

cussion or payment, but with gun in hand to see that it actually was done.

It meant an entirely new stage also in relations with ~~the Mensheviks~~
the Bolsheviks as a whole and Lenin in particular. Three datelines and places --
Kuokkala 1906; ^{May} London/1907; Stuttgart, August 1907 -- will tell the breadth and
newness of the development.

Apr
1906
May 1907
Aug 1907

Lenin, Zinoviev, and Bogdanov ~~held an entire~~ held an entire
week's discussion with Rosa on the course of the RR, on its ramifications inter-
nationally -- to Luxemburg, the most important part of the ~~1905~~ 1905 RR was
how she was going to apply and develop this -- the General Strike -- on the
German scene -- and what organizational questions would be drawn from it
or related to it, in the coming 1907 Russian Congress.

For the first time, they would be a truly international united Congress
where Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, Russians and Poles/Latvians and Letts as well as the
Bund, would meet at a single Congress, would debate questions ~~of a practical~~
~~of a practical~~ by direct confrontations, ^{on a pr-nc-} and come to conclusions.

The fantastic and not-so-fantastic point of this was that days on end
would be spent just on the agenda. However, far from that being a consequence
of "chaos", as both a Trotsky and a Balabanova were to write; as a Deutscher ~~and~~
were to repeat, though more than a half century afterwards
when both hindsight and documents were available to prove the contrary, the truth
was that it was a question whether you were going to confront reality theoretically
drawing conclusions from what has been for as well as practically, ~~in a practical~~ perspectives. ~~etc.~~ The reason there is such
disregard of history, is that it wasn't only the Mensheviks who had moved away
from revolution, ~~who did not wish "theory" discussed, but supposedly~~
who were supposedly so interested in things to be done that they didn't want to
waste time on abstract theory.

had explain
the above
Per
to

But Trotsky, ~~was~~ whether for purposes of organizational "unity" or because
 none followed him in his concept of permanent revolution, participated in that
 charades of amendments and delays on ~~about~~ what the agenda was to be. *at the not*
 none can escape history, and there is no way to discuss the concrete without *only didn't*
 revealing the underlying theory when finally it got to the one theoretical *place then*
 question agreed upon for discussion, that is to say, relationship of the party *in the*
 to bourgeois parties, all the different theories, evaluations, perspectives *agreed*
 did come out. Luxemburg shined at her most brilliant, and not just as an in- *but was*
 dividual theoretician, but as a confrontation with Marxism, with history, and *since*
 relationship of tendencies. *prol.*

Thus, whether it was just in the speech where she spoke as a delegate
 a representative of the German party -- 9 full pages of introduction *of 5* paragraphs
 of what the German party delegated her to say -- Or whether it was directly on *you*
 the question of the relation to bourgeois parties, where though the ~~XXXXXXXX~~ *didn't*
 Polish party presented an independent resolution, but then voted with the Bol- *bring*
 sheviks against the Mensheviks; or in the ~~XXXXXXXX~~ *OK* concluding remarks, where
 she had to contend with Plekhanov as the "father" of Russian Marxism, as well as
 though very close to Bolsheviks, she nevertheless chose, instead to stress the *he in this*
 impossibility of successful revolution without being a unified party, the red *with them*
 thread that runs through all of it was the practice of revolution and the pre- *not*
 paration for ~~the~~ world revolution, in neither of which could theory and practice *for*
 will and goal, ^(totality) personality as revolutionary, rather than as supposedly narrow *factor*
 factionalism.

Defm
 Thus, in the first speech of greetings, there was the most magnificent
 analysis of the RR, as being so massive, so new, so great as to tar over any
 idea of advanced Germany and even showing what it meant to have 50 years of
 experience as against Marx who had to participate who had to participate in a

~~bourgeois~~ bourgeois revolution in 1848. This speaking Russian, and with it the sudden lowering of Germany, which had been recognized by all, including herself, as the greatest Marxist party with the most advanced proletariat and most likely to be the vanguard of all revolutions, was something that will remain with her until the day of death, and indeed upon which she ~~was~~ was to base, 10 yrs later, her own Germany revolution. At the same time, this "speaking Russian" meant also the ground not just of her theory of General Strike, but her ~~break~~ break with Karl Kautsky and the whole leadership, years before, Lenin or anyone else was to see the depth of the Germ SD's opportunism, that would lead to betrayal. And, though this seemed totally unrelated, and surely unexpected by herself since she was to relate her greatest theoretical work on accumulation of Capital to the questions that confronted her in the teaching of Marxian economics in the ^{German SP} school, (we will develop this later) what I'm trying to say here is that it meant so totally new a stage in her own self-development, in her relations with international leaders on the one hand, and Jogishes on the other, that nothing, indeed, was left standing from the old Rosa, even though it was there that she wrote her first ^{outstanding} work on Reform or Revolution, which did remain the red thread through her entire life. Contradictory as that sounds, both the continuity and the discontinuity came to so great a point of tension that reorganization was inescapable.

The one unfortunate, and in a certain sense, inexplicable was in this fact. Here everyone was relating the RR to the 1848 revolutions of Marx's day. And the 1848 Rev. of Marx's day was discussed both within the context of what preceded it, the CM, what actually followed, and the new that they were confronting, the necessity for Marxists to spell out Marxism for their own day. And yet none -- and that includes Trotsky

14232

exception and again, ahead of what any other revolutionary was thinking and doing, Lenin included, was the anti-imperialist struggle. Who in the International raised the criticism of SPs on the question of China as early as 1900? Who raised in (1905) on Morocco? And who in the fight against militarism raised it not only as a principle within, but also as would be used against the colonies? So much credit is given about the new stage of capitalism having first been raised by a bourgeois, Hobson, as a study, and by the first Marxist, Hilferding, concentrating on finance, with the implication being given that even if she had been correct in (1913), it was not a first. Wasn't it? Didn't all her work on imperialism point to exactly that being the underlying motive in her classes in the school, 1907-09(?)? Only she wasn't writing studies a la Hilferding, she was working out a theory of revolution for her day.

