

"... cause is the highest stage in which the concrete
Notion as beginning has an immediate existence in the
sphere of necessity, but it is not yet a subject..."
Hegel, Science of Logic, Vol. 2, p. 172

ROUGH DRAFT OF CHAPTER 5 - 7

SPONTANEITY, ORGANIZATION, PHILOSOPHY (DIALECTICS)

RL was so consistent throughout her life in her belief
in the Party, that even when she called the 2nd International
a "stinking corpse" she opposed the building of a 3rd Internat-
ional and ~~was~~ at the time she broke with Kautsky ~~over~~
nothing ~~but~~ short of the General Mass Strike, it appeared as
if it were only personal because she ~~was~~ not only did not
leave the Party, she did not create a ~~Left~~ ^{Left} which she only built in it
faction, and ~~USPD~~,
when she finally did in the outright revolution of 1918,
it ~~was~~ was the ~~CP~~ CP of Germany; in a word, it still
was "the Party."

And yet, not only was that point not stressed, it is hardly
even mentioned except when Marxists ^{her} do defend ^{as} not having
been a "total" spontaneist. What she is known for and rightly
(i.e. rightly if you understand the multifacetedness of her), ^{and complexity}
so, is for her ^{giving} ~~her~~ ^{priority} ~~very~~ ^{very} glorification--
and surely her ^{priority} to, spontaneity over ~~not only~~ Party
but also ~~her~~ leadership. And that remained true even when she did
in the Revolution not only create a ^{Communist} Party in Germany, but
consented to that which she had fought all her life, to a
unity of her Polish tendency with that of the Left PPS to
construct the C.P. of Poland.

How to explain so many contradictions ⁱⁿ which there
likewise exists a unifying force--the Party--and so tightly
a unifying force that unity, unity, unity, in the unfortunately
in the full Social Democratic concept, that she opposed splits
even at the point where there wasn't a single ~~point~~ point of
affinity between the tendency her thought represented and the
dominant tendency in the SPD,

14866

2.
It is the overriding concept of unity which has given so many false interpretations of what RL's concept of organization as well as concept of spontaneity truly was. Let's begin with her first and most famous and most mis-used--misused ^{article} ~~to~~ the point of ~~the "West"~~ not even allowing her to name the title of her article. ~~It was~~ The title she gave ~~was~~ "Organizational Questions of the Russian Social Democracy." The title the "West" gave it was "Leninism or Marxism?" ~~Since~~ the different historic periods likewise led to one-sided interpretations. Thus the ^{G.} S.D. before WWI were forever quoting and attacking both ~~her~~ her writings on spontaneity during the first Russian Revolution, specifically The Mass Strike pamphlet, while the post-WWII S.D., West or otherwise, were always stressing the 1904 ^{critiques} ~~of~~ of Lenin. In both cases 2 opposites that weren't genuine opposites to RL--democracy/dictatorship regarding the 1904 writings and 2 opposites--spontaneity/organization for 1906, were stretched out to ~~make~~ make her say what she did not say.

Thus, "The Organizational Questions of the Russian S.D." (The new translation ~~of~~ with the correct title appears in Dick ~~How~~ Howard, Selected Writings, pp. 283-306), was a critique not of What Is To Be Done?, which everyone including Nettl attributed it to* (Nora Geras but was a critique of Lenin's One Step Forward, Two Steps Back. Because of her disagreement with the Bolsheviks on the National Question, RL's tendency never attended that famous 1903 Congress. It was Lenin's critique of the behavior of the Mensheviks at that congress that she criticized. She was asked ^{for the article} ~~by~~ by Iskra ^{not} ~~the~~ Iskra that Lenin edited but the one appropriated by the Mensheviks at that 1903 congress even though they had been outvoted.

14867

She doesn't mention that fact, since as far as she was concerned, the S.D.P. of Russia was still one.

It is important to keep this in mind even as it is important to be as rigorous as she was in paying strict attention to the objective situation to the fact that Russia was indeed "a police state," that you truly had need for centralism, and that in fact it wasn't only the RSD but the GSD that practiced centralism as a principle.

