

Trotsky's New Book Rearms the Bourgeoisie

By SAM DARCY

THE HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION. Volume 1. By Leon Trotsky. Published by Simon & Schuster. \$4.00.

In this epoch, the capitalist class must find new methods of struggle against Communism. The tactic of the frontal attack and open slander of the Communist Party is no longer as effective as it used to be, chiefly because of the fact that the working class by its day to day experiences is learning to distrust the capitalist class, its agents and its system and believe in the leadership of the Communist Party. The bosses therefore need a more insidious, insinuating method of combating Communism and in this, Trotsky's book has importance. It will undoubtedly provide a most effective weapon for every enemy of the Communist International and of the Soviet Union.

What! You Never Heard of the Revolutionary Malamuth?

The scene presented by this situation in the United States has of course some very comical effects; for example, what could be more laughable than the antics of a Professor Charles Malamuth of the University of California in Berkeley who rants against Stalin and the Communist International because it is not revolutionary enough according to Trotsky's criterion. From the barricades of bitter class struggle on the campus in Berkeley, Mr. Malamuth who poses as a spokesman for Trotsky, (and he undoubtedly is) writes on May 15th to the San Francisco Chronicle:

"Stalin and his obsequious aids have put the idea of world revolution in camphor and moth balls. Soviet politicians talk about it on state holidays, but whenever any earnest young Communist urges that it be put into practice he is promptly bundled off to prison or exile. There are more advocates of world revolution in Soviet jails than in American jails. So far, Russia looks like a malicious caricature of Socialism. Stalin is a great me-

diocrity. He was on the reviewing stand all the time during the May Day parade of last year, but he never said a word."

Is it not significant that this spokesman of Trotsky finds the columns of the "San Francisco Chronicle" open to him? The "San Francisco Chronicle" which headed the struggle against the attempt to release Mooney and Billings from the penitentiary.

The capitalist class cannot any longer fight the Communists by denouncing Communism and so they try more slimy methods, for example: "Communism is all right" but "Stalin is a great mediocrity." The conclusion is obvious that the workers should not follow the Party which Stalin heads, the Communist Party.

Trotskyism Sees No War Danger

Malamuth further says about the First Workers Republic:

"The people are kept on their toes by a series of war scares. They are told that the capitalist countries are ready to attack Soviet Russia. As far as I have been able to discover, capitalist countries cannot get together on a less momentous enterprise than a concerted attack on the Soviet Union."

This is less skillful, more open counter-revolution. In effect Malamuth says "Go to sleep workers; the capitalists couldn't possibly get together against the U. S. S. R., the war scare is only an excuse invented by Stalin to keep himself in power."

Is there anyone on the West Coast who witnessed the fleet mobilization, Akron maneuvers, war games in Hawaii, and increased fortifications who can doubt the imminence of war? And is Malamuth a fool or a capitalist agent that he tries to cover up the mobilization of all imperialist war forces in the East by U. S., France, Great Britain and Japan against the Chinese revolution and the U. S. S. R. It is the inevitable trail of the Trotskyites, from renegacy

to open counter-revolution.

Trotskyism Against Leninism

In undertaking to review Trotsky's book, one is determined to overlook everything one knows about his overbearing personal arrogance and to judge his work on its merits. But hardly have the first pages been read when it is clear that his personal arrogance is only the outward cover for the basic things, namely Trotsky's essential Menshevist makeup and his opposition to Bolshevik theory. For example, in the introduction by one of Trotsky's great admirers, Max Eastman, there is a studied attempt to build up Trotsky as the greater leader than Lenin. This must not be regarded as a purely personal matter. It is only a superficial manifestation of the attempt to build Trotskyism as against Leninism and Communism. Lunacharsky who worked closely with Trotsky before Trotsky entered the ranks of the Communist Party, when both were members of the Mezhrayontsi declares:

"You must not think, however, that the second great leader of the Russian Revolution yields in all respects to his colleague; there are points in which Trotsky indubitably excels him: he is more brilliant, he is more clear, he is more motile. Lenin is perfectly fitted for sitting in the President's Chair of the Soviet of Peoples Commissars, and guiding with genius the World Revolution, but obviously he could not handle the titanic task which Trotsky took upon his shoulders, those lightning trips from place to place, those magnificent speeches, fanfares of instantaneous commands, that role of continual electrifier now at one point now at another of the weakening army. There is not a man on earth who could replace Trotsky there."

