

Trotsky's New Book Re-arms the Bourgeoisie

By SAM DARCY

(Conclusion)

Trotsky's dishonesty has been repeatedly shown so that it is almost institutionalized. Comrade Zinoviev points to one outstanding example: In September 1924, in Trotsky's article, "Lessons on October," he wrote:

"We have seen there (in Germany) in the second half of the past year a classical demonstration of the fact that a most extraordinary favorable revolutionary situation of world importance can be missed."

Trotsky makes this belittling statement of our Party in Germany in face of the fact that he himself, in the thesis which he drew up with Comrade Radek in January 1924, nine months previous, wherein he said:

"If the Party (of Germany) had declared the revolt in October (last year) as the Berlin comrades have proposed it would now be lying with a broken neck."

Lenin had utter contempt for Trotsky's phrases. In all his works against Trotsky he stated this quite plainly. Thus, out of his Collected Works, we are citing only some quotations from the pen of Lenin.

LENIN ON TROTSKY'S BOMBAST

Lenin characterized Trotsky's defense of the Mensheviks against the Bolsheviks at the London Party Congress as follows:

"This is not a standpoint based on principles, it is the lack of principle characteristic of the 'Center'—and at the same time, naturally, of its defender, Trotsky."

In 1911, in the struggle against the liquidators, Lenin wrote an appeal to all party organizations:

"Such people as Trotsky, with his puffed-up phrases on the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party, with his kow-towing to the liquidators who have nothing whatever in common with the R. S. D. L. P., are now the disease of the age."

Further, Lenin wrote:

"The real liquidators conceal themselves behind their phraseology and make every endeavor to frustrate the work being done by the anti-liquidators, that is the Bolsheviks. . . Trotsky and the Trotskyists and opportunists like him are more harmful than all the liquidators because the convinced liquidators state their views openly and it is easy for the workers to recognize the errors of these views, but Trotsky and those similar to him deceive the workers, conceal the evil and make it impossible to expose and remedy it.

Everyone who supports Trotsky's group supports the policy of lies and deception of the workers, the policy concealing liquidatory aims."

Still further, Lenin speaks of Trotsky as "this poor hero of phraseology." In 1911 Lenin, criticizing Trotsky's articles sent for publication to the International, says:

"Trotsky clings to the Mensheviks and hides behind particularly high-sounding and hollow phrases."

We could fill volumes with quotations from Lenin where he exposes Trotsky's "Right politics disguised in Left phraseology," and shows Trotsky's "liquidatory" standpoint artificially disguised beneath Trotsky's revolutionary phrases. In face of this, Trotsky pompously declares that his was the correct view since 1905 in the same breath that he pretends to defend Lenin against the "Rights."

It would take, not a review or even a book, but an encyclopedia to expose (1) Trotsky's lies, (2) those errors which he completely overlooks or defends in his book, (3) his differences with Lenin against which Lenin has written so much and which Trotsky disregards in his book. If Trotsky were honest, his work would have value despite all his mistakes, as a source of historic information, but his obvious dishonesty makes his work valueless and must concern the workers only insofar as it must be answered and denounced. Otherwise it will become an effective weapon in the hands of the bourgeoisie and their agents against the Party of the working class—the Communist Party.

TROTSKY'S LINE IN 1917

Trotsky, for example, as late as October 29, 1917, wrote an appeal in which he declared:

"The only thing which could save the country is the Constitutional Assembly, which consists of representatives of the working and exploited masses of the people."

At this date Lenin's slogan of "All power to the Soviets" had already taken root and the masses were ready to seize power, and precisely at this point Trotsky announced that "the only thing which could save the country is the Constitutional Assembly." Trotsky fails to mention that, in this, his latest book. He admits, though, without acknowledging it as a mistake but as a matter of fact defending it, that on June 4th in the first Congress of the Soviets, following a speech by Lenin in which he declared the readiness of the Bolsheviks to take power, Trotsky spoke, favoring a "left" counter-revolutionary minister. He said at the Congress:

"I do not belong to the same party with him (Peshekhonov) but

if they told me that a ministry was to be formed out of 12 Peshekhonovs I should say that this was an immense step forward."