What she objected to was what she called ^{Lenin's} "ultracentralism" (Lenin's denial that he was ultracentralist in his reply to her was never published; it was rejected by Kautsky and even in the Russian it was first published...)

to illuminate the differences and again to give due credit to the RSD wanting to establish a national organization. She stressed that it was indeed necessary to have done with the "circle and local club atmosphere" that had pervaded the Russian attempts to build a unified organization and required a full 3-year campaign, 1900-03, to prepare for that congress. "However," she continued, (p. 296) "at the party congress and even more so after, it became evident that centralism is a slogan which does not completely exhaust the historic content and the ... S.D. organization."

The criticism of RSD was, indeed, ^{implicitly} likewise a criticism of GSD. To sharpen that ~~same~~ aspect of her critique she made it clear that she did not think that ^{SDP} whose party is not as big as the German, it is in any way "underdeveloped; each Marxist party was, historically, equal."

She leveled her ~~most~~ severest attack on Lenin's formulation that a social democrat is "a Jacobin indissolubly connected with the organization of the class conscious proletariat." And it is at that point when she develops her opposition to Jacobinism and Blanquism in so detailed a form, that she left no room whatever for the concrete happenings of ~~the~~ (which was the preoccupation of Lenin) the congress, ~~which~~ which led to the split. / One could say that the minute she reached "history," her critique was so full of generalizations that ~~it was hard to~~ ^{it was hard to} see anything ~~concrete~~ concrete relating to the congress, and even ~~she~~ be inclined to over praise Lenin who stuck only to the concrete, and thus "proved" her wrong. Which with hindsight, absolutely is not true, that is to say, some of the generalizations are so very relevant to our day, that we must go into them.

For example, there is absolutely no doubt that ^{there is a need for ?} a great deal more of democracy, more need for different tendencies to express themselves, and surely it is imperative not to make a virtue of necessity, which leads ~~some~~ ^{one} living under Czarism to overstress the need for centralism to oppose it. Furthermore, whereas her expression, "No rigid formulae for organization will do to express Marx's conception of socialism," may have left elbow room for opportunism to ~~the~~ continue functioning in a Marxist organization, as witness the fact that ^{the} first expression to reformism, Bernstein, was not expelled, it is even truer that Lenin's concept of centralism ~~was not~~ had even more need of decentralization.

Where it seems to this writer that RL wrongly almost makes do with spontaneity if not sans organization, certainly without philosophy, is in her singling out the 1896 strike in St. Petersburg, ~~the student agitation of 1901 and the mass strike in Rostov-on-Don, as if their arising spontaneously had also meant that they had no need for a Marxist party.~~ The fact was that it was precisely these strikes and great spontaneous actions which led Lenin to ~~say~~ conclude that if Marxists are going to act only as economists, there will be ~~a gap~~ ^{between} the development of ~~political work~~ ^{an actual revolution.} ~~It was no accident~~ ^{at} that RL's hammering away ~~at~~ Lenin's supposed exaggeration of "factory discipline" which he insisted the intellectuals lacked, in turn led her to defend intellectuals.

~~Where she shone brilliantly was in the dialectical relationship~~ ^{of} spontaneity to organization:

"What is always important for Social Democracy is not to prophesy and to preconstruct a ready-made recipe for the future tasks. Rather, it is important that the correct historical evaluation of the forms of struggle corresponding to the given situation be continually maintained in the party, and that it understand the relativity of the given phase of the struggle, and the necessary advance of the revolutionary stages toward the ultimate goal of the proletarian class struggle."

While RL was absolutely correct in her emphasis that the Marxist movement was the "first in the history of class society which, in all its moments, in its entire course, reckons on the organization of the independent, direct action of the masses," she is not correct in holding that that very nearly automatically means ~~so~~ so total a conception of socialism that a philosophy of Marx's conception of revolution could be likewise left to spontaneous action. Far from it. And nowhere is this seen more clearly than when we get to the 1905 Revolution, where spontaneity ~~was~~ is absolutely the greatest, but fails to achieve its goal. The ~~question~~ question ~~of class consciousness~~ of class consciousness does not exhaust the question of cognition, of Marx's philosophy of revolution, of second negation, that is to say, not alone the destruction of the old, but the creation of the new, has still to be tested, and we cannot here skip from 1904 to 1917 and 1919. So within the context of that debate, it is sufficient to end where she ended;

Stress stressed the right of the working class "to make its own mistakes and to learn the historical dialectic by itself. Finally, we must frankly admit to ourselves that errors made by a truly revolutionary labor movement are historically infinitely more fruitful and more valuable than the infallibility of the best of all possible "central committees." (p. 306)

