

ALTERNATE BEGINNING FOR WQ

Today's WIM/ is proud of itself because, when they ~~raise~~ raise the question of Women's Liberation as an idea whose time has come ^{altogether} altogether too belatedly, considering the fact that it has, in fact, been around for centuries ^{they} stress that it's only in our time, however, where, at one and the ~~same~~ same time, it has raised altogether new questions, including ^{forbidden} the ~~sexual~~ sexuality and it is in our time, alone, that the total aspect of women's liberation is both ~~IXX~~ a world phenomenon and directed at the left and not only the right.

There is much truth in ~~IX~~ that contention. But not only does that avoid the history and achievement of women's liberation in revolution long before our time, but it avoids the central problem -- the question of theory, of philosophy, of revolution, and it thus disregards women as well, especially Rosa Luxemburg, who did not make ^{and independent} a category of ~~tthat~~ that, ^{political} that is to say, giving it a primacy "above"/revolution. ~~IXXIX~~

The WIM thus not merely left out of view the greatest woman ^{for} revolutionary theoretician but left out/itself a sense of historic achievement and present direction. It is for this reason, that I will now break the chronological order of the analysis of Luxemburg, and while beginning at the first sign of a difference of man/woman relationship in her own relationship with a colleague and lover, Jogiches, I will actually go up to World War I before returning to the ^{great} turning point in history -- the Russian Revolution -- in relations with the German Social Democracy leadership and in ~~analysis~~ analysis of the revolution, when all the tendencies in ~~EMEX~~

14760

Russia, and that includes Poland, Lithuania, Latvia.

The first sign of tension between Rosa and Jogiches is seen in the letter when she first moved to Germany. While neither of the parties were in any way conscious of the beginnings of a separation, much less that it was related to her new status as theoretician as well as presence in the great Social Democracy, all one has to do is contrast the first few letters when she speaks of lonesomeness and complains of lack of personal attention, with her letter of April 21, 1899, which reveals a quite different attitude, where she takes issue, even on the organizational question, which was his

14761

the question. Nothing could be further from the truth, whether the relationship concerns Jogiches ^{with her} ~~with her~~. What is of the essence -- and that does not play down the ~~question~~ question of either jealousy or need for a permanent relationship with a single person -- is the ~~real~~ objective situation. It is a fact that whereas when Luxemburg and Jogiches first met in Zurich ^{revolutionary} and became both/colleagues and lovers, Jogiches was the ^{party} more experienced revolutionary and the more mature in ~~the~~ ~~theoretical~~ questions. She started from the very beginning as greatly more interested in theory, journalism and oratory than in Party-building, though both were co-founders of the ^{first} ~~first~~ revolutionary of /Socialist Party in Poland. Nevertheless, the ~~weightier~~ weightier truth was that that in no way measured up to what the German Social Democracy was, when she became a leader, and wrote Reform or Revolution. She reveals all this to Jogiches, as ^{her} ~~her~~ most intimate confidante, and that in a political sense more even than a personal one. Surely, her articulation of what she intends to do with that pamphlet of what her concept of what needs to be done for the Party itself and her different estimation from Jogiches on the whole question of revolution, theory, originality, is evident not just in the personal differences that suddenly arise between them but in her view of her own role. Read this:

"I feel in a word, the need, as Heine would say, to 'say something great'. It is the form of writing that displeases me, I feel that within me there is maturing a completely new and original form which dispenses with the usual formulas and patterns and breaks them down and which will convince people -- naturally through force of mind and conviction and not just propaganda. I badly need to write in such a way as to act on people like a thunderclap, to grip them by the head -- not of course through declamation, but by the breadth of outlook the power of conviction, and the strong impressions that I make on them. But how, what, where? I don't know yet, but I tell you that I feel with utter certainty that something is there, that something will be born."

How can anyone, after such an expression, write of her as one who was interested only in tactics and, "made no pretense" to profound political thinking, much less bourgeoisify "dialectic as a career". Yet, that is what permeates most of the writing on Luxemburg by, I am sorry to say, the male biographers, whether that person devotes no less than 927 pages as did Gilbert Badia in Rosa Luxemburg: Journaliste, Polemiste, Revolutionnaire (Paris: Editions Socialies, 1975) or whether it is one who merely introduces her writings, like Dick Howard.²

What should concern women's liberationists if they are revolutionaries is not the difference in the relations between Luxemburg and Jogiches, though there is no reason at all to avoid them and in fact to see more with ~~more~~ hindsight than at the time it occurred, but to study Luxemburg's crucial contribution to the theory and practice of revolution and what from her experiences and theories are essential in working out a revolutionary theory for our own age. There is no

It is fantastic that even someone as objective as Nettl, the author of the most comprehensive biography of Luxemburg, ~~and~~ in the process of proving that Luxemburg built no system and though giving full credit to the originality of the theory of Accumulation of Capital should nevertheless, 1) entitle ~~one of~~ the chapters *in which* "Dialectic as a Career" as she first develops her theory against reform, and 2) end the book with (p.786) ...

