## ALTERNATIVE ON 1905 REVOLUTION AND 1907 CONGRETS

The world of Rosa Luxemburg, even as the world in general, changed completely with the 1905 Russian Revolution. Something was definitely in the air throughout the world, although likewing, the connectiveness of the events, much less the concept of 1905 as prologue to 1917, were present to none for rand that the the 1905 revolution resulted from the Russo-Japanese war and that maximally raised the question of the Orient from an entirely new point as well as internationalism. The arrest main theoretic separation on the self-determination, which kept the Bolsheviks and arrest apart (arrest of organization).

The relationship of spontaneity to the party -- as well as the relationship of leadership to ranks, were problems of life and each in an actual revolution in such a manner that they couldn't possibly be what they were "theoretically"

That is to say, the dialectics of the concrete put every single theory to the test, and every single event is a new relationship to theory.

The hectic activity of participation in a revolution, the overnight mass growth of the very small Polish partym, the General Strike and its transformation of strike action into political challenges to Trarism; and the revolutionary once and actions of the peasantry as well as the prol. released so many new energies at well as thoughts in the masses, in revolutionary leaders, in organization, and even in personal relations, in a way that nothing seemed in any way related to what talking or theory or action was before.

In the case of Rosa, where, on organization, she not only gladly accepted.

Jogishes leadership, but showed very little interest in the question, there she was, not just alongside but towering practically as well as theoretically. For example, a simple matter not like writing a new broadside meant being also responsible for its publication, meant rushing to find a printer, not just by a dis
14229

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

the Bolzheviks as a whole and Lenin in particular. Three datelines and places -
May

Kuokkala 1906/London/1907; Stuttgart, August 1903 -- will tell the breadth and was rewness of the development.

For the first time, they would be a truly international united Congress
Latvians
where Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, Russians and Poles/and Letts as well as the
Bund, would meet at a single Congress, would delate questions graves for the confidence of the confidence

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, while the perspectives. The reason there is such disregard of history, is that it wasn't only the Mensheviks who had moved away from fevolution, 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.

But Trotsky, test whether for purposes of organizational "Unity" or because in that have none followed him in his concept of permanent revolution, participated in that have characles of amendments and delays on what the agenda was to be. The since the name can escape history, and there is no way to discuss the concrete without revealing the underlying theory when finally it got to the one theoretical prol. question agreed upon for discussion, that is to say, relationship of the party to bourgeois parties, all the different theories, evaluations, perspectives did come out. Luxemburg shined at her most brilliant, and not just as an individual theoretician, but as a confrontation with Marxism, with history, and relationship of tandencies.

Thus, whether it was just in the speach where she spoke as a delegate a representative of the German party — 9 full pages of introduction 32 paragraphs, of that the German party delegated her to say — Or whether it was directly on the question of the relation to bourgeois parties, where though the Marketta folish party presented an independent resolution, but then voted with the Boleheviks against the Mensheviks; or in the Marketta concluding remarks, where she had to contend with Plekhanov as the father of Russian raism, as well as though very close to Bolsheviks, she nevertheless chose, instead to stress the father impossibility of successful revolution without boing a unified party, the red impossibility of successful revolution without boing a unified party, the red thread that runs through all of it was the practice of revolution and the preparation for the world revolution, in neither of which could theory and practice (totality)

will and goal, personality as revolutionary, rather than as supposedly narrow factionalism.

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

14231

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 proletarist and most likely to be the vanguard of all revalutions, was something that will remain with her until the day of death, and indeed upon which she was to base, 10 yers 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 MENERALIENX 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 Mixechool, (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 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 1232

who had developed a theory of permanent revolution in writing, if not at the Congress itself \* --considered Marx's own "concluding remakers" to the 1848 Rev'n in the 1850 Address to the Com. League, where he proclaimed that the revolution mus6 not stop at the bourgeois stage but continue in permanene to socialism itself:

It is this which will make us at this point turn away from this most significant Congress with the held in order to Will probe what it is we mean by being "in the air" beginning with the 1848 Rev'n, but looking at it, this time, not in Germany or in Europe, or even in outright revolution, but rather, in the first woman's convention in the U.S. and the Black dimension that gave a totally different and more profound direction to the movement not only then, or a little later in the actual civil War, but 100 years later in our day.

\* Psculiarly enough, the place where Trotsky chooses to solidarize himself with Luxemburg, and to insist, in fact, that they see eye to eye, has warm little to do with anything relating to permanent revolution. It is tune that when he retold the story some 3 decades later in My Life he interpreted that phrase about seeing eye to eye as if it were a question of the Perm. Rev. And jumping off from this retelling, Deutscher, by referring to the 5th Congress, makes it appear quest. But in fact, while she was analyzing to course of the RR from Jan 1905 to Oct. Rove and Dec., not only was it a quest. of developing her view on the General Strike and the class dynamics of that, but what had suddenly gotten firs t the applause of the Mensheviks, then the applause of the Bolshevike, firs t the applause of the Mensheviks, then the applause of the Bolsheviks then her own independent separation from both, was the fact that the criticism and ANTIGOTIES bending in both directions was due to the organizational question, which made her stress that trouble and the stress that trouble and trouble and the stress that trouble and troub the precondition for any successful rev'n was the unity of the party. It was that which made her speak against the narrowness of the Mensheviks, the rigidity of the Bolsheviks, and the true German unity, unity, unity, and since Trotsky thought he, too, was above both factions in the Russian party, that was the point at that moment that brought about the experssion of "eye to eye". What led to all the misconstructions of what happened at the Confress was the fact that everyone was thinking his own theory and since the following year he had written an analysis of the Russian situation from the viewpoint of a theoretician whostere of the the president of the

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 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.

It is philosophy was that limited her. For example, in November, 1911, she wrote to constanting Zetkins "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."

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 soes 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 apportisms 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 deconomic questions posed there. was she then the decided it was Vol. II that had something missing. But, the very subtitle of the workAcc 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 inti-Critique saw an outbreak of actual imperialist war and betrafyal and thereupon the lung-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 Mark in Vol. II. No, the real point -and we will show this over a whole decade -- is that the overwhelming preoccupation, 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 will 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 four years before there was a war but after to had written what was still hailed by Lenin as a great reclutionary work, the Road to Power, with its fantastic "theory of attrition".

As early as 1899, as she was printing agitatedly to Jogiches 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

Som Som

333

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 serious of the break with Kautsky over the General Strike begins in 1910, we are also facing the Second Moroccan crimis, and there is Luxemburg, all over again, so enfuriated at the so-called personal letter that is circulated among the leadership, which showed that at loss to some were ready to capitulate to imperialist venetures 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 ser truth, though an awful lot of people manner. That 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 outside break of the war, she remain 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 the original stemographic 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 collosus 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 muting Social-Democratic demonstration." (Nettle, Vol. II, p. 527)