

Copy #27

NOT TO BE DUPLICATED IN ANY FORM --
NOT FOR SALE OR FOR CIRCULATION

Raya Dunayevskaya

DRAFT OF CHAPTER III
for work-in-progress on Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation and
Marx's Philosophy of Revolution

LUXEMBURG'S INTER-REGNUM AND EXCURSUS INTO MARX'S NEW CONTINENT OF THOUGHT:
From the "National Question" (Before and During World War I) to Accumulation
of Capital

Whether Luxemburg's inter-regnum brought on by the 1910-11 break with Kautsky -- the feeling of isolation in the Party, the search for roots of imperialism and a theory as new as the phenomenon of imperialism -- did or did not make her turn back to her own origins as revolutionary -- internationalism vs. "nationalism" -- it is high time to confront the "Polish Question."

PART I --THE POLISH QUESTION

From her start in the Marxist movement, internationalism was Luxemburg's most distinctive revolutionary mark as she and Jogiches first emerged on the Polish exile scene in Zurich, broke with the Polish Socialist Party (PPS) and established a new Party, the Social Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland (SDKP). Though her adamant, unbending, stubborn, intransigent opposition to the "right of nations to self-determination" in general, and as it related to Poland, the country of her birth, in particular, flew in the face of Marx's position, she considered her stand the only true, proletarian, internationalist position. At her first appearance at a Social-Democratic Congress in 1896 the young woman lectured the experienced, orthodox leaders of the Second International, the direct inheritor-continuers of Marxism, that they knew nothing at all about the Polish Question; that the recognition of the PPS, who were no more than "nationalists", if not outright 'social patriots', was proof enough of that.

14800

The objective situation, she maintained, had totally changed since Marx's day, when there was hardly a proletarian movement, much less a revolutionary one. Now, however, there was a revolutionary Marxist movement both in Russia and in Poland. And Poland was not only economically integrated into the Tsarist empire, but was more advanced industrially than Russia itself. Over the next two years she continued work on her doctoral thesis, The Industrial Development of Poland, which was to prove the point. Though no one agreed with her position on self-determination, she did win recognition from the International for the SDKP as the official Marxist Party of Poland. Within four years, the Lithuanian Marxists joined with the SDKP, which thus became SDKPIL.

Luxemburg never let up on her opposition to self-determination of nations before or even during a revolution. When Jogichos, who had collaborated on the original thesis of opposition to the "National Question," felt it nevertheless inappropriate and untimely to show so clearly her opposition to Marx's position on the question at the outbreak of the 1905 Revolution in Poland, she answered: "The fear that I make too much play of our contradiction with Marx seems groundless. The whole thing should, in fact, be taken as a triumphant vindication of Marxism. Our clear 'revision' will impress our youngsters all the more...." She added a P.S.: "At worst, any impressions of direct disagreement with Marx could be altered with a little retouching."¹

Contrary to the belief of anti-Leninists who have written voluminously that the great divide between Luxemburg and Lenin centered on the organizational question, the exit of Luxemburg's adherents from the famous Russian Social-Democratic Congress occurred not on the organizational but on the National Question. It is true that she wrote against Lenin on the question of organization, but that was after the Congress, and, again, during the 1917 Revolution. (In a later chapter we will go into that in detail.) The point here is that, while

she walked out of the 1903 Congress, she joined the Party in 1906, though the famous "Point 9" of the Party program on self-determination remained exactly what it was when she walked out. Revolution was always the life force of her own activities, her principles, her writings. Revolution was the unifying force. Which didn't mean that she stopped her critical writing. Quite the contrary. In 1908-09 she worked out her most comprehensive statement in six lengthy articles which she entitled "The Problem of Nationality and Autonomy."

Just as some anti-Leninists try to make the organizational rather than the National Question the point of division between Lenin and Luxemburg, so others act as if Lenin did not "refute" Luxemburg's 1908-09 thesis.² In truth, one of Lenin's greatest contributions is precisely his work on the National Question before and after the war, as well as after he, himself, had power. Everyone from Marx and Engels to Kautsky and Bobel, to Plekhanov and Lenin -- absolutely everyone in the international Marxist movement outside of her own group -- opposed her position. Nothing, however, moved her from her opposition.

