



<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>

Theses Digitisation:

<https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/research/enlighten/theses/digitisation/>

This is a digitised version of the original print thesis.

Copyright and moral rights for this work are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This work cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Enlighten: Theses

<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>
research-enlighten@glasgow.ac.uk

Leon Trotsky: Three Aspects

Ian Dennis Thatcher

ISEES

University of Glasgow

August, 1990

A thesis submitted in fulfilment
of the requirements for the
awarding of the degree of M. Litt.

ProQuest Number: 10983768

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10983768

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Acknowledgements

On the several occasions that I have finished writing a dissertation and thought about those who have helped, I have felt a sense of shame that the final product in no way approaches the qualities of those who have inspired and encouraged. This thesis has proved to be no exception. To the following I therefore give my thanks and my apologies: Kay McWalter, Dubravko Matko, Stephen White, Martin Dewhirst, Rene Beerman, Dave Frisby, Professor W. V. Wallace, David Western, Ada, Basia, Tania, Cath Mooney, Nicholas Glossop, Hillel Ticktin and Peter Lentini. Special thanks and apologies go to my Russian teacher, Tanya Frisby, and to my supervisor, James D. White.

Contents

Abstract		i
Preface		iii
Chapter One	Uneven and Combined Development: The Relationship to Permanent Revolution	1
Notes		55
Chapter Two	Recent Soviet Writings on Leon Trotsky	63
Notes		121
Chapter Three	Trotsky's Philosophy	132
Notes		157
Bibliography		161

Abstract

This thesis examines three aspects of Leon Trotsky (1879-1940). Chapter One analyses Trotsky's most famous, and most written about, 'theory of permanent revolution'. Defining theory as explanation, it is argued that one cannot talk of a specific 'theory of permanent revolution'. Trotsky introduced laws of uneven and combined development, and it was these that acted as the explanation of the component parts of 'permanent revolution' - (i) the Russian proletariat could seize power before the Russian bourgeoisie; (ii) that once in command the Russian proletariat would introduce socialist measures; (iii) that world revolution would be necessary for full socialism to be constructed. This does not mean that the notion of 'permanent revolution' has to be abandoned. It can be retained, but as a political programme.

Chapter Two presents a survey of post-Gorbachev Soviet interpretations of Leon Trotsky. The extent to which contemporary Soviet writings both remain within, and move away from, Stalinist historiography is illustrated. Four possible explanations for recent Soviet writings on Trotsky are examined: (i) as a product of glasnost applied to historical study; (ii) as a precursor to Trotsky's rehabilitation in the CPSU; (iii) as part and parcel of perestrioka's attack on Stalinism and as an ideological

heritage upon which Gorbachev can draw; (iv) upon suppositions of harmlessness.

Trotsky's philosophy is the subject matter of Chapter Three. It is argued that Trotsky's explicit philosophical writings fail, as exemplified by his attempt to illustrate the supremacy of dialectics over formal logic. Moreover, Trotsky utilized different methodological approaches at various times. Thus, the researcher attempting to locate Trotsky's underlying philosophical assumptions is left in a maze of possible confusions.

Preface

The particular 'three aspects' which make-up this thesis were a product of previous personal interest and the time of writing.

When I first read about the Bolshevik revolution and its subsequent development in secondary school, I was attracted by the tragic nature of Trotsky's life. In subsequent studies I always focussed upon Trotsky whenever possible, most notably as part of my undergraduate 'Marxism' course. However, these contacts remained brief and I retained a desire to study more fully two aspects of Trotsky which, to me, seemed crucial: the so-called 'theory of permanent revolution' and Trotsky's philosophy. Hence Chapters One and Three.

From 1989 onwards Trotsky studies different from old-style Stalinist historiography started to appear in the Soviet press. In October 1988 I came to Glasgow with no knowledge of the Russian language. However, excellent tuition enabled enough progress to be made for articles in Russian to be read. It appeared important for a record of the impact of perestroika on Trotsky studies in the Soviet Union to be kept. Hence Chapter Two.

