

Trotsky's New Book Re-arms the Bourgeoisie

BY SAM DARCY

(Continued from Last Issue)

In 1910 Lenin pointed out that "Trotsky's fundamental error... is the lack of smallest thought about the question of transition from this (the bourgeois) revolution to a socialist revolution."

Trotsky was always anxious to establish that it was his conception and not Lenin's which guided the Russian Revolution to victory. He declares in his book:

"Here it is necessary to remember that up to the outbreak of the February Revolution and for a time after, Trotskyism did not mean the idea that it was impossible to build Socialist society within the national boundaries of Russia. Trotskyism meant the idea that the Russian proletariat might win power in advance of the western proletariat and that in that case it could not confine itself within the limits of a democratic dictatorship but would be compelled to undertake the initial socialist measures. It is not surprising then that the April thesis of Lenin were condemned as Trotskyist."

TROTSKY RE-ARMS THE BOURGEOISIE

Thus, according to Trotsky, Lenin in his famous thesis of April 1917 surrendered Leninism and went over to Trotskyism. He calls this the "Rearming of Bolshevism." This piffle is not the re-arming of Bolshevism, but the re-arming of the Bourgeoisie against the rising tide of Communism. Trotsky is a liar. Because as a matter of fact Trotsky wrote in his pamphlet "Our Revolution," published in 1904.

"But how far can the socialist policy of the working class go under the economic conditions of Russia? One can say one thing with certainty: it will meet rather encounter political hindrances than be supported by the technical backwardness of the country. Without direct state support of the European proletariat the working class of Russia will not be able to maintain power and transfer their temporary rule into a long enduring socialist dictatorship. One cannot doubt this for a moment."

Here Trotsky clearly says that the victorious proletarian dictatorship cannot endure without "state support of the European proletariat" with their revolution first. It is on this fallacious basis, this complete lack of understanding of Leninism, that Trotsky built his theory. His explanation in his present book that Trotskyism meant that if the Russian proletariat might win power in advance of the Western proletariat... it could not confine itself within the limits of democratic dictatorship but would be compelled to undertake the initial Socialist measures," is an attempt to twist his anti-Leninist theories so as to give them a more palatable covering. The quotations cited above show his obvious misrepresentation.

LENIN ADOPTED TROTSKYISM TOO LATE, SAYS TROTSKY

He goes further. He declares in effect that what saved the Russian revolution was that Lenin adopted Trotskyism in 1917 but he condemns Lenin for not having adopt-

ed Trotskyism earlier. He says:

"Lenin himself, to be sure, did not replace the formula of democratic dictatorship by any other formula, even conditional or hypothetical, until the very beginning of the February revolution. Was he correct in this? We think not."

In the conclusion of his book he declares in summary:

"In the first pages of this work we tried to show how deeply the October revolution was rooted in the social relations of Russia. Our analysis, far from having been accommodated ex post facto to the achieved events, was on the contrary made by us long before the revolution—indeed before its prologue of 1905."

You see, Lenin was always wrong. Trotsky was right since 1905, all through the succeeding years, and Lenin became the leader of the Russian revolution only because he adopted Trotskyism even though belatedly!

In this whole work of lies and misrepresentations, Trotsky tries to replace Lenin and show that Lenin's greatness was really borrowed from Trotskyism.

CAN TROTSKY DISCOVER THINGS

He also tries to prove that within the Bolshevik Party there was a right wing headed by Stalin, Kamener and Zinoviev, and there was a left wing, namely, Trotsky. And between these two wings Lenin had to choose, and of course, as we have already shown above, he chose Trotsky!

Concerning the period following the February revolution, Trotsky declares:

"But in just those hours when Lenin was trying to communicate the tensivity of his will to Petrograd across smoking Europe, Kamenev with the co-operation of Stalin was turning sharply toward social patriotism."

WHO IS A SOCIAL PATRIOT?

Now Trotsky thunders forth in the role of the defender of Lenin against Kamenev and Stalin, the social patriots! How perfectly ridiculous such a role for Trotsky is can be seen by Lenin's own position on the matter. On March 7, 1917, six weeks after the February Revolution, Lenin wrote concerning the proposals to make an alliance with Trotsky:

"In my opinion a matter of the greatest importance at the present juncture is not foolish attempts at a 'coming to an understanding' on the lines projected by Trotsky and Co. with the social patriots or with even the same dangerous element of the Organization Committee type (Menshevik) but to continue the work of our Party in a logical international spirit."

Thus what did Lenin think about the matter? Not that Kamenev and Stalin were turning towards social patriotism but that exactly Trotsky was responsible for such maneuvers.