~~As we have seen in the chapter on the/General Strike,~~ 1906 pamphlet on the
 as well as the one on the 1910 split with Kautsky,
 RL's making a category of spontaneity was in the first
 case exactly in the same period as Lenin modifying his
 rigid concept ~~in~~ in What is to be Done? and stressing
 instead spontaneity. It wasn't merely the fact that she
 had written this in Kuokkala, but that the revolution itself
~~sharpened their views~~ sharpened their views
 historically, as well as actually. On the other hand,
 she was way ahead of Lenin in 1910 in judging the deep
 opportunism of Kautsky. ~~At the same time, however,~~
 At the same time, however, the inversion of the relationship
 between organization and action once again meant the disregard
 of philosophy. It is absolutely true as RL expressed it
 in "What Next?", that "any mass action," once unleashed,
 must move forward." It is not true that a forward movement
 by the masses cannot be reversed or stopped by a leadership
 which uses the ~~same~~ rhetoric of revolution but practices
counter-revolution. In a word, where RL saw the opportunism
 in Kautsky, she by no means expected outright betrayal
 and indeed did not ~~even~~ conceive that counter-revolution
 can arise from within revolution. It is that dialectic,
 that transformation into opposite, that Lenin, who had
 not seen as clearly as she the nature of German Soc. Democracy,
 left far beyond her once WWI showed the betrayal, in
~~demanding that the~~ issuing the slogan, "Turn the imperialist
 war into civil war," and in his criticism of even his
 on Bolsheviks ~~not pose~~ *the question of the conquest*
 power.

8.

Bertram D. Wolfe mistitled her work because ^{his title} ~~it~~ was more "attractive," and thus gave her 1904 critique so anti-Leninist a twist that he attributes to her a persistent anti-Leninism not only in 1904 but also in 1917.

Between 1904 and 1917 there was first and foremost nothing short of the Russian-Polish Revolution of 1905-07. So close were Lenin and Luxemburg in that period and directly after, both on revolution and organization, that the Polish Party actually joined the Russian Party. Moreover, though in 1906 when it joined there was also a joining of Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, it was by no means the ^{Men} ~~the~~ shheviks whom she related to. It was the vote of "the Poles" that helped Lenin get a majority at the 1907 ^{Russian} Congress. Theoretically, their interpretation of the Revolution extended beyond Russia and Poland. That same year, 1907, there was also the International Socialist Congress, where again Lenin and ~~KL~~ ^{lay,} (while Trotsky and Martov likewise associated ~~with the amendment~~ with the amendment, there is no doubt whatever where the closeness, theoretically and practically even to the point of specific formulations), ~~it was~~ Lenin and ~~KL~~ ~~gave the direction to the amendment on the anti-war drive.~~

(Interestingly enough, it was also at that congress that KL introduced Lenin to Zetkin--Zetkin was both a member of the International and the head of the ~~the~~ S. D. women's ~~conference~~ conference which also met during that period. The point was that Lenin's own reports of the Stuttgart congress were heavily and openly based on Zetkin's and her articles about that Congress in Einheit.)

By the time the disputes with Kautsky on her ~~side~~
 demand that her position on the general strike be applied
 to Germany 1910 reached a climax, ~~she~~ ^{they were} so absolutely at
 opposite ends that she broke with him completely. Bertram
 Wolfe has (as part of) his reasons for skipping all those world
 historic events, ~~which~~ not to mention betrayal on the
 part of the Social Democracy in World War I and RL's final
 break with that organization. In a word, when we come to her
 intransigent revolutionary anti-war stand, there is certainly
 not one whiff of affinity between her and the ~~German~~
 Social Democratic organization, ~~German~~ ^{German} or international,
 which she declares to be a "stinking corpse." And certainly
 there is again not a single grain of affinity between her
 critical position on the Russian Revolution and the Social
 Democratic position on the counter-revolution against it.
 She hailed that Revolution as the greatest world historic
 event which, even if it failed, would remain a beacon for all,
 and for which ^{failure} the German S.D. would bear the greatest respon-
 sibility.