She began her most comprehensive thesis on the "nationality problem" by taking issue with the Russian stand ("Point 9" of the RSDIP program) "that all nationalities forming the state have the right to self-determination." She admitted that -- although "at first glance" it appeared as "a paraphrase of the old slogan of bourgeois nationalism put forth in all countries at all times: 'the right of nations to freedom and independence'" -- it was true that the Russian Social-Democracy was also for the class struggle and for revolution. Still, Luxemburg held forth triumphantly, "it gives no practical guideline to the day to day politics of the proletariat, nor any practical solution of nationality problems." (p. 109) Having reduced the Marxist principle of self-determination to hardly more than "bourgeois nationalism", since "practically" it offers nothing, Luxemburg now proceeded to put down that straw man. She concluded that self-deter-

mination was sheer "utopia" : under capitalism it is impossible of achievement, and why would anyone need it under socialism?

When Luxemburg took issue with Marx on the National Question, she raised the point only that it was outdated. The dispute was conducted as if it were merely a question of whether "orthodox" means you hold that Marx could never be wrong. But it wasn't a question of whether Marx could or couldn't be wrong, nor was it that the objective situation couldn't have changed. It was a question of dialectics, of the methodology in approaching opposites. Any question of dialectic methodology and the relationship of that to the dialectics of liberation, where it had been raised, had been judged "abstract" by Luxemburg. In Luxemburg's inter-regnum, too, as she searched for new theory to answer new "facts," dialectics of liberation entirely passed her by. Unfortunately, so did the new forces of revolution in the national struggle against imperialism.

Luxemburg could not have been in the dark about Marx's position which was expressed innumerable times in innumerable places, and she argued against it often enough. She may not have known, however, about the Feb. 7, 1882 letter Engels wrote to Kautsky³ on "Nationalism, Internationalism and the Polish Question." It bears special importance to us here because it was written just a few weeks after Engels collaborated with Marx on a new Preface to the Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto, dated Jan. 21, 1882. It has special relevance to the problematic of all discussions about the 1905 Revolution, not only as it was discussed while it was happening, 1905-17, but as it reappeared in the 1910 dispute with Karl Kautsky when the question was the relationship between "backward" Russia and "advanced" Germany. The 1882 Preface had predicted that a revolution could occur first in Russia and be successful if it "becomes" the signal for proletarian revolution in the West. Naturally, this added impetus to the whole question of Poland which was then part of the Russian Empire.

Here is how the letter of Engels to Kautsky read:

"Polish socialists who do not place the liberation of their country at the head of their program, appear to me as would German socialists who do not demand first and foremost repeal of the socialist law, freedom of the press, association, and assembly It is unimportant whether a reconstitution of Poland is possible before the next revolution. We have in no case the task to deter the Poles from their efforts to fight for the vital conditions of their future development, or to persuade them that national independence is a very secondary matter from the international point of view. On the contrary, independence is the basis of any common international action.... We, in particular, have no reason whatever to block their irrefutable striving for independence. In the first place, they have invented and applied in 1853 the method of fighting...; and secondly they were the only reliable and capable lieutenants in the Paris Commune."

It simply isn't true, as Luxemburg had argued, that the objective situation had changed so drastically since Marx's time that a new thesis was needed; that, in any case, there are "no absolutes" in Marxism. No doubt national self-determination wasn't "an absolute", but neither was it something limited to the 1840s or 1860s. Marx always had a global vision and the opposition to Russian Tsarism was that it was then the centerpoint of European reaction and that to have, as he put it in a letter to Engels about the Polish resistance, "20 million heroes between Europe and Asia", was not only a question of self-determination of the nation, but a question of revolutionary potential. He singled out their role in the Paris Commune.

In a word, to counterpose the class struggle, not to mention revolution, to "the National Question" as Marx analysed it, is to make an abstraction of the real and transform the reality into an abstraction. Not only did the objective situation in Luxemburg's time not change so drastically on the National Question from what it was in Marx's day, but self-determination as a revolutionary potential demanded a broadening of the very concept of a philosophy of revolution as a totality.