In explaining the fact that Trotsky was the leader of the Russian Revolution and not Lenin or the Party of Lenin, Trotsky does not hesitate to stoop to the pettiest falsification in his book. He tries to convince the reader that beginning with the war up till the strug-

gle around October 1919, the Bolshevik Party collapsed. He used the complaints of various workers against individuals of the Central Committee to prove that there was no leadership, and he explains that the victory was achieved not under the leadership of a Leninist Party but purely because "ideas" of revolutionary action had been inculcated in the masses. This is Trotsky's slide-back to the old idea for which Lenin broke with him at the beginning of the century, which shows Trotsky's absolute misunderstanding of the role of a revolutionary party. He does not recognize that only a conscious, disciplined, Bolshevik Leninist Party can lead the masses to victory, and not vague "ideas" inculcated in the masses. There is no doubt but that every revolutionary action has a degree of spontaneous character, but to speak about the victory of a revolution based upon these spontaneous features is to deny the elementary Leninist theory concerning the need for a conscious, well-led, proletarian party.

AS HISTORY IS FALSIFIED BY TROTSKY

Trotsky explains this rejection of Leninism as follows:

"Up to the last hour these leaders thought that it was a question of a revolutionary manifestation, one among many, and not at all of an armed insurrection."

The principal leaders of the underground Bolshevik organization were at that time three men: the former workers Shliapnikov and Zolntzky and the former student Molotov.

"The underground organization of the Bolsheviks at the beginning of 1917 had not yet recovered from its oppressed and scattered condition, whereas in the masses the patriotic hysteria had been abruptly replaced by revolutionary indignation."

"In their aggression and self restraint, in the absence of leadership and in the face of opposition from above, was revealed a vitally well founded, although not always expressed, estimate of forces and a strategic calculation of their own."

So you see the Bolsheviks did not participate as leaders of the workers in the revolution at all. At least according to Trotsky! But how does Trotsky speak about his own organization with which he was connected for considerable time even after the February Revolution before he joined the Bolsheviks? Not with such belittling terms, but with the glowing tone enlarging upon the role played by this little group which, according to Lenin, was proposing alliances with social patriots. Trotsky says:

"The Mezhrayontzi, a social democratic organization close to the Bolsheviks, formulated this sore question with revolutionary audacity. 'In order that the aristocrats and officers shall not deceive you,' said their appeal to the soldiers, 'choose your own platoons, company and regiment commanders, accept only those officers whom you know to be friends of the people.'"

Thus, the Bolshevik Party had collapsed and not recovered but the Mezhrayontzi was speaking "with revolutionary audacity."

This scandalous falsification Trotsky needs in order to enlarge upon his own role as the leader of the handful of Mezhrayontzi so that he might belittle the role of the Bolshevik Party, the Party of Lenin as the leader of the Russian Revolution.

However, he had to explain away how it is that the Bolshevik Party has power and the Mezhrayontzi disappeared. For this he declares:

"On the 3rd of April Lenin arrived in Petrograd from abroad. Only from that moment does the Bolshevik Party begin to speak out loud, and what is more important, with its own voice."

The question here naturally arises, how is it that Lenin did not immediately align himself with the Mezhrayontzi who spoke with "revolutionary audacity" but instead, took it for granted that his place belonged to the Bolshevik ranks? This Trotsky fails to explain, leaving the implication that Lenin was some sort of an unprincipled character who aligned himself with an organization even though it had a wrong "social patriotic" position and disregarded the Mezhrayontzi, who were speaking with "revolutionary audacity."

TROTSKY ANTICIPATED LENIN, SAYS TROTSKY

In Trotsky's book there is an appendix with quotations from articles which he wrote in the *Novy Mir*, a New York paper in which he again reaffirms what had been previously written by the Russian editor of his work, a certain Lenzner, that Trotsky "anticipated" Lenin. A reading of these quotations is a sufficient answer to Trotsky's claims. They are vague, ambiguous and can be made to fit almost anything. And to try to use these words as an anticipation of Lenin is sheer nonsense.

TROTSKY QUOTES TROTSKY

With dramatic "revolutionary" flare, Trotsky quotes himself in various parts of the book, in one place where he deplores "and how far the March leadership of Kamenev and Stalin lagged behind the gigantic historic tasks." Comrade Stalin has long ago, showing Bolshevik integrity, acknowledged his error. He was amongst the first to go over to the side of Lenin, and Comrade Stalin never indulged in the cheap antics of Trotsky, pretending that his theories, not Lenin's led the Russian Revolution to success. But if Trotsky so deplores the temporary lagging behind of Comrade Stalin, how about himself, who for 13 years prior to 1917 not only lagged behind but openly fought the Bolshevik attempt to utilize these events for the revolutionary emancipation of the masses.

(Concluded in next issue.)

United Front Election Conference in Nevada

RENO, Nev., July 18.—A United Front Conference to prepare for the Nevada and national elections will meet in Fallon Nevada, July 23.

All farmers and workers organizations are urged to send delegates. The Communist Party must collect 2,500 signatures in order to be placed on the ballot.