Chapter One

Uneven and Combined Development:

The Relationship to Permanent Revolution

1. Introduction

For Trotsky, Marxism was a method for the analysis of the interaction of social forces within society:

Marxism is above all a method of analysis - not the analysis of texts, but the analysis of social relations. [1]

The point of such an analysis was that it was linked directly to the aims of people like Trotsky. His business was revolution, and

a revolution is a struggle for state power....As the party of revolution we have before us the task to reveal to the masses the necessity of conquering state power....We considered the class dynamics of the Russian revolution. [2]

Therefore, in any situation, notions of class relations and the relative strengths of the various component groups were the crucial issues.

In a complex analysis involving a terminology of uneven development, combined development, and permanent revolution Trotsky presented a scenario in which the nature of the class relations within Russia gave the possibility for the party of the proletariat to come to power both before a regime of the bourgeoisie internally, and before the establishment of proletarian governments in the advanced nations. Moreover, once in power the party of the Russian proletariat would not be able to confine

itself to a bourgeois-democratic programme but, through the logic of its class nature, would introduce socialist measures.

In so doing, Trotsky saw himself as opposing those Marxists whom he saw as expressing a view of society, both internal and international, as progressing through various stages of development. The version of this idea which Trotsky criticized most vociferously was that which claimed that a backward nation such as Russia had to go from tsarism to parliamentary democracy politically, and under this political system undergo a transition from a backward to an advanced economic base. This developmental pattern would provide the pre-requisites for socialist revolution, and only when Russia had 'caught-up' with the West in these senses could such a revolution take place there.

Trotsky accused all those whom he suspected of holding such an idea of producing "pseudo-Marxism" [3], of basing themselves on statements to be found within Marx but of turning such sentences into a rigid maxim. [4] Thus, in 'Our Differences' (1908) Trotsky attacked a number of Mensheviks for limiting the immediate goal of proletarian action to placing the bourgeoisie - who were seen as the social group to implement the necessary catching-up measures - into government. The Bolsheviks were praised for realising the folly of positing hopes for change of

whatever nature on the Russian bourgeoisie and in calling for a workers' and peasants' government; but were labelled "hopelessly idealistic" [5] in thinking that a government so composed could limit itself to tasks with a bourgeois-democratic content.

The aim of this chapter is to locate, within Trotsky's writings, the explanation for what Trotsky highlighted as the crucial issue: namely, in terms of Russia's development, the balance of class forces which allowed a proletarian revolution without the necessity for a protracted bourgeois-democratic stage.

The following will both give an exposition of Trotsky's terms mentioned earlier - i.e., uneven development, combined development, permanent revolution -, and show how they relate to each other to form a hierarchical explanation of the October 1917 revolution. Moreover, it will be argued that the consequences of this hierarchy lead us to abandon notions of the theory of permanent revolution as being a theory at all. Uneven and combined development became the theory of the Russian revolution, permanent revolution acting as a political programme dependent for its proposed validity upon this theory. The paper is split into two sections. Section one deals exclusively with Trotsky. Section two compares the interpretation expounded in section one with those of other commentators. The exposition of Trotsky will begin

with the concept which occupies the highest level of explanation in Trotsky, namely uneven development.

Section One

2. Uneven Development

Talk of uneven development becomes dominant in Trotsky's writings from 1927 onwards. [6] From this date, whenever the law is mentioned, the claim consistently made for it is that,

the entire history of mankind is governed by the law of uneven development. [7]

The nature of uneven development in the capitalist epoch received its fullest and most lucid definition from Trotsky in his writings between 1927-1930, most notably in the work The Third International after Lenin (1928). The reason for Trotsky's motivation to turn to uneven development and to give it concrete definition during these years was related to the nature of the power struggle in the CPSU from 1926 onwards. Specifically, Trotsky was responding to Stalin's claim that socialism in one country was based upon Lenin's usage of the law of uneven development in the period of monopoly capitalism or imperialism. [8] The whole debate involved questions of the nature of the Russian revolution, the prospects for building socialism in the USSR, and which of the various

answers represented the Leninist heritage. The way in which Trotsky presented his case had consequences for any body of text which one might want to highlight as being the theory of permanent revolution. For in the years 1927 onwards Trotsky reinterpreted his previous writings with the law of uneven development upmost in his mind. This had the result that theory shifted to the level of the law.

