

The specific 1882 Preface to the Russian edition of the Manifesto which was written when Marx had completed ^{three} years of his intensive studies of all the new work in anthropology ¹¹, has special relevance to us here and to Luxemburg's prolematic in the 1905 Russian Revolution and after. First it is necessary to ~~keep~~ keep in mind that the period in which he worked on the Etimological N^otebooks Marx had received a letter from Vera Zaslitch on the question of the possibility of a revolution in so backward a country as Russia, and whether the peasant commune could or could not be used to advance that ~~goal~~ goal. Marx had found it ~~easy~~ ^{not} easy to answer the question. There are no less than four different drafts of his answer, with the first, which remained unpublished for many years, being the most extensive and relevant, and with the last being brief. However, what ~~he~~ this led him to add to that 1882 preface was a prediction that ~~a~~ revolution could occur in Russia first if it "becomes the signal for proletarian revolution in the West," ^{.....}

Now, it is precisely this question which had ~~preoccupied~~ preoccupied the Russian revolutionaries, including of course Luxemburg, and ~~recurred~~ ¹⁹¹⁰ indeed, became the centerpiece of the/dispute with Kautsky on "Theory and Practice" and on the relationship ~~between~~ of "backward" Russia and "advanced" Germany. [Because, fundamentally, the failure of the 1905 revolution lay in the objective situation, it was all too easy to attribute the entire failure just to that, to the backwardness of the country, to the might of the Tsarist empire, that hubub of reaction and counter-revolution at home and abroad. Luxemburg balked, however, at trying to make that sound as if the Russian proletariat was backward.