Luxemburg, however, continued to develop her differences both on the question of ideology and on the question of production:

"Any ideology is basically only a superstructure of the material and class conditions of a given epoch. However, at the same time, the ideology of each

epoch harks back to the ideological results of the preceding epoch, while on the other hand, it has its own logical development in a certain area. This is illustrated by the sciences as well as by religion, philosophy and art.... Because the modern capitalist culture is an heir to and continuator of earlier cultures, what develops is the continuity and monolithic quality of a national culture....

"Capitalism annihilated Polish independence, but at the same time created modern Polish national culture. This national culture is a product indispensable within the framework of bourgeois Poland: its existence and development are historical necessity, connected with the capitalistic development itself."
(Davis: pp.253-255)

What is ironic is that, without ever changing her "general" position that "national culture" was "indispensable" to the bourgeoisie, she insisted on the autonomy of the SDKPiL even after they "merged" with the Russian Social-Democracy.

The outbreak of World War I did not stop her opposition to self-determination. Rather, the shock of the betrayal of the Second International deepened her belief that internationalism and "nationalism", including the question of self-determination, were absolute opposites. She mobilized at once to fight the betrayal. Under the pseudonym of Junius, she produced the first great outcry against the betrayal. The Crisis of the Social Democracy ⁴ spoke most eloquently:

"The 'civilized world' which looked on calmly while this same imperialism consigned tens of thousands of Hereros to the most horrible destruction, and filled the Kalahari desert with the mad cries of those perishing of thirst and the death rattles of the dying; while in Putumayo, in ten years forty thousand human beings were martyred by a gang of European industrial robber barons, and the rest of a people beaten into cripples; while in China an ancient culture was offered up to all the abominations of destruction and anarchy, under the fire-brands and murders of the European soldier-rabble; while Persia helplessly suffocated in the ever-tightening noose of foreign despotism; while in Tripoli the Arabs were bowed to the yoke of capital with fire and sword, their culture and their dwellings alike razed to the ground -- this 'civilized world' has only today become aware that the bite of the imperialist beast is fatal, that its breath is infamy."

Nevertheless, the Fifth Thesis of the Junius pamphlet states:

"In the era of rampaging imperialism there can be no more national wars. National interests can serve only as a means of deception or betraying the working masses of the people to their deadly enemy, imperialism...."

"It is true that socialism recognizes for every people the right of independence and the freedom of independent control of its own destinies. But it is a veritable perversion of socialism to regard present-day capitalist society as the expression of this self-determination of nations."

Junius concludes: "So long as capitalist states exist, i.e. so long as imperialistic world policies determine and regulate the inner and the

outer life of a nation, there can be no 'national self-determination' either in war or in peace."

Great as the solidarity was that swept the revolutionary internationalists abroad -- Lenin included, of course -- when they got that anti-war pamphlet from Germany, Lenin (who did not know that Junius was Luxemburg) was shocked to read in the same pamphlet that opposition to national self-determination, which counter-posed to it "the class struggle." It was /the exact opposite of his own attitude, not because he always was for the right of nations to self-determination, but because, where previously it had just been principle, now he considered it a matter of the very life of the revolution as well, holding that the struggle for national self-determination would become the bacilli for a proletarian socialist revolution itself. He wrote:

"In saying that the class struggle is the best means of defense against invasion, Junius applies Marxist dialectics only halfway, taking one step on the right road and immediately deviating from it. Marxist dialectics call for a concrete analysis of each specific historical situation ... Civil war against the bourgeoisie is also a form of class struggle..." (p. 210)

"There is not the slightest doubt that the Dutch and Polish Marxists who are opposed to self-determination belong to the best revolutionary and internationalist elements in international Social-Democracy. How is it, then, that their theoretical reasoning is, as we have seen, just a mass of errors? Not a single correct general argument; nothing but 'Imperialist Economism!'" (p. 293)