In itself unevenness, Trotsky tells us, refers to differences in two states when making comparisons between countries. First, in the speed of growth in the fields of economics and culture. Second, in the absolute levels of achievement in those particular areas. The capitalist era is significant for uneven development. It is important because it differs from previous economic systems in being expansionist. This fact about capitalism led it to have specific effects upon the existing state of unevenness in both senses.

First, capitalism merged countries at different levels of advancement into a connected whole. This, in turn, effected a levelling process between nations, so that any gaps which existed between, for example, India and Great Britain or Europe and America, diminished over time. This process had implications for differences in the rates of development between countries. Specifically,

The capitalist development in certain parts of India is much more rapid than was the capitalist development in England in its beginnings. The difference, the economic distance between England and India - is this today greater or smaller than 50 years ago? It is smaller....The development of Canada, South America, South Africa has proceeded during the last period with gigantic strides. The 'development' of England is a stagnation, yes, even a decline. Therefore the tempo is uneven as never before in history. [9]

Second, as a consequence of the situation in which the rate of development of the backward nations increased while the tempo of the advanced declined, the differences in the absolute levels of economics and culture decreased:

Thereby it brings about their rapprochement and equalizes the economic and cultural levels of the most progressive and the most backward countries....the level of development of these countries has become more closely approximated than 30 or 50 years ago. [10]

It was a levelling out in the second sense that Trotsky was, in 1931, to call the 'law of combined development'. And, accepting that this is correct, it is here, in 1927-28, that Trotsky first showed how combined development related to uneven development. The nature of uneven development in the capitalist epoch, in regard to rates of development, resulted in the backward nation importing the latest achievements of capitalism into its society. It was from this interaction that combined development was to emerge. As Trotsky claimed in History of the Russian Revolution (1931), combined development is derived from uneven development:

Historical laws have nothing to do with pedantic schematism. Unevenness, the most general law of the historic process, displays itself most sharply and complexly in the fate of backward countries. Under the stimulus of external necessity their backwardness is forced to accomplish leaps. From the universal law of unevenness there is derived another law which, for the want of a more suitable term, one may call the law of combined development, in the sense that there is a rapprochement of different stages of the journey, a combination of separate stages, an amalgam of archaic with the most contemporary forms. Without this law taken, of course, in its whole material content one cannot understand the history of Russia or, in general, of any country of the second, third or tenth level of civilization. [11]

When Trotsky uses the phrase 'the whip of external necessity' he is referring to the fact, expressed in 1927-28, that capitalism is expansionist. Initially, Russia had no choice on whether it was to become a part of the capitalist system. And as a member of the capitalist order it had to submit to existing advanced forms:

The Russian state came into contact with the military organisation of Western nations, which stood on higher economic, political and cultural foundations. Thus, Russian capital in its first steps collided with the far more developed and powerful capital of the West and fell under its leadership. [12]

However, this process, under capitalism, would never enable nations to reach a position of equality in both tempo and levels of development. Unevenness in both respects remained in force. Capitalism is a definite economic order characterised, for Trotsky, by anarchic methods which set country against country, and guarantees that branches of industry will develop unevenly in

relation to one another. All of this was, in turn, made worse by imperialism:

Imperialism, thanks to the universality, penetrability, and mobility and the break-neck speed of the formation of finance capital as the driving force of imperialism, lends vigour to both these tendencies. Imperialism links up incomparably more rapidly and more deeply the individual national and continental units into a single entity....it attains this 'goal' by such antagonistic methods, such tiger-leaps, and such raids upon backward countries and areas that the unification, and levelling of the world economy which it has effected, is upset by it even more violently and convulsively than in the preceding epoches. [13]

We re-enter the language of 'tiger-leaps' and 'raids upon backward countries'. This interaction amounted to combined development, and Trotsky was to outline the specific effects of this on pre-revolutionary Russian society.

However, before Trotsky wrote of a specific law of combined development this law was subsumed under his earlier usage of the law of uneven development. This explains why Trotsky made claims for uneven development which were subsequently attributed to combined development. For example, in 1930 Trotsky wrote that,

Stalin does not understand to this day that the uneven development consists precisely in jumping over stages (or staying too long in one stage)....the prediction that historically backward Russia was able to arrive at the proletarian revolution sooner than advanced Britain was entirely and completely based on the law of uneven development; [14]

in 1933,

We have attributed the October revolution in the final analysis not to the fact of Russia's backwardness, but to the law of combined development; [15]

and in 1936,

the law of combined development....i.e., to a jump of the backward country ahead in comparison with the advanced countries. [16]

Combined development will now be examined. The issue of the relationship between uneven development and combined development will be raised again in this section.

