

ALTERNATE BEGINNING FOR WQ

Today's WIM is proud of itself because, when they raise the question of Women's Liberation as an idea whose time has come 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 time, it has raised altogether new questions, including the forbidden sexuality and it is in our time, alone, that the total aspect of women's liberation is both a world phenomenon and directed at the left and not only the right.

There is much truth in 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 a category of that, <sup>and independent political</sup> that is to say, giving it a primacy "above"/revolution.

The WIM thus not merely left out of view the greatest woman revolutionary theoretician but left out <sup>for</sup> 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 <sup>great</sup> turning point in history -- the Russian Revolution -- in relations with the German Social Democracy leadership and in ~~analysis of the revolution~~ analysis of the revolution, when all the tendencies in ~~EMXX~~

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

the question. Nothing could be further from the truth, whether the relationship concerns Jogiches <sup>with her</sup> ~~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 <sup>revolutionary</sup> and became both/colleagues and lovers, Jogiches was the <sup>party</sup> more experienced revolutionary and the more mature in ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~ 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 <sup>first</sup> ~~first~~ ~~revolutionary~~ ~~of~~ ~~Socialist~~ Party in Poland. Nevertheless, the ~~weightier~~ ~~truth~~ ~~was~~ ~~that~~ ~~that~~ ~~in~~ ~~no~~ ~~way~~ ~~measured~~ ~~up~~ ~~to~~ ~~what~~ the German Social Democracy was, when she became a leader, and wrote the tremendous work Reform or Revolution. ~~As~~ ~~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.<sup>2</sup>

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, ~~in the process of proving~~ 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~~ 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~~ 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 ~~Writings~~ /...



1905-1906 Russian Revolution  
L. Be

more significant event for this purpose than the 1907 London Congress where her speeches paralleled and often were pitted against revolutionaries of equal stature from Plekhanov to Trotsky and from Martov to Lenin, ~~with some not-do-subtle male chauvinism by Plekhanov rearing its head directly and evasiveness from the subject of revolution, and what to do.~~ <sup>to what will turn when he</sup> ~~relationship to Jogiches, and no amount of "proof" of how Luxemburg and Jogiches acted as one can eliminate the fact that (1) they were separated; and (2) ~~XXXXXX~~ the break came about after they acted as one in an even more important objective event -- the revolution itself --; after the Polish party grew overnight from a mere 100 to 30,000; after they were imprisoned.~~ <sup>Here is what did happen.</sup>

Here is what did happen. Jogiches had gone to Poland at the outbreak of the Russian revolution, and was most active there. But evidently he was not encouraging Luxemburg to leave Germany. The German comrades, in turn, likewise were expressing the great danger she would encounter and as if that were not enough also stressing that those dangers would be especially harmful to her as woman. All of this led to Luxemburg getting on a train and telegraphing Jogiches not any questions but the mere statement ("I'm arriving 2 pm.....")

Once there, the whirlwind of activities was endless. There was nothing Luxemburg didn't do from writing to talking to participating in strikes, demonstrations, and organizational work. That is to say, the overnight growth of the Party further

14764

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~~ <sup>make</sup> 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 ~~met~~ <sup>did</sup>, 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~~ <sup>created</sup> 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 ~~XXXXXX~~  
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 <sup>from ~~XXXXXX~~ prison</sup> to friends, most of them women, give ~~XXXXXX~~ witness to this concern with ~~XXXXXX~~ 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 <sup>a</sup> Mathilda Wurm: (p. 662 Netli)

" 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)





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