"Imperialist economism" meant subordinating the new "Subject" -- the colonial masses who are sure to revolt -- to the overwhelming might of the imperialist land. For Lenin, the whole point, always and forever, so to speak, was that: "All national oppression calls forth the resistance of the broad masses of the people; and the resistance of a nationally oppressed population always tends towards national revolt." (p. 248) It became absolutely imperative to see the single dialectic in revolution and in thought when the Irish rebellion erupted. As he put it:

"The dialectics of history is such that small nations, powerless as an independent factor in the struggle against imperialism, play a part as one of the ferments, one of the bacilli which help the real power against imperialism to come on the scene, namely, the socialist proletariat." (p. 303)

That would have been exactly Luxemburg's point of view if the prole-

tariat was the mass involved; that, precisely, was what she meant by spontaneity. But having judged national self-determination to be "bourgeois"; having seen the great suffering of the colonial masses but not the dialectic of their creativity, she didn't change her old position. As it happens, Ireland had been the country she used as "proof" for opposing national self-determination, and even before the Easter Rebellion, when Lenin thought that it was only because Luxemburg didn't know Marx's position on the independence of Ireland, he considered her attitude one of "amusing boldness" as he repeated her contrast between herself as "practical" and those favoring national self-determination as "utopian." He wrote: "While declaring the independence of Poland to be a utopia and repeating it ad nauseam, Rosa Luxemburg exclaims ironically: why not raise the demand for the independence of Ireland? It is obvious that the 'practical' Rosa Luxemburg is unaware of Karl Marx's attitude to the question of the independence of Ireland." 6

Now that it was not a question of knowing or not knowing Marx's position but of needing to confront the imperialist war and the colonial masses revolting, he struck out against all, especially the Bolsheviks, who opposed national self-determination, calling their position nothing short of "imperialist economism."

Luxemburg's admirers, adherents and non-adherents alike, are at so great a loss for a rational explanation of her position on the "National Question" that it has been attributed to everything from "factional origins" (she had emerged as a Marxist internationalist revolutionary in the struggle against the Polish Socialist Party's "Nationalism") to very nearly calling her position "insanity." "There is no other word for it," wrote George Lichtheim, asking his readers "to pause here. The subject is loaded with passion. It was the central issue of Rosa Luxemburg's political life ... It was the one issue on which she stood ready to break with her closest associates and to fly in the face of every authority, including that of Marx. Poland was dead! It could never be revived! Talk of a Polish nation, of an independent Poland, was not only political and economic lunacy; it was a distraction from the class struggle, a betrayal of Socialism! One thing only counted: fidelity to proletarian internationalism as she understood it (and

as Marx, poor man, had plainly not understood it). On this point, and on this alone, she was intractable One of the strangest aberrations ever to possess a major political intellect."⁷

The birth of the Third World in our era has made it easy not to fall into any trap of counterposing "internationalism" and "nationalism", as if they at all times were irreconcilable absolutes. In the hands of a revolutionary like Frantz Fanon, the dialectic relationship of the two has been beautifully developed by him in expressing the idea, even of an absolute, as if it were a fighting slogan. In "Pitfalls of National Consciousness" he wrote:

"History teaches us clearly that the battle against colonialism does not run straight along the lines of nationalism ... National consciousness which is not nationalism is the only thing that will give us an international dimension. ... The natives' challenge to the colonial world is not a rational confrontation of points of view. It is not a treatise on the universal, but the untidy affirmation of an original idea propounded as an absolute.... For Europe, for ourselves and for humanity, ... we must work out new concepts and try to set afoot a new man." ⁸

Even if we do not go out of the historic framework of Rosa Luxemburg's time there is no need to stoop to psychologizing. All we need to do is take a deeper look at Marx's new continent of thought not limited to the National Question, much less Poland.

PART II -- EXCURSUS INTO MARX'S PHILOSOPHY OF REVOLUTION!

In an essay on "The Progress and Stagnation of Marxism"⁹ Luxemburg took issue with critics who called Marx's writings outdated, holding instead that "our needs are not yet adequate for utilization of Marx's ideas." Luxemburg was right when she related what is remembered and what is forgotten of Marx's writings to the specific stage of class struggle and what Marxists judged to be "practical," useful for that stage.

