

where RL holds that good organization does not precede action <sup>2</sup> but is the product of it. His ft. 3 says that the whole crux of organization as process and spontaneity accusation against her all revolved around the Mass Strike pamphlet.

RL: "A rigid mechanical bureaucratic conception will only recognize struggle as the product of a certain level of organization. On the contrary, dialectical developments in real life create organization as a product of struggle."

On p. 506, he quotes again from that pamphlet, citing the Moscow December date as the high-point, precisely because "the internal logic of events transforms the mass strike into an open uprising ..."

On p. 509 he credits her with great Hegelian dialectic, which only shows that neither of them understood it. I think, however, that he has a very tantalizing point (p. 514) when he holds that her speeches in 1910 "were her German version of What Is To Be Done" and he quotes from What Next? where RL speaks "Any mass action once unleashed must move forward." The rest of the chapter is correctly centered on RL's prescience on imperialism and break with Kautsky.

*ed. What is to be done  
p. 514  
also 271, 272*

\*\*\*\*\*  
FROM THE LEGACY OF RL by Norman Geras

Geras is trying to show that whereas Lenin was right and RL was wrong on organization, and especially so in 1918, "This was not a 'mistake' . It was, as it turned out, a momentous contribution if only for a future revolutionary generation.. The Bolshevik Party could have used more such worries, as Luxemburg had voiced and a revolutionary of her caliber to fight for them." ( p. 192)

But whereas that is correct, if you are going to credit her with anticipating bureaucratization in Russia, I cannot

14441

*The point is - for today that is not sufficient  
it is not a  
my 2 Sp/1918  
Then write in Sol...  
with full on...  
2/1918*