What ~~was~~ then was her ~~criticism~~? We wish here
 to focus strictly on organization (later we will ~~deal~~ deal
 with the theoretical differences). The main point of
 difference organizationally--and in that she was certainly not only
 correct as against Lenin, but actually foresaw ~~it~~ what became
 the Stalinist degeneration--was ^{her demand for} greater democracy ~~and~~ not
 only for the masses but within the state and government,
 with a ^{multiplicity?} plurality of parties and tendencies.

She warned against making "a virtue of necessity", that is to say, ~~Marxists~~ Marxists must be careful that even when an absolute necessity, because ~~of~~ the counter-revolution ^{is} at the door, requires the curtailing of ~~any~~ freedom, ~~and~~ at no time should one give in to the temptation to make the temporary release into a general principle.

Surely ^{critical} her/contribution to the question of proletarian democracy and democracy within the Marxist party was of great merit and far outdistanced any of the Bolsheviks who were directly in the fray in foreseeing what was to become bureaucratization. But how can that possibly be made to have any affinity whatever with S.D.? How can that criticism which was definitely ^a technical type be raised to the level of her break with the International, her leadership of Spartakus, and above all, the leadership of the actual German revolution? *Then* ^{regarding} ~~one~~ one of the ~~very~~ very things she had criticized in Russia, i.e. the dismissal of the Constituent Assembly, she declared in the most unequivocal terms on the German scene that this type of assembly was a bourgeois institution to which she counterposed workers' democracy as ~~was~~ contained only in actual workers' councils, so that very nearly all of the main slogans of the Russian Revolution were exactly what she herself called for in what turned ~~out~~ out to be the last 2 months of her life.

No, what she criticized in 1904 and what she criticized in 1917 ~~cannot~~ bear very little resemblance to each other, either in principle or in tactic, either in theory or in practice, either ^{the different} in/historic periods or the different goals ~~in~~ 1905 and ~~in~~ 1917. ~~And~~ ^{her} greatest contribution, both in relationship to ~~the~~ rooting the concept of the party in spontaneity and internal democracy. 14875

was not without its own philosophic weakness.

Nor was her philosophic weakness limited to organization. When you rethink what the contradiction seems to be, the genuine genius in the prescience of catching imperialism before it was ever recognized or even seen by either bourgeois scholars or Marxists, when you recognize that back in 1899 soon after the Russo-Japanese War she was already sensing a global shift in powers and had not let go ~~in her critiques of the G.S.D. be it in not articulating~~ in her critiques of the G.S.D. be it ~~in not articulating~~ opposition to the ^{Japanese} ~~Russo~~ War in China or the Morocco Incident and being so aroused over the opportunism in not fighting the very ~~first~~ first sign of imperialism, that she made you literally listen, ~~you~~ hear the cries of the Herero women and children as they tried ^{to} escape the savagery of general Trotha and his army pursuing them; and when you see how deep her internationalism ^{as relates to race} that even when there was a world war and ~~Matilde Wurm~~ Matilde Wurm bemoaned the condition of the Jews she replied:

^{one would think} and yet she would have immediately singled out as Subject the colonial masses oppressed by imperialism as its grave-diggers;

"What do you want with this particular suffering of the Jews? The poor victims on the rubber plantations in Putamayo, the Negroes in Africa with whose bodies the Europeans play a game of catch, are just as near to me. Do you remember the words written on the work of the Great General Staff about Trotha's campaign in the Kalahari desert? 'and the death-rattles, the mad cries of those dying of thirst, faded away into the sublime silence of eternity.'

Oh, this 'sublime silence of eternity' in which so many screams have faded away unheard. It rings within me so strongly that I have no special corner of my heart reserved for the ghetto: I am at home, wherever in the world there are clouds, birds and human tears . . ."

She always was looking for root causes, ^{and} always speaking of class consciousness, and yet not jamming the two up against each other so that ~~they would~~ they would result in a new unity. Instead she let them lie side by side. We have seen ~~when Lenin argued against her position~~ when Lenin argued against her position on the "National Question" which she couldn't see as revolutionary in this imperialist war, he used the term "half-way dialectical." It came from his own ^{philosophic} reorganization during that war. ^{It is} the very period when ^{Lenin} ~~was~~, when approaching the Absolute Method in Absolute Idea, shows that ~~is~~ "when opposite determinations... come before consciousness without mutual contact ~~the object~~ (the object)--that is the essence of anti-dialectics."*

Lenin's point, as in this case Hegel's, was to show that only second negativity is the solution, because there is no ~~other~~ way to transcend "the opposition between Notion and Reality, and that unity ^{which} ~~is~~ the truth", except to see that they "rest upon this Subjectivity alone." In a word, the fact that only the proletariat, only the oppressed, only the Subject who is being oppressed, is the one for the overthrow, cannot possibly be kept apart from the objective situation which drives them in that direction.