She was wrong, however, when she wrote:

"Though that theory is an incomparable instrument of intellectual culture, it remains unused because, while it is inapplicable to bourgeois class culture, it greatly transcends the needs of the working class in the matter of weapons for the daily struggle. Not until the working class has been liberated from its

present conditions of existence will the Marxist method of research be socialized in conjunction with other means of production, so that it can be fully utilized for the benefit of humanity-at-large, and so that it can be developed to the full measure of its functional capacity."

This judging of Marx's new continent of thought as just "a weapon in the class struggle," "a method of research," and "an instrument of intellectual culture," needed by the "party of practical fighters," as if all that was needed was practice, practice, practice, was the near-fatal error of all Marxists after the death of Marx. To grasp it at its root rather than as if it were just characteristic either of Luxemburg or Germany in the early 20th century, we better begin at the beginning, directly with Marx's closest collaborator, without whom we would not have had either Volumes II or III of Capital -- Friedrich Engels.

Here is a Marxist who did not, at least not when he spoke of Marxism in general and not in specifics, delimit Marx's contribution to "method of research." Here is Marx's closest collaborator, who could be considered, in some fundamental respects, a co-founder of Historical Materialism. He was certainly the most devoted and consciously tried only to follow Marx's bequests.

Moreover, Engels was modest enough not to allow the Movement to behave as if he were Marx. He not only stressed that Marx was "genius" while the rest were at best "talented"; he correctly maintained that though Marx and he were moving in the same direction independently of each other -- pointing to his own writings both on political economy and Conditions of the Working Class in England -- nevertheless, as he put it in the 1888 Preface to the Communist Manifesto, he considered himself "bound to state that the fundamental proposition which forms its (the Manifesto's) nucleus belongs to Marx" and that, in fact, Marx had worked this out in almost as clear terms as Engels was then (1888) presenting it, "some years before 1845." In a word, Engels is saying that the new continent of thought was discovered by Marx as early as 1843 when he first broke with bourgeois society; that all the development for all decades since was but an extension of "the nucleus" of all we identify with Marxism -- from Historical Materialism and the economic laws of capitalism

to the Marxian dialectic of the class struggle and revolution, with its global dimension both of the downfall of capitalism and the creation of a new class-less society.

And yet, and yet, and yet.... First came Engels' own work, The Origin of the Family, which he considered the fulfilling of a bequest of Marx. Then, after the publication of Vol. II of Capital in 1885, came a new introduction to the 1888 English edition of the Communist Manifesto, in which he took the liberty of footnoting the historic, majestic first sentence -- "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles" -- by adding the words: "That is, all written history." Engels went on to explain, in a long digression, the "discoveries" of the pre-history which had "first then" become known and recommended The Origin of the Family to all readers.

Thus Engels muted the dialectical flow of the challenge to all Marx held to be the "pre-history" of humanity, whose true development would first unfold after the overthrow of capitalism. It isn't that Engels didn't know that Marx saw no need to change anything in the historic text of the Manifesto when a new Russian edition was published in 1882, at a time when he had already read the new discoveries about primitive society. Engels himself stressed the fact that Marx had tried to convince him to read Morgan's Ancient Society. In a letter to Kautsky on Feb. 16, 1884, he wrote: "Marx spoke about it but my head was full of other things at the time, and he never returned to it. This must have suited him as he wanted to introduce the book among the Germans himself, as I see from the quite extensive extracts he made."

It is true that Engels did think he was carrying out a "bequest" of Marx in writing The Origin of the Family. It is also true that his enthusiasm in discovering Marx's Notebook on Morgan, which led him to get his own copy of Morgan's Ancient Society, and which inspired him to write the book, made him believe that he was expressing Marx's views in a coherent form rather than the polyglot marginalia

Marx was using for himself alone as he was excerpting Morgan. But Engels was not Marx, as he, himself, was the first to admit, and The Origin of the Family was his version, in which the select quotations from Marx gave the impression that he was reproducing Marx's "Abstract."

