

and the same time, that the dispute was directed as much against the Germans as the Bolsheviks and the fact that she, herself, was living the biggest contradiction since all of the criticism against bureaucracy, leadership, etc., did not lead her to break with the Party. That was seen most in 1914 and even when she organized the Spartacus League it was as a faction within the SPD; 5) the 1919 Revolution itself likewise shows that she herself was living the greatest contradiction, i.e. that the greatest contradiction was within her own concept of party and spontaneity, so that at the end, a) though she called the Second International "a stinking corpse" she opposed the attempt to create a Third International -- AND THAT PERSISTED EVEN AFTER THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION AND IS THE LEGACY SHE LEFT HER TENDENCY; b) she reversed her whole life motif by in the end approving the unity of her group and the PPS as the new CP of Poland; c) she did head (even though she didn't vote for it) the CP in Germany and called for "all power to the Soviets".

ORGANIZATIONAL QUESTIONS OF RUSSIAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY. by RL
(Dick Howard translation) pp 283-306.

** Each of history shows **

After a very brief introduction which establishes the fact that she doesn't hold that when a Party is not as big as the German SD, it shows "under-development". Quite the contrary. Each is "of equal historical status" and there is to be learned as much from the under-developed as the developed. She further admits that it is not an easy question because the Russian SD has to work in a absolutist state and must always look at the police.

Furthermore (p. 285) the Russians had a special problem because they certainly had to get rid of "circles and local clubs" atmosphere and to achieve "a unified political action of the masses in the entire state." which is why for three long years (1900-1903) the thrust of Iskra was towards that one end with all stress on the question of centralism. However, though the German Party likewise considered centralism important, "the ultra centralist viewpoint of the Russian party " as "Com. Lenin, one of the outstanding leaders and fighters of the Iskra in its campaign for the preparation of the Party Congress, must be criticised."

(rd- RL, HOWEVER, DOESN'T BOTHER TO MENTION THAT THE ISKRA WHICH IS ASKING HER FOR THIS ARTICLE IS NOT THE ISKRA WHICH CONDUCTED THE CAMPAIGN AND IS CERTAINLY THE MENSHEVIK ORGAN.)

The point is always that "no rigid formulas for organization will do to express Marxist conception of socialism," and that Lenin's ~~two principles~~ "two principles -- (1) on the blind-subordination of all party organization ... to a ~~central~~ central power which alone ~~the~~ thinks, plans and decides for all; and (2) ... seems to us to be a mechanistic transfer of the organizational principles of the Blanquist movement of conspiratorial groups to the Social Democratic movement of the working masses." (p. 290)

RL then continues her attack, (1) on "discipline", going hammer and tongs against Lenin's expression that "factory discipline" is something the proletariat has and ~~the intellectuals don't have~~ the intellectuals don't have and are no good. After that she goes into proving how all the development over the last decade in Russia has come from the spontaneous movement and not from the SD leadership: "in each case, they were the spontaneous product of the movement in action." (p. 292) She mentions the 1896 strike in Petersburg, the student agitation in Petersburg of March ~~1901~~ 1901 and the mass strike in Rostov-on-Don, but even here the thrust is equally directed against the German SD. (p. 294)

Summary

THE ORGANIZATIONAL QUESTION & RL

Since Howard's Selected Writings (p. 283 ff.) is the only one that has a new translation of (and cleared of the slanderous retitling of the RL 1904 article as "Leninism ^{OR} Marxism?") RL's original article, titled "Organizational Questions of Russian Social Democracy". I will summarize that even though there is only one aspect, the more important one being both 1905-07 and 1917-1919.

Pp. 283-4 RL correctly states that she knows the extraordinary task SD has in trying to create a working class party "in a police state."

P. 286 she is also correct in saying that the fight for centralism was absolutely important in a situation of "circles" and local club atmosphere. What is wrong, she says, is that ~~centralism~~ centralism then became a motto as the new face of organization at the party congress. She is correct again and quite objective in that 3-year campaign, 1900-03, that ^{it} took to prepare that congress; "However, at the party congress, and even more so after, ~~the result~~ it became evident that centralism is a slogan which does not completely exhaust the historic content and the of the Social Democratic organization."

It is here, that is as soon as she mentions the historic content, that she becomes quite abstract in the sense of completely disregarding the concrete ~~xxxx~~ with which she started--"no rigid formula for organization will do to express the Marxist conception of socialism." *P

Once she has stated that and once she doesn't really go through the concrete at the congress which incidentally she did not attend, nor does she make it so clear that she is talking not on What is to Be Done, but on Lenin's One Step Forward, 2 Steps back

14274

WK out

that nearly everyone, including Nettl, misrepresented her 1904 thesis as an attack on What is To Be Done (see The Legacy of RL by Norman Geras for an interesting expose of that fact), she launches into an attack on Lenin's concept as ultracentralist.

287: "Lenin thinks that the unification of such a strict centralism which the Social Democratic mass movement is ~~the~~ a specific revolutionary Marxist principle."

RL ~~admits~~ admits that such a tendency has been "inherent in the SD," because that's what capitalist

On p. 288 she then goes further back in history in relationship to "independent direct action of the masses" and how it was opposed to early socialist movements like Jacobinism and Blanquism: "Lenin appears to underestimate that fact when he calls ~~the~~ S.D. 'a Jacobin indissolubly connected with the organization of the class conscious proletariat.'" She then insisted Lenin is wrong, that proletarian class consciousness is opposed to the conspiracy of small minorities: "He forgets that this difference implies a complete revision of the concept of organization, a whole new content for the concept of centralism and a whole new conception of the reciprocal relations of the organization to the struggle."

On p. 290 she accuses Lenin of ~~making~~ making "a mechanistic transfer of the organizational principle (?) of the Blanquist movement of conspiratorial groups to the S.D. movement of the working masses."

P. 291 she quotes and opposes both Lenin's attacks ~~on~~ on intellectuals and his glorification of the "educational influence of the factory on the proletariat," whereupon (p. 292) she points to the class connections during the last decade:

3.

"In each case, they were the spontaneous products of the mass in action." She speaks there of both the 1896 Petersburg strike and the March 1901 Petersburg and Rostov-On-Don strikes as having arisen spontaneously, with the S.D. nowhere around. But they weren't exactly a party then either, and the whole point from those early circles to the Party was that they went in two ~~the~~ separate directions, the masses and the Party; ~~while~~ while the Marxism didn't take root, neither did the spontaneous activity of the masses result.....

P. 295 Russian S.D. stands on the eve of revolutionary struggles and to try to change

14276

On p. 289, appears really the essence of her argument where she takes Lenin's expression that the SD is "a Jacobin indissolubly connected with the organization of the class-conscious proletariat" and she devotes the next few pages to exposing Jacobinism and Blanquism: " *should be* "

"He (VII) forgets that this difference (class consciousness) implies a complete revision of the concept of organization, a whole new content for the concept of centralism, and a whole new conception of the reciprocal relations of the organization and the struggle and cannot possibly simply be dismissed as if class consciousness automatically meant opposition to Blanquism as "a conspiracy of a small minority." *she is not right*

Quite the contrary. The SD movement was the "first in the history of class societies which, in all its moments; in its entire course, reckons on independent, the organization and the direct action of the masses," *she is not right*

in history no one also introduced a conception, or a... that... could... be left...