Findler, p. 253: "The origin of the idea in the Notion of teleology throws ~~new~~ light on Hegel's philosophy. The ~~idea~~ idea does not explain things by their cause, or their underlying substance, or the whole of which they are parts: it explains by being the end towards which they must be thought of as tending."

p. 222: "We should be able to see what Hegel means by the 'Notion' by seeing how its concept developed out of the 3 concepts of substance, reciprocity, ~~and~~ necessity there 'swung over' into ^{causality and} ^{freedom."}

At the same time, (2) ~~the causal relationship~~ when the causal ~~relationship~~ relationship of theory is class consciousness, which is what makes materialism not mechanical and not just a matter of trade union goals, but class power, and live people therefore holding destiny in their own hands, there suddenly manifests itself root cause as purpose, which enables the intellectual to be there with the proletariat.

(3) On the other hand, causality is used to ~~get~~ rid of the leadership of its opportunism, parliamentarism and routine-like work to bring in the spontaneous action of the proletariat who would push the leadership forward. It is true she ~~again~~ uses the word revolution as the only answer to Kausky's "Strategy of Attrition" as sheerist opportunism to evade the actual ~~and~~ class actions of the general strike (which is both political and economic), but it stops short of subject.

(Work out the relationship to Lenin's remark that the end of teleology just before we enter the ^{Notion} says: "R.E. freedom equals subjectivity, on the threshold of the Idea ('or' goal, striving, R.E.).")

Dialectically speaking, why should a revolutionary stop at causality? A sort of one-to-one relationship is thereby explained, and one must get rid of explaining as if cause isn't but one moment and effect the ~~is~~ next; and since cause and effect interrelate in a way that at separate times RL did see as part of a totality, why should the totality have been so mechanical as not to see subject? Without subject there can be no total uprooting. Without subject revolutionary action is hardly more than contemplation, that is to say, you look at an object--in this case, imperialism--and say that it causes something else, i.e. impossibility otherwise of continued accumulation; inevitably then and even colonialism you go to markets/instead of subject. No wonder those objects don't move. The market can't produce its own negativity, but the subject could.

You never look at people, the exploited, except as suffering subjects, which is why they remain as if they are only objects. There is no duality, no deep contradiction. Instead RL shifts back to home and says long before this type of collapse will happen, the proletariat will

If, however, you look not just at the root cause but at new beginnings that will themselves determine the end, there would be no way to avoid subject.

(What has been unnoticed until this day is that early on, back in 1899, long before RL hit out against Marx for his ~~rococo~~ style even in the 1st volume, is that RL had always excluded vol. II from a consideration of the totality of Marx's economic views. Thus she wrote:

"The Marxist formula for crises as presented by Engels in Anti-Duehring and by Marx in the first and third volumes of Capital, applies to all crises only in the measure that it uncovers their

As we saw when we dealt with RL's inter-regnum, which led to ~~her~~ critique not so much of Kautsky as of Marx, it becomes ~~clear~~ clear that just as ~~her~~ Accumulation of Capital diverted from Marx's analysis, ^{but Lenin's did not,} so, ironically enough, on the question in which ^{and Lenin} RL seemed to be on totally opposite points--the Party--, both alike did not ~~integrate~~ integrate philosophy with organization; (1) Rosa, because she paid very little attention to philosophy, and (2) Lenin because ^{with} all the ~~attention~~ ^{profound} attention he gave philosophy to the extent even of reorganizing himself, as well as the nature of imperialism and the national question, ~~and~~ the national question and revolution, dialectics themselves, and the state, it nevertheless was not extended to the Party. Thus, ~~with~~ no one gave an answer, and we naturally cannot assume ~~that~~ after the event that if there had interpreted philosophy, there would have been the correct answer. We do, however, start with a clean slate; that is, nobody has the answer. Nevertheless, precisely because IM and IM alone had discovered a new continent of thought and had a philosophy of revolution ~~at~~ from the very start of his break from capitalism, he will also have the ground for a philosophic concept of organization, even if he had "no theory of organization," ^{though very briefly,} Let's review/what he did say in addition to the fact that the ~~proletariat~~ ^{proletariat} must have a party of its own, from which he never departed, be it 1848, 1871, 1875 or 1892. Where it became concretized/or broadened, as you wish, is in the ~~philosophic~~ philosophic conception. Thus, the 1848 Revolutions ended ~~with the need for an independent working class party but also~~ with ~~the need for an independent working class party but also~~ a philosophy of permanent revolution.