Eclecticism of Trotsky

Covering all his attempts to replace Lenin and Bolshevism with himself and Trotskyism, Trotsky continually protests accusations against him and insists on his own objectivity. But one is obviously impressed while reading his book that he only reaches an exaggerated sort of "objectivity" when he speaks of Lenin and the Bolshevik Party. Thus his "objectivity" consists of denying the role of the Bolshevik Party and belittling the role of Lenin and explaining things only by spontaneous upsurges of the masses. But when he speaks of himself he makes it clear that no one else in the world could have accomplished the jobs that he accomplished. He leaves it to Lenocharsky and Eastman to make all necessary subjective remarks concerning Lenin but concerning Stalin and concerning his bourgeois competitors, he always speaks subjectively. He explains the role of Tzeretelli that—

"He was a theoretician and not even a journalist, but a distinguished orator";

"Skobelev" was a "student playing the role of statesman on a home-made stage";

"If the first violin in the orchestra of the Soviet majority was Tzeretelli, the piercing clarinet was played by Lieber—with all his lung power and blood in his eyes. This was a Menshevik from the Jewish Workers' Union (Bund) with a long revolutionary past, very sincere, very temperamental, very eloquent, very limited, and passionately desirous of showing himself an inflexible patriot and iron statesman. Lieber was literally beside himself with hatred of the Bolsheviks."

These flounderings of Trotsky explain the struggle around and within the Russian Revolution on the basis of subjective characteristics as in relation to Leninism. Throughout his book Trotsky misses completely the classes which these elements represent, and everything he writes concerning them is most obviously aimed to show up his own "brilliance" as against the dullness of all the others. Certainly Trotsky did play a considerable role in the Russian Revolution and made a contribution to its successes but as a matter of fact his role is very much exaggerated, chiefly by bourgeois writers, who never understood the inner workings of the Bolshevik Party and revolutionary development, but only saw "magnificent speeches" and "fanfares of commands."

Truth About Trotsky

Comrade Stalin gives some very

important examples to show this:

1. Re Koltschak. It was in the summer of 1919. Our troops attacked Koltschak and operated before Ufa. Meeting of the C. C. Comrade Trotsky proposed to stop the attack on the line of the Bjalaja river (before Ufa), to leave the Urals in Koltschak's hands, to remove part of our troops from the eastern front and to throw them on to the southern front. Heated debates took place. The C. C. did not agree with Comrade Trotsky and found that the Urals with their works, their network of railways, should not be left in Koltschak's hands, because he could there easily bring his troops into order, collect large farmers around him and advance to the Volga, but that first of all Koltschak should be driven back over the ridge of the Urals into the Siberian steppes, and that only then should the transference of troops to the south be proceeded with. The C. C. declined Comrade Trotsky's plan. The latter resigned. The C. C. did not accept his resignation. The commander in chief, Wazetis, a partisan of Comrade Trotsky's plan, retired. His place was taken by a new commander in chief, Comrade Kamenev. From this moment on ward, Comrade Trotsky declined any direct participation in the transactions on the eastern front.

2. Re Denikin. The affair took place in autumn, 1919. The attack against Denikin failed. The 'steel ring' around Mamontow (the storming of Mamontow) was an obvious failure. Denikin took Kursk. Denikin approached Orel. Comrade Trotsky was called from the southern front to a meeting of the C. C. The C. C. declared the situation to be disquieting and resolved to send new military functionaries to the southern front and to recall Comrade Trotsky. These functionaries demanded "non interference" on the part of Comrade Trotsky on the southern front. Comrade Trotsky withdrew from immediate participation in the action on the southern front. The operations on the southern front, up to the taking of Rostov on the Don and Odessa by our troops proceeded without Comrade Trotsky."

Comrade Stalin further points out that as late as the 16th of October, 1917, Trotsky who pretends that the Revolution could not have been won without him was not even elected on the directing committees of the Revolution.