Far from that being true, we now know that not only is the "Abstract" -- that is to say, Marx's actual Notebook on Morgan -- 148 pages long, but also that it is not the whole of Marx's Notebooks on anthropology. The whole is 254 pages -- and even that is not the whole.¹⁰

It is not just a question of knowing or not knowing those 1880-1882 Ethnological Notebooks which were first published in the 1970s when Women's Liberation first became the Idea whose time had come. While it's true that Luxemburg knew nothing of this, nor for that matter of the now famous 1844 Economic Philosophic Manuscripts -- she believed that she had seen all of Marx's writings when Mehring published some of his early essays¹¹ and Kautsky published Marx's Theories of Surplus Value -- that is not what is at issue. What is at issue is that the problematic of the 1905-07 Russian Revolution and the 1910-11 dispute on theory and practice, and Morocco, and imperialism, is the same, and should have compelled Luxemburg to dig deeper into Marx's philosophy of revolution rather than just new facts. What is also at issue is: Why has it taken 100 years to publish Marx's works? More important still, why did it need nothing short of a series of revolutions to publish what we now do have?¹²

The 1844 Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts were not published until after the Russian Revolution. The 1857-58 Grundrisse was not published until after the Chinese Revolution. Unfortunately, Women's Liberationists of the mid-1960s to mid-1970s exercised no revolutionary prod to wrest Marx's notes on anthropology from the Archives, much less dialectically work out, on that ground, all the new from the ongoing Movement. Quite the contrary. The Women's Liberation Movement, which had helped create a new interest in Engels' The Origin of the Family, Private

Property and the State, only served to provide new loopholes for Marxists, "orthodox" and so-called independent alike, to rush in and try to have that work be the ground, the direction the Movement would take.

Though there had always been a Party, and, indeed, an International (the Second) that laid claim to the heritage of Marx, the truth is that it took the Russian Revolution of November, 1917 to prod even Marxist scholars to discover the now-famous 1844 Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts. And once the early workers' state became transformed into its opposite -- a state-capitalist society -- these continued to gather dust until the 1956 Hungarian Revolution brought them onto the historic stage.

To bring about a serious study of the next unpublished work, the Grundrisse 13, in the 1950s, it took nothing short of the Chinese Revolution of 1949. It took still another decade before even the single most discussed chapter of that work -- "Forms Which Precede Capitalist Production" -- was published in English as Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations. Because, however, the discussion was focused mainly on feudalism, or rather, the transition from feudalism to capitalism, many lacunae gaped open as to its relationship to Engels' The Origin of the Family, with all Marxists, Eric Hobsbawm included, claiming: "This was a work which Marx wanted to write, and for which he had prepared voluminous notes, on which Engels based himself so far as possible."¹⁴ As for the Ethnological Notebooks, there still has been no serious grappling with them on the part of Marxists.

Luxemburg's disgust with the "orthodox" GSD leadership did not extend to a perception of how total was the lack of comprehension of Marx's philosophy of revolution that would extend far beyond any single question, be it on "nationalism" or the "Morocco Incident". Her profound sensing of the opportunism within the German Social-Democracy, which led to the 1910-11 break with Kautsky was not made into the kind of universal that would get others "to follow", that is, get others to realize that there had been a diversion from Marx, not just on tactical grounds;

that the course needs to be reversed to reconnect with Marx's philosophy, that is, actuality of revolution. And make that the solid ground of the new, new, totally new. But to feel the presence of something totally new that was the absolute opposite of imperialism required not only economic and political analyses, but live subjects that are creatively struggling, instead of just suffering and therefore can become what Lenin called the "bacilli of proletarian socialist revolution."

There is but one dialectic conceptual framework, an indivisible whole which does not divide economics and politics from Subject; masses in motion -- a living, feeling, thinking, acting whole. Which is why, in Marx's new continent of thought, history wasn't just "economic periods" but masses making history. Because a single dialectic course determines the objective and the subjective forces, the dialectic of Marx's philosophy of revolution is what allowed Marx's theory of history to transform historic narrative into historic Reason.¹⁵ It is this which eluded Luxemburg in her inter-regnum.

