

Section 9 of this article does have a reference to the Polish Social-democrats, referring back again to point 9 of the program which the Polish group rejected in 1903.

This Vol. includes ^{the} two most important articles on self-determination, one a critique of the Junius pamphlet, and the other called "A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism", which means VII included RL! The one on the Junius is especially important since he did not know it was RL, and did know it was anti-imperialism, and therefore did praise it but:

"The fallacy of this argument (vs. self-determination - rd) is obvious.

Of course the fundamental proposition of Marxian dialectics is that all boundaries in nature and society are conventional and mobile, that there is not a single phenomenon which cannot under certain conditions be transformed into its opposite. A national war can be transformed into an imperialist war and vice versa." (p 203.)

"In saying that class struggle is the best means of defense against invasion, Junius applied Marxian dialectics only half^{way}, taking one step on the right road and immediately deviating from it. Marxian dialectics calls for a concrete analysis of each ^{specific} historical situation... Civil war against the bourgeois is also a form of the class struggle... Evidently, Junius' error^R is due to two mistakes in reasoning... "

(rd - the two stages were "theory of stages", and "to outwit history".)

(p. 210, 211, 212)

(p. 297) " But ~~these~~ the very arguments which are correct from the particular position of Poland in the present epoch are obviously incorrect in the general form in which they are presented. Poland will always be a battlefield in the wars between Germany and Russia, as long as wars are waged; this is not an argument against greater political freedom (and consequently against political independence) in periods between wars."

(Engels to Kautsky, Sept. 12, 1882, p.399)

(Section 10 is then on the Irish rebellion, and by then he got his subject and is out of this world:

"Whoever calls such an uprising a "putsch" is either a hardened reactionary or a doctrinaire, hopelessly incapable of picturing to himself a social revolution as a living phenomenon... Whoever expects a "pure" social revolution will never live to see it. Such a person pays lip service to revolution without understanding what ~~is~~ revolution is." (p. 301) Also quote p. 302.

The similarity in two articles "On the Right of Nations to Self-determination", written in 1914 but before the war, (included in VII SW Vol. 4, pp 249-293) Feb. 1914, and the article "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-determination" (theses March 1916) is confusing in the sense that all principles are the same, and ~~is~~ implicit is the criticism of RL, but there is nothing implicit in the one in Feb. 1914 which is totally and fully devoted precisely to RL's super-thesis (i.e. her most important theoretical work of 1908-09). Here Lenin takes issue with RL's attack on KK on the NQ and her lumping KK and Bauer in the same camp, but after that, it is fully and objectively vs. RL:

"She failed to notice this (rd- enormous exaggeration of the national aspect) connection. She did not weigh the totality of Bauer's theoretical views." (p. 252)

"Not only the miniature Balkan states, but even America in the 19th century, was economically a colony of Europe, as Marx pointed out in Capital ... Rosa Luxemburg has substituted the question of the economic independence of states for the question of political self-determination of nations ~~in~~ in bourgeois society, and of their independence as states." (p. 253)

"In reading over the instructive quotations from Marx and Engels, one can see with particular clarity in what a ridiculous position Rosa Luxemburg has placed herself. Eloquently and angrily, she preaches the need for a concrete historical analysis of the national question in various countries at various periods, but makes not the slightest attempt to determine through what historical stage in the development of capitalism Russia is passing through at the beginning of the twentieth century, what the peculiarities of the national question in this country are." (p. 257)