Let us take the minutes of the following meeting, of the 16th of October. Present: the

permental Farm, themselves formerly nomads, Aina and the people win and the final scenes show the transition of the old life into the new. Under the new leadership and with the help of government agriculturists, the nomads settle, build their own and by turning to farming solve their ancient hard struggle with a fiercely hot land and gain the conditions of a better life.

members of the C. C. plus representatives of the Petrograd committee, plus representatives of the military organization, of the factory committees of the trade unions, of the railwaymen. Among those present were besides the members of the C. C., Krylenko, Shotman, Kalinin, Volodarsky, Shlapnikov, Lazis and others. The question for discussion is the insurrection from the purely practical point of view of organization. Lenin's resolution as to the insurrection was passed by a majority of 20 votes against 2, 2 refraining from voting. The practical central committee for the organizing direction of the revolt was elected. Five comrades were elected to this committee: Sverdlov, Stalin, Dzherzhinsky, Bubnov, Uritsky. The duties of the central committee consisted in directing all the practical organs of the insurrection in accordance with the instructions of the C. C. As you see, something 'terrible' happened at this meeting of the C. C., i. e. the 'inaugurator,' the 'central figure,' the 'only leader' of the insurrection, Comrade Trotsky, was not elected a member of the practical central committee, whose duty it was to direct the insurrection."

Trotsky and his followers always claim that he was the practical leader of the Revolution always utilized by Lenin, its theoretical director. But here we have an example where Lenin's role is clear but Trotsky's practical leadership is clearly absent.

The Great Trotsky is Tricked by a "Nonentity"

Trotsky, all through his book prepares to show what a nonentity Stalin is. Of course, to the intelligent worker, the question immediately arises that if Stalin is such a nonentity how is it that Stalin so thoroughly trounced Trotsky in the Party discussion? The explanation lies in the essential Leninist soundness of the Bolshevik Party, the best exponent of which is undoubtedly Comrade Stalin. In speaking of Cheize, the Menshevik leader in the Duma, he says:

"He carried the ineradicable imprint of his province. Mountainous Georgia, the land of sun, vineyards, peasants and petty princes, with a small percentage of workers, produced a very wide stratum of left intellectuals, flexible, temperamental, but the vast majority of them not rising above the petty bourgeois outlook."

audience is expected to overlook the significance of this fact. The outstanding thing in this "Roar" of laughter is a new type of slander against workers. The plot hangs on the inability of the drunken American riverboat captain to get his passengers aboard because it takes a dozen coolies so long to repair the paddlewheel. And to prove how lazy and worthless these Chinese workers are, the scene is deliberately shot in slow motion.

Already with this, Trotsky was preparing for his "explanation" of Stalin. Stalin was the leader not because he was the best pupil and the example of correct revolutionary leadership but because he came from "mountainous Georgia" which gives the men all the characteristics which by special arrangement with Trotsky Mountainous Georgia gave to Cheidze.

Trotsky does not hesitate to quote Sukhanov, a bourgeois commentator on the Russian Revolution, that Stalin was a "gray spot" which would sometimes give out a dim and inconsequential light. There is really nothing more to be said about him." Thus Trotsky, who has been made largely impotent by Comrade Stalin's Leninist leadership of the Bolshevik Party tries to make up for his impotence by a shrill that Stalin is a politically castrated individual. And all the little "Trotskyisms" including that great leader of revolutionary struggle, Professor Malamuth, of the University of California, rush to Trotsky's support. He also says in a letter written denouncing one of our comrades:

"Stalinism is the stultification, the distortion, of Leninism, and apparently it demands and exacts the abandonment of common human decency, let alone of revolutionary honor, from its adherents. This is the only way I can for the moment explain your joining the chorus of cowardly detractors who attacked me surreptitiously in the New Masses and other publications."

Thus Trotsky, like a homing pigeon, has again completely separated himself from Bolshevism, openly attacking Bolshevism, written a book full of lies and distortions, dishonest and disregarding any principles to guide him, falsifying history which Lenin said was the essential traits of Trotsky and Trotskyism. We must repeat again, this book only has importance insofar as it is a weapon of the bourgeoisie against the revolutionary working class. That this is true can already be seen from Professor Malamuth whose role it is to write in the San Francisco Chronicle belittling and attacking the Soviet Union with the air of doing it from the "inside."

Trotsky's Trash Called "History"

This is only the first volume of Trotsky's work. So far as historic value is concerned, if Trotsky's second volume is worth no more than this, then he can lay down his pen because the victorious world's working class will consign all his writings to the trash heap where they belong.