3. Combined Development

For Trotsky it was combined development, the invasion of advanced capitalism into backward Russia, which enabled the occurrence of jumps over features which had been a part of progression within the advanced nations:

Almost without highways, Russia was compelled to build railroads. Without having gone through the European artisan and manufacturing stages, Russia passed directly to mechanized production. To jump over intermediate stages is the fate of backward countries. [17]

More importantly, this had effects upon class relations within Russia:

[it] gives birth to an utterly new, 'combined' social formation, in which the newest achievements of capitalist technique and structure take root into relations of feudal and pre-feudal barbarism, transforming and subordinating them into the formation of a peculiar alignment of classes. [18]

And, as Trotsky wrote, the October revolution triumphed because of the "peculiar correlation of forces among the different classes and the state power" [19] in pre-revolutionary Russia.

In particular the fact that capitalism entered Russia through the influx of finance capital had several important consequences. First, it enabled the Russian state to attain a high degree of independence. This meant that the state was the executor of economic change in Russia, becoming the largest capitalist entrepreneur. The state monopolised and through this collected enough to fund a repressive force which increased its capacity for survival. However, this meant that Russian society was characterised by the separation of state from social classes which led to a marked polarisation of class forces. This, in turn, meant that conflict in Russia would be noticeable for its extreme nature:

the revolution was guaranteed to have a radical character beforehand, the more mighty absolutism deepened the gulf between it and the masses who were involved in the new economic development....for revolution to become inevitable class contradictions have to be strained to the breaking point. [20]

Second, finance capital prevented the development of a strong, numerous indigenous bourgeoisie. Finance capital drew the Russian bourgeoisie into the system of European capitalism at its imperialist stage. However, the Russian bourgeoisie was the weakest member in this system, so that when imperialism caused the First World War the Russian bourgeoisie was the least well-equipped to survive it. The weak position of this social class rendered it useless as a force for the overthrow of tsarism and the introduction of bourgeois democracy. As such it stood in stark contrast to the concentrated mass of Russian workers collected in large-scale production units. These factories were another result of finance capital.

In a society convulsed by the effects of rapid industrialisation it would be the strength of the proletariat, derived from its homogeneity and strategic importance within Russian industry, that would overthrow tsarism. Combined development produced both the crisis in the form of a reaction against the pre-revolutionary organisation of production:

Russia advanced on the road to proletarian revolution not because its economy was the first to mature for a socialist revolution, but because it in general was not able to develop for long on a capitalist basis. Social ownership of the means of production became a necessary condition for leading the country from barbarism: such is the law of combined development for backward countries; [21]

and the system of class relations in which the proletariat

were the only class powerful enough to cause change. Combined development did not touch the Russian peasantry. It remained in a state of backwardness, experiencing no leaps, and was too isolated to be an effective political force. The weakness of the Russian bourgeoisie simply made the seizure of power by the proletariat easier.

Moreover, the Russian proletariat was special in that it did not develop over a long period of time. It had skipped both medieval apprentice schools and membership of guilds. This meant that it lacked a conservative tradition and this fact constituted another nail in the coffin of bourgeois democracy in Russia. For,

The Russian proletariat was formed not gradually through the centuries, dragging with it the weight of the past, as in England, but by leaps, by means of abrupt changes in conditions, connections, relations, and a sharp break with yesterday. It was precisely this - in combination with the concentrated oppression of tsarism - that made the Russian workers susceptible to the most daring conclusions of revolutionary thought - just as backward Russian industry was susceptible to the latest word in capitalist organisation. [22]

Indeed, for Trotsky, the law of combined development included the idea that in certain spheres the backward nation would even be ahead of the advanced. So that the statement in the preface to the first edition of Capital (1867) [23] concerning the advanced nations showing the backward just the mirror image of their own future development, which Trotsky saw as being dogmatized by

others, was turned on its head. For instance, in ideology the Russian workers fell under the influence of Marxism when the British proletariat was still going to church.