1875
1905
1913
L
B
C

11/11

It is philosophy ~~was~~ that limited her. For example, in November, 1911, she wrote to Konstantin Zetkin: "I want to find the cause of imperialism. I am following up the economic aspects of this concept...it will be a strictly scientific explanation of imperialism and its contradictions." ~~...and its contradictions.~~ The root cause is a very great step forward in essence, but for a revolutionary philosopher, for the dialectics to work itself out, it has to go beyond contradiction--and it goes beyond, whether we think it stops when we start our analysis. (The greater part of Hegel against Kant, when he says that he stopped dead. AND the precise place where Lenin ~~was~~ broke through fully on the Hegelian dialectic was the syllogism which breaks down the opposition.

between objective and subjective, and which therefore seems not only that what has been a cause is also an effect, and an effect becomes a cause, and proceeded to make all those aphorisms about none understanding CAPITAL who have not grappled with the LOGIC.)

It is true that when she wrote ACC of Cap she related it to her classes in school to the fact that that she couldn't answer certain economic questions posed there, ^{and} she then ~~decided~~ decided it was Vol. II that had something missing. But, the very subtitle of the ~~ACC~~ ACC of Cap book, "A Contribution to the Economic Clarification of Imperialism" tells a different story, and the fact that between the writing of the work in 1912 and the writing of her Anti-Critique saw an outbreak of actual imperialist war and betrayal and thereupon the long-lasting debates then and since, point precisely to the most original aspect of her work -- the analysis of imperialism -- do more than prove otherwise. That is to say, it is not a question of "proving" was it imperialism and politics or was it "strictly scientific" questioning of ACC of Capital as developed by Marx in Vol. II. No, the real point -- and we will show this over a whole decade -- is that the overwhelming pre-occupation, sensitivity, both to what was being born in capitalism -- its imperialist phase -- and with it the preoccupation and disgust with the appearance of opportunism within the organization, and that after the defeat of revisionism, was indeed her ~~greatest~~ greatest contribution, theoretically and organizationally, which made her tower above all other leaders, Lenin included, so that she didn't have to wait for the actual betrayal to break with Kautsky but in fact had begun it ~~not only~~ ^{not only} four years before there was a war but after ~~she~~ had written what was still hailed by Lenin as a great revolutionary work, The Road to Power, with its ~~fantastic~~ ^{challenging} "theory of attrition".

Handwritten notes:
 Kautsky
 1914/15
 1917
 1918
 1919
 1920
 1921
 1922
 1923
 1924
 1925
 1926
 1927
 1928
 1929
 1930
 1931
 1932
 1933
 1934
 1935
 1936
 1937
 1938
 1939
 1940
 1941
 1942
 1943
 1944
 1945
 1946
 1947
 1948
 1949
 1950
 1951
 1952
 1953
 1954
 1955
 1956
 1957
 1958
 1959
 1960
 1961
 1962
 1963
 1964
 1965
 1966
 1967
 1968
 1969
 1970
 1971
 1972
 1973
 1974
 1975
 1976
 1977
 1978
 1979
 1980
 1981
 1982
 1983
 1984
 1985
 1986
 1987
 1988
 1989
 1990
 1991
 1992
 1993
 1994
 1995
 1996
 1997
 1998
 1999
 2000

Finishing
 As early as 1899, as she was ~~working~~ working Reform or Revolution which was a great enough contribution, she was writing agitatedly to Jogiches asking that the question be answered "immediately -- and I do mean immediately." It turned out that what she was demanding an immediate answer to was one of the problems of the contradictions of capitalism that lead to its collapse: "at first this occurred to me as a theme for a beautiful lead article entitled
 14236

Handwritten: 14236 3333

4

experience in the PR that it is no simple thing of either declaring your opposition to capitalist wars, imperialism, but of raising the flag of revolution.

When the ~~PR~~ beginning of the break with Kautsky over the General Strike begins in 1910, we are also facing the Second Moroccan crisis, and there is Luxemburg, all over again, so infuriated at the so-called personal letter that is circulated among the leadership, which showed that at least some were ready to capitulate to imperialist ventures that she publishes that "personal" letter. The fact that the bureaucratic leadership quickly diverts the whole question from the substance to a matter of discipline can in no way divert from the actual ~~PR~~ truth, though an awful lot of people ~~had~~ had made such a fetish of the unity of the party and discipline, that the Left as well as the Right began attacking her attitude. In a way, the bureaucracy knew better than the Left that they'd better not go the whole hog and have her expelled, but had her apologize.

Finally, and this finally is limited only to the point before the outbreak of the war, she ^{both} ~~was~~ runs afoul of German imperialism and gets arrested and is accused of nothing short of treason, and the local paper at Freiburg, on March 3, 1914, chooses to quote her speech ~~as~~ as the original stenographic report underlines the whole last part: "This proud German militarism, which according to Bismarck was afraid of God but nothing else, this militarism which is supposed to frighten us in the guise of a colossus of iron and steel bristling with armament from top to bottom -- this colossus shivers at the very thought of a mutiny of precisely twelve soldiers. The whole of the German Empire is seen as dissolving in ruins as a result of a ~~social-democratic~~ Social-Democratic demonstration." (Nettlé, Vol. II, p. 527)

14237