2- A great deal more annoying in this down-playing of Luxemburg as a theoretician by male biographers who seem very much to have monopolized the field of "Luxemburgism" is the New Left, who certainly should have no pretense of theoretical originality, as the whole was very well summed up by Cohn-Bendit when he said theory could be picked up "en route". Yet here is Dick Howard with his Selecte ~~XX~~ Writings /...

convinced her that organization, far from ~~being~~ being administrative work was the outcome of revolutionary theory, revolutionary continuity, spontaneity of the masses. She was, indeed, to build her whole new theory of Mass Strike on this ~~elemental~~ elemental outburst. At the same time, being a courageous woman, it wasn't only that the General Strike was becoming not just economic but political, but that it was in fact the ~~prologue~~ prologue to revolution, itself. And it was the essence not just to write but to see that it get published and distributed. It was not out of the question for her to ~~make~~ ^{make} it clear ~~to~~ with gun in hand to ~~any~~ any publisher who refused ~~to~~ to print her statement that they had better print what she had written.

All this activity ~~was~~ certainly erased any ~~question~~ question of who was the superior in organization. Neither thought the revolution had been totally destroyed when they were imprisoned. She happened to ~~have~~ have been released earlier than Jogiches. When she came out of prison she proceeded directly to ~~the~~ Kuokola, Finland, to meet with the Bolsheviks -- Lenin, Zinoviev, -- for very intensive discussion of the revolution -- and they ~~did~~ ^{did}, indeed, see eye to eye on the revolution. And each proceeded to single out what they considered the greatest achievement and what would become ground for future revolutions. It was in these heady circumstances and company that she ~~created~~ ^{created} her concept of Mass Strike. ~~It~~ It was this period of her greatest achievements both in an actual revolution and a theory of revolution and new relations with the Bolsheviks (the Polish Party joined the Bolsheviks in 1906) ----- 14765

and Luxemburg, Clara Zetkin, Angela Balabanova, Alexandra Kollontai, not only met as part of the Congress. ~~XXXXXX~~
The 1910 to 1913 years, just when she broke with ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~
Kautsky and even left the party school for several intensive
campaigns on suffrage, she was definitely involved in
activities around women. As she expressed it to Louise
Kautsky in a letter Aug. 1911 (Letters to LK p. 164): "Are
you going to the Women's Conference? Just imagine, I have
become a feminist! I received a credential for the Congress... "
This reference to the International Women's Day Conference of
March 19, 1911, along with the speech on suffrage (Dick Howard)
and above all, her many letters ^{from ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ prison} to friends, most of them women,
give ~~XXXXXX~~ witness to this concern with ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ the "woman
question", whether or not she was conscious of it. The most
exciting of all -- and it's that which shows her wide reading
over many, many years* -- is in the letter to ^a Mathilda Wurm: (p. 662
Netti)

"I swear to you, let me once get out of prison and I shall
hunt and disperse your company of singing toads with trumpet,
whips and bloodhounds -- I wanted to say like Penthesilea, but
then by God you are no Achilles. Had enough of my New Year's
greeting? Then see to it that you remain a human being. To
be human is the main thing, and that means to be strong and
clear and of good cheer in spite and because of everything, for
tears are the preoccupation of weakness. To be human means
throwing ones' life 'one the scales of destiny' if need be..."

*
(see next page)

(1887)

* She was not quite 16 when she read Morgan's Ancient Society and the interest in ancient society and the role of women persisted /even though she was always subordinating it to revolution, ~~XXXXXXXX~~ ~~XXXX~~ ^{through the years} When she came to Switzerland ~~and~~ the discussion ~~was~~ ^{was} among socialists ~~was~~ both on Bebel's Woman and Socialism and Engels' Origin of the Family as well as great excitement over Ibsen's plays; especially Doll's House ~~XX~~ She had met Clara Zetkin at an international congress even before she landed in Germany in 1898. Though she adamantly refused to be circumscribed to women's work, it is clear from her letters on her very first lecture tour that she not only was well acquainted with all the writings on the Woman Question, but had very definite, clear ideas about it. Thus, in her letter to Jogiches she

There is no doubt that whether it was the revolution of 1905, which called for full social economic and political equality for women, or it was the suffrage campaign in 1911-12 in Germany, or it was literature, (she quotes Virginia Woolf...) or her own letters from prison, there is a great deal to learn from her on the woman question in which she seemed to be least interested. How foolish, therefore, to hear ~~XXX~~ a debate on the question that the reference to the Amazon queen, Pentheselia was not so much to the Greek legend as to the modern play by

What difference? Does anyone doubt that
both as literature -- and she was a great literary critic --
as history and legend above all character, courageous
liberator, that be it Pentheslea of the Greeks or the moderns
or the great mass socialist women -- and in the anti-war
movement in Germany they were the majority --

14768