The passion that had moved Luxemburg -- reality vs. "orthodox" theory -- resulted in her most serious theoretical work; Accumulation of Capital (which she subtitled: A Contribution to the Economic Interpretation of Imperialism) turned out to be not so much a critique of Karl Kautsky as of Karl Marx. This became even more pronounced as she sat in jail during World War I and the criticisms of her work kept pouring out by revolutionaries as well as by reformists. In her private letters, as she was working on her rejoinder, Anti-Critique, or What the Epigones Have Done to Marxist Theory, she was taking issue with Marx's "style", which by now she designated as "rococco."

* * *

FOOTNOTES

- 1- See her letter to Jogiches of May 7, 1905. Roza Luksemburg: Listy do Leona Jogichesa-Tyszki, Vol.2 (1900-1905) (Warsaw: Ksiazka i Wiedza, 1968).
- 2- See The National Question: Selected Writings by Rosa Luxemburg, Edited and with an Introduction by Horace B. Davis (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1976), p. 9, "The Problem of Nationality and Autonomy", translated as "The National Question and Autonomy", is included in this work, along with other fundamental writings by Luxemburg on the National Question. It isn't that the U.S. is so "backward" on theoretical questions that we did not get an English translation of Luxemburg's 1908 work until 1976. Rather, it is that this fundamental work by Luxemburg so flew in the face of reality that it didn't evoke translations into other languages. As Lenin once put it: "No Russian Marxist ever thought of blaming the Poles..." Russians must continue to be for their independence."
- 3- It was first published by Moscow in 1933 in Briefe an A. Bebel, W. Leibknecht, K. Kautsky und Andere. It has been translated among the articles included in The Russian Menace to Europe, a collection of articles by Karl Marx and F. Engels, selected and edited by Paul W. Blackstock and Bert F. Hoselitz (Illinois: The Free Press, 1952), pp. 116-120.
- 4- This pamphlet is universally known as the Junius pamphlet, from the signature Luxemburg used. The quotation which follows is translated from Gesammelte Werke, Band 4 (Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1974), p. 161. The reproduction of this pamphlet in Mary-Alice Waters' Rosa Luxemburg Speaks (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1970) contains a most fantastic error in referring to the Hereros doomed to destruction as "tens of thousands of heroes..." (p. 326).
- 5- The quotations which follow are from V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 19. (New York: International Publishers, 1942). Paginations in the text refer to this edition. In his article on the pamphlet by Junius, Lenin writes, with great feeling: "Junius' pamphlet conjures up in our mind the picture of a lone man who has no comrades in an illegal organization accustomed to thinking out revo-

lutionary slogans to their conclusion and systematically educating the masses in their spirit."

- 6- V.I. Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 274.
- 7- See George Lichtheim's review of Nettl's biography of Rosa Luxemburg in Encounter, June 1966.
- 8- Frantz Fanon, Wretched of the Earth (New York: Grove Press, 1968).
- 9- This essay was originally published in Vorwarts, March 14, 1903. The quotation used here was translated from Gesammelte Werke, Band I, pp. 363-368.
- 10- In 1972, Marx's Notebooks, under the title, The Ethnological Notebooks of Karl Marx (Van Gorcum, Assen, 1972) were finally transcribed by Lawrence Krader, painstakingly footnoted and with quite a profound, 90 page Introduction. It is necessary to emphasize the word, transcribed. It is not a translation. The Notebooks were written by Marx in English but include many phrases and full sentences in French, German, Latin and Greek.
- 11- Luxemburg's review of Franz Mehring's From the Legacy of Our Masters is in Gesammelte Werke, Band I, pp. 130-141.
- 12- Not all have been brought out even now! There is no dearth of scholars who are happy to jump at such an excuse in order not to grapple seriously with that which is available, especially on Capital. See Ernest Mandel's Introduction to the Pelican edition of Vol. I of Karl Marx's Capital, p. 29 and again p. 944. And see my critique of Mandel, "Today's Epigones Who Try to Truncate Marx's Capital," in Marx's Capital and Today's Global Crisis (News & Letters, 1978).
- 13- The Grundrisse was not published in full in English until 1973, when the Pelican Marx Library published it in London.
- 14- Karl Marx, Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations, with an Introduction by Eric J. Hobsbawm (International Publishers, 1965), p.51, fn. 2. There is no indication anywhere that Hobsbawm had seen these "voluminous notes" which dealt with Morgan, Phear, Maine and Lubbock.
- 15- The great economist, Joseph A. Schumpeter, who far preferred economics to philosophy and was especially hostile to Hegelian-Marxian dialectics, nevertheless