Thus, the Paris Commune had a new reason—"its own working existence". Thus, the Gotha Program was criticized mercilessly, comprehensively, theoretically, point by point, precisely because his position was that, whereas a movement is greater and more important than any set of programs, ~~but~~ if you cannot have ~~any~~ ~~un~~principled ground, then it is best not to unite ~~with~~ ~~it~~ to limit united action to specifics only, ~~not to unite with it~~ ~~also~~ also had yet a newer vision extending all the way a communist society where "working" would not just be a means to life, but the very first necessity of living." But otherwise, it meant that if there really is an end to the division between mental and manual work, then that is your life, that is to say, there is no division between life and science and thought, etc. He insisted that children, in play, actually labor and discover many things through breaking things. Finally, what is most exciting about his very last years is that in returning to the man/woman relationship which is traced through from gens, matrilineal society, to the savagery and retrogression in progressive capitalism when it comes to the position of women, he was critical also of primitive communism, insisting that it was not an outside force that overthrew it, but that it came from within through the development of chiefs, etc. Thus, above all else what was new was this: a backward country like Russia could have a revolution ~~from~~ the multilinear development of humanity, be it from primitive communism, or the Asiatic mode of production, or Western capitalism, proved that it is impossible to have but one answer to all the multitude of developments. On the contrary, before an advanced country ~~of~~ in new forces and relations including even the peasant commune made its revolution or

rather related its revolution to the technologically, industrially advanced nations, and if, ~~the~~ ^{with} the new countries like U.S.A., it had a global not a national view, and if....

Precisely because we have so many more new grounds for philosophy, even when it is only on the subject of organization, we better finally ~~learn~~ learn Marx's philosophy of revolution.

(NOTES TO MYSELF)

Check whether the question of party was taken up not only as relationship of spontaneity to organization but as leadership to mass, and as philosophy to organization, so that RL must answer what is meant by "pushing" the leadership forward.

Moreover, with RL making a special category of general strike as both political and economic, she still naturally sees that it must go to insurrection, then how could that be without subject?

The tragedy in Lenin is not only that he didn't reorganize on the question of the party, but that his great philosophic leap forward is not made available to the masses. Again, raise RL and party: she certainly wasn't as hostile to the peasantry as LI, and yet she is so opposed to the Bolsheviks' giving land to the peasantry, as if that meant immediate parcelling out the national land to private property.

Finally, the proof of error was not only that Spartakus should have been independent long before, but why the opposition to the timing of the 3rd International because it would be dominated by Russia?

Questions appended to Q.A.C.S.

SCIENCE OF LOGIC, pp. 377-8

"Causality according to natural laws is ~~not~~ not the only one from which all the phenomena of the world may be derived; it is necessary to assume another causality through freedom in order to explain them.

"The antithesis is: --There is no freedom, but everything in the world happens ~~solely~~ ^{natural} according to laws...."

"It is said that this proposition is self-contradictory because natural law consists just in this, that nothing happens without a cause sufficiently determined a priori, ~~and~~ which cause thus contains an absolute spontaneity; --that is, the assumption which is opposed to the thesis is contradictory because it contradicts the thesis.

"In order to prove the antithesis it has to be posited that there is a freedom as a particular kind of causality-- a freedom to initiate ~~and~~ state and hence also a series of consequences of ~~the~~ state." (It's the page in which Lenin calls attention to the fact that Hegel is talking against Kant.)

(Hegel says "because self-determination is applied to them only externally" (p. 391) or what we would call intellectual planning, they are only means to an end, not an end in themselves.)

Diff. Causality Freedom
Nature Mind

laws Nature is subj. to laws whereas Mind is free, i.e. self-determining.
The difference bet. *Th. 1 B.* the reflects diff. bet. Causality. Freedom 14883