[24] In organisation the supreme means for coordinating revolutionary struggle by proletarian democracy appeared first in Russia:

Let us note right away that the soviets....are not simply the outcome of the Russia's historical backwardness, but are a product of her combined development, which is shown by the fact that the proletariat of the most industrialised country, Germany, at the time of its revolutionary upheaval, 1918-1919, could not find any other form of organisation as the soviets....The law of combined development is revealed here before us in its most extreme manifestation: beginning with the overthrow of a decayed medieval institution, the revolution in the course of a few months placed into power the proletariat led by the Communist party. [25]

So combined development produced a situation in Russia in which the proletariat armed with Marxism constituted the only real force for change. This meant, first, that unlike the other advanced nations the bourgeoisie would not be the focus for economic and political progress. Combined development caused a leap in this sense. And, second, a Marxian inspired proletariat in power would be just that, and introduce socialist measures. Combined development caused a leap in another sense. There would be no protracted bourgeois-democratic stage in Russia.

Trotsky wrote that in backward countries the fulfilment of tasks natural to one class by another is a feature of

combined development. However, even if the Russian proletariat in power intended to limit itself to carrying out those reforms which the bourgeoisie in the advanced nations undertook at an earlier stage in their development, it could not do so:

already on the second day of the 'democratic-dictatorship' this idyll of quasi-Marxist asceticism would be shattered to dust. Under whatever theoretical banner the proletariat came to power it could not but at once, on the first day, come face-to-face with the problem of unemployment....The proletariat in power should, in one form or another (public works, etc), quickly solve unemployment at the state's expense. This, in its turn, will immediately bring about an enormous upsurge of economic struggle and a whole series of strikes....the reply of the capitalists will be....closing works and factories.They will place great locks on the gates and tell themselves: 'Our ownership is not in terrible danger because it is established that now the proletariat is not a socialist, but a democratic dictatorship.' And what would a workers' government do faced with the closing of works and factories? It would open them and resume production at the state's expense. And is this the path to socialism? Certainly! What other path are you able to suggest? [26]

Combined development thus explains the first part of the 'theory' of permanent revolution. Trotsky repeatedly stated that this consisted of two propositions: first that the Russian proletariat would take power before the Russian bourgeoisie; and, second, that once in power the Russian workers would introduce socialist measures. Trotsky consistently stated that this resulted from "the alignment of classes". [27] This alignment was a consequence of the nature of Russian industrial development. For example, Trotsky argued that:

The social character of the Russian bourgeoisie and its political make-up were determined by the conditions of the origin of Russian industry and the structure which it acquired. [28]

And, according to Trotsky, the nature of Russian economic progress was explained by the law of combined development:

But it is precisely in the economic field....that the law of combined development operates with the greatest force. [29]

Defining theory as something which seeks to explain phenomena, the fact that combined development is the explanation of the first part of permanent revolution means that, in this respect, permanent revolution is a political programme, a political summary of a reality which is explained by higher concepts. In 1928 Trotsky wrote that the first element of permanent revolution was,

based upon a correct understanding of the law of uneven development; [30]

which suggests that the highest level of explanation is at uneven development. But we have already seen that combined development is derived from uneven development. So what emerges from this is a hierarchy of explanation with uneven development at the top and permanent revolution at the bottom. However, when the bottom - permanent revolution - is reached there is not that much, if anything, which is left to be explained. Given this, the claim that theory resides at the bottom level is not

tenable. So on this point the theory of permanent revolution is not a theory at all. In diagrammatic form the hierarchy of explanation would look as follows:

I. Uneven Development [unevenness+ capitalism]

II. Combined Development

- 1: Economic crisis demanding socialisation of means of production;
- 2: Independence of state guaranteeing polarisation;
- 3: Weakness of Russian bourgeoisie;
- 4: Weakness of Peasants;
- 5: Radical ideology among workers;
- 6: Advanced forms of proletarian organisation;
- 7: Strength of proletariat.

III. Permanent Revolution

- 1: Proletarian revolution;
- 2: Introduction of socialist measures.

How uneven development relates to the second component of permanent revolution can now be examined.

4. The Necessity for World Revolution

For Trotsky uneven and combined development caused a relation of class forces so as to enable a proletarian revolution and the introduction of socialism within Russia. However, this process did not leave the Russian

proletariat with a sufficient economic base from which complete socialism could be built within the boundaries of Russia. For several reasons Trotsky claimed that uneven development meant that world revolution was necessary if socialism was to be fully achieved.