We must say this is written in a very petty bourgeois spirit. It is clear the victory of the Russian Revolution could not have taken place without the victory of the

Red Army and guerrilla bands over the counter-revolutionaries and Lunacharsky declares that "there is not a man on earth who could replace Trotsky" as the leader of this struggle. The inevitable conclusion to this must be that without Trotsky there would have been no victorious Russian Revolution. We will show later how much exaggerated and romanticized is Trotsky's role in connection with the formation of the Red Army. We must say here that of all the individual leaders connected with the Russian Revolution, the only one concerning whom it could be said was really decisive for the outcome was Lenin, not because of "magnificent speeches" or "fanfares of instantaneous commands" but because Lenin was the best exponent of Marxism in the imperialist epoch, because he, better than anyone else, understood the class forces and the tactics which must be followed. That Lunacharsky should have written so is not entirely surprising since more than once Lenin had to put Lunacharsky in the pillory for his confused thinking, his petty bourgeois deviations away from Marxism and towards middle-class ideology even including "God" ideas. Eastman's quoting Lunacharsky in the introduction is only the curtain raiser for the entire role of the book, which is to replace Leninism by Trotskyism and explain that the Russian Revolution was successful not because of Leninism or the Leninist Party but because Trotskyism and Trotsky lead it to success.

Bolshevism is Anti-Revolutionary, Says Trotsky.

The struggle between Leninism and Trotskyism did not begin in 1923 or 1924 when the Polburo of the Russian Party found it necessary to open an exposure of Trotsky. It began almost 20 years back. Trotsky always tried to help the Mensheviks by maintaining a middle-of-the-way position, a sort of bridge over which he hoped the workers would go from Bolshevism to Menshevism. His theoretical platform consisted of a denuncia-

tion of Leninism and the Leninist theory of the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat in alliance with the peasantry. In 1909 in an article which is quoted in the appendix to this book, Trotsky declares:

"If the Mensheviks, starting from the abstraction 'our revolution is a bourgeois revolution' arrive at the idea of adopting the whole tactic of the proletariat to the conduct of the liberal bourgeoisie, even to the point of a conquest by it of state power, then the Bolsheviks starting from an equally bare abstraction, 'a democratic and not a Socialist dictatorship' will arrive at the idea of a bourgeois democratic self-limitation of the proletariat in whose hands the governmental power will be found. To be sure the difference between them on this question is very considerable: while the anti-revolutionary sides of Menshevism are expressed in their full strength even now, the anti-revolutionary traits of Bolshevism threaten a great danger only in the case of a revolutionary victory."

In 1913, in a letter written to Cheidse, a prominent Menshevik leader, Trotsky wrote "the whole construction of Leninism is at present built up on lies and contains the poisonous germs of its disintegration."

Bolshevism a Danger, Says Trotsky

Thus Trotsky even now tries to establish (1) that Bolshevism is anti-revolutionary, (2) that the anti-revolutionary character of Bolshevism threatens a danger when the proletariat is victorious. Precisely this explains Trotsky's attack upon the Bolshevik Party following Lenin's death. He did not dare to raise his old theories against Bolshevism while Lenin lived but he hoped upon Lenin's death to succeed. He, Trotsky, did not count with the powerful Leninist Party.

One of the pillars of Leninism was exactly the theory of the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry in a democratic dictatorship, as a step towards the dictatorship of the proletariat. From the slogan "Democratic Dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry" which Lenin maintained in 1905, he led the proletariat to the next step, the slogan of "The dictatorship of the proletariat and poorest peasants" in 1917, to the

"Dictatorship of the Proletariat" in alliance with the peasantry. It is this: Trotsky's failure to understand this road pointed out by Lenin that caused him to make his counter-revolutionary mistakes concerning the attitude toward the peasantry and counterpose his phrase "the permanent revolution" against the Leninist teachings.

Just as Trotsky today tries to becloud the issue by charging Comrade Stalin with "Thermidor" and "Personal dictatorship" so immediately following the period of 1905 Trotsky in alliance with Martov and Axelrod, two enemies of Bolshevism, wrote a scurrilous pamphlet against Lenin in which he covered up his own counter-revolutionary theories by accusing Lenin of being a candidate for the post of dictator." Lenin himself, more than once exposed and showed up Trotsky's fallacies. In his collected works he characterizes Trotsky as follows:

"These people 'explain' that they are above the fractions, but the sole basis for this assertion is that they take their ideas from one fraction today, from another tomorrow.

"Trotsky was an open adherent of the Iskra from 1901 till 1903, and Rjasanov named the role played by Trotsky at the Party Congress in 1903 that of a 'Lenin's cudgel.' By the end of 1903 Trotsky was an open menshevist, he had deserted from the Iskra to the economists. He proclaimed that 'a deep chasm yawned between the old and the new Iskra.' In the years 1904-5 he left the mensheviks and maintained an irresolute attitude; at one time he co-operated with Martinov (an economist), at another time he dished up his left 'permanent revolution' again. In 1906-7 he approached the Bolsheviks, and in the spring of 1907 he declared himself in full agreement with Rosa Luxemburg.

"During the epoch of the decline he turned to the right after lengthy 'anti-fractional' vacillations, and in August 1912, he joined the bloc of liquidators. Now he leaves them again, but in all essentials he repeats their ideas.

"Such types are characteristic of the crumbling away of the historical formations of yesterday, when the mass labor movement in Russia was not fully awakened."

(To Be Continued Next Issue)