caught in Marx not only that indivisible whole which he called Marx's "conceptual schema" but wrote a profound analysis of the Communist Manifesto on its 100th anniversary: "The Communist Manifesto in Sociology and Economics", in Journal of Political Economy, No. 57, June 1949, pp. 199-212. It was he who, in his last, massive and yet unfinished 500-page History of Economic Analysis, used the expression, "transformation of historic narrative into historic reason."

FURTHER RANDOM NOTES ON CHAPTER 3

I'm still at a complete loss as to how to interconnect the 3 critical aspects -- WL, NQ and the inter-regnum in general -- with M&R's philosophy of rev'n as seen in his last year 1880-1883.

Take the question of 1881 insofar as the Preface of the Russian edition of CM is concerned. That is really a question of permanent revolution. and that really should have been connected to the 1905 chapter except I would have been criticizing what wasn't relevant to the participants in 1907, didn't in fact live for anyone, I believe, even in 1917, at least not explicitly. It did very much live for all the revolutionaries in 1917, as if it came to them originally out of the blue, and out of an objective crisis.

And yet I had wanted to call that chapter "interregnum and Marx's concept of permanent revolution. That is to say, I was going to hang everything on permanent revolution as that total uprooting which Marx had always and which would answer every question, including WL. But that also didn't work out because it was clear that I was then giving my interpretation and skipping over RL's problems as well as what was demanded the specific years 1911-1913.

When, therefore, I changed it to being the year rather than the concept of permanent revolution, WL did appear more relevant both to RLs problem and to Marx's EN.

Whereupon, the troubles first started on a new level i.e. the National Q_uestion. RL is totally wrong on that, that it would make it almost impossible to say one complimentary word other than on internationalism. And, moreover, it wasn't the subject that preoccupied her in that period. THEREIN IS THE RUB. She doesn't think that that's her problem. She is on to something entirely new that no one else has the slightest idea of either its urgency or its relationship to Accumulation of Capital. She is so preoccupied with "ROOT CAUSE" of imperialism as "pure science" that it never enters her mind that if she's going to be discussing imperialism, its total opposite is not the "old" proletariat in the home country but the masses, non-proletarian masses, in the non-capitalism countries. All of that may not be hard for me to "expose" in the following chapter on her work BUT THE POINT IS THAT NOW i.e. INTERREGNUM, I HAVE TO SHOW THE DIALECTIC AS THE DRIVE FOR HER TO GET OFF THE DEEP END BUT NOT SHOW THE DEEP END.

Now, then, it does remain a fact, no matter what consciousness or non-consciousness is involved that it is precisely those 3 subjects which do constitute inter-regnum. That is to say, having just lost out in the party on the question of the Mass Strike, which ~~XXXXXXXX~~ ^{even when so important a fact as} was reduced to a Morocco question of "indiscretion" and "indiscipline" and that in an atmosphere of disgusting male chauvinism, which she had

14818

let them "get away with" by sticking only to the supposedly objective subjects. The ~~isolation~~ isolation within the party and the contradictions of, on the one hand, being way in advance in catching Kautsky's opportunism, and on the other hand, doing nothing about it, but sinking into the isolation -- and here she is teaching at the school which she credits completely with the impulse to write an answer to someone's questions -- when nevertheless all component parts of the drive to get out of the present state to meet the challenge of what is in the wings that others aren't conscious of, and therefore digging in deep into theory. That it resulted in something she did not expect makes it all the more urgent for us to go into the depth of what was, of the "facts" -- the new reality when you're thinking unfortunately of so-called "pure science" instead of philosophic rudder. And here we do have the great advantage of ~~the~~ the writings in Marx's final years. Hence, we will begin with that...