeming to know next to nothing of open, actual history of Marx that was ~~the~~ very much part of the movement. What I'm referring to is even if one of the periods, 1844, was unknown, <sup>1848</sup> EN, certainly was not unknown, and there Marx spoke not only about equality, but about the need to destroy the family as totally bourgeois.

2ndly, there was the magnificent First International of which we never stop hearing, and yet we likewise did not know that Marx had not only been very active in so-called recruiting women, but had seen that they <sup>had</sup> ~~were~~ full leadership responsibility. Madame Harriet Law, who was a member of the General Council and an editor. of... was <sup>the</sup> very one who published Marx in various periods when all others refused. <sup>Verd</sup> Furthermore, just before the Paris Commune, Marx not only sent a young Russian woman, to organize a women's section of the International in Paris, but again the relationship was not ~~only~~ only organizational and not only French, but theoretical and Russian, that is, she gave him a lot of information on Russian agriculture which she was then studying.

4thly, again, if even we did not know the EN, there was absolutely no way not to know the preface to the Russian edition to the Communist Manifesto and the correspondence with Vera Zasulich. ~~3/2/81~~

Dr. Ogden has read

So the question is, how the heck did all these Marxists have so absolutely bourgeois a conception of the so-called role of women, and how could it persist so long that when we come to the mid-1960s when it is already a mass movement in the U.S. and in the world, we still get these absolutely

backward remarks about WL.

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~  
~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

Could it be that all were so well-trained by Bebel and Engels that at one and the same time <sup>they</sup> really have a backward position on the "world historic defeat" of women, and on the other, limited the women's role.

+ Selig  
+ W/11

~~One~~ more absolutely open and indeed more or less of our age high point of development of women has likewise ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ had little attention paid to it. I am referring to Feb. 1917, when the women were actually the ones who initiated nothing short of the overthrow of Tsarism. By ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ the time Trotsky wrote the History of the Russian Revolution, he certainly wrote a most moving piece on the women's historic action. Unfortunately, as moving as it was, he did not make a category out of it. Quite ~~the~~ ~~contrary~~, the essence of that beautiful passage was not only a paean to unconscious behavior in revolutionary movements, but the stress on the fact that since it was only spontaneous, it was only when the direct action of Bolshevism came in that the Feb. revolution moved toward Nov.

to be  
W. Selig  
L. W. 11  
L. W. 11  
L. W. 11  
L. W. 11  
L. W. 11  
L. W. 11  
L. W. 11  
L. W. 11

(4) Fourth section of new form would then be our age-- the 1970s and 80s.) In our age therefore, not only must we, though critically, give full credit to the WL's new vantage points, just because they are new, rather than <sup>because</sup> ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ unless we recognize that by this new and only with this new, even when it couldn't work out the philosophic ramifications, we ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ get a total conception of how deep must be the uprooting and with it, the demand that it be discussed now, not the day after the revolution.