First, socialism meant the attainment of harmony in the fields of economics and culture, and this could only be achieved through world revolution. For Trotsky, the destruction of the restrictions of capitalist national frontiers would enable the overcoming of the contradictions flowing from uneven development through a process of cooperation between the various economies and cultures:

From the world division of labour, from the uneven development of the different countries, from their economic interdependence, from the unevenness of different aspects of culture in the different countries, from the dynamic of contemporary productive forces, it follows that the socialist order can be built according to a system of economic spiral, by taking the inner disparities of the separate country out into the whole group of countries, through the mutual assistance to the different countries and the mutual supplementation of different branches of their economy and culture, i.e., in the last analysis on the world arena. [31]

Second, uneven development operated over capitalism in its imperialist stage which had brought about a world economy in which national boundaries had to be transcended. This made a nonsense of the idea of constructing anything within the nation-state. Just as the capitalist powers

were forced to trade with each other after the First World War, so Russia would not be able to escape the reality of the world economy post-revolution:

The problem of building socialism is not settled merely by the industrial 'maturity' or 'immaturity' of a country. This immaturity is itself uneven. In the U.S.S.R., some branches of industry are extremely inadequate to satisfy the most elementary domestic requirements....other branches on the contrary cannot develop under present conditions without extensive and increasing exports....even the 'inadequate' branches cannot seriously develop if the 'super-abundant' (relatively) are unable to export. The impossibility of building an isolated socialist society....in the concrete geographical and historical conditions of our terrestrial economy, is determined by various countries in different ways - by the insufficient development of some branches as well as by the 'excessive' development of others. On the whole this means that the modern productive forces are incompatible with national boundaries. [32]

Third, even if Russia had an advanced economic base uneven development would prevent the complete building of socialism in one country. The contradiction between the limits of frontiers and the universal nature of modern productive forces would vitiate any such idea, irrespective of the level of technology:

the incompatibility between the present productive forces and national boundaries, from which it follows that highly developed productive forces are by no means a lesser obstacle to the construction of socialism in one country than low productive forces....while the latter are insufficient to serve as the basis, it is the basis which will prove inadequate for the former. The law of uneven development is forgotten precisely at the point where it is most needed and most important. [33]

Only if one assumed that countries develop both unevenly and independently of each other could the idea of building full-blown socialism within national boundaries become tenable. For Trotsky, the corollary of this would be an acceptance of the Menshevist version of stages of development:

If the historical process were such that some countries developed not only unevenly but even independently of each other....then the law of uneven development would indubitably follow the possibility of building socialism in one capitalist country and then, as they mature, in the more backward ones. [34]

It was the acceptance of the independence of each unevenly developed capitalist country that lay at the centre of Stalin's conception of the law of uneven development. This fuelled his belief in socialism in one country. [35] For Stalin, monopoly capitalism or imperialism did not mean that the economies of separate countries had become or were becoming interconnected. Rather it signified a transition in capitalist development itself from free competition to huge capitalist combines. These combines were tied to individual capitalist countries and their colonial empires in a world which was already divided. However, for Stalin, this did not mean that a stable hierarchy of unevenly developed nations had been established. Like Trotsky, Stalin thought that the epoch of monopoly capitalism was notable for an increase in the tempo of development of the backward nations compared to the advanced. Like Trotsky, Stalin believed that this had

the consequence of a levelling process in which differences in absolute levels of development between the various countries decreased. Like Trotsky, Stalin argued that these processes contained the possibility of the backward nation 'leaping over' the advanced. However, unlike Trotsky, Stalin did not make the levelling process dependent upon a law of combined development deriving from a world economy acting upon previous levels of unevenness. According to Stalin, levelling was to be explained by the nature of technology in the imperialist era. And, for Stalin, it was levelling that gave the possibility to the proletariat of one country to have their own, successful, socialist revolution:

It is precisely because the lagging countries accelerate their development and tend to become level with the foremost countries that the struggle between countries to outstrip one another becomes more acute; it is precisely this that creates the possibility for some countries to outstrip others and oust them from the markets, thereby creating the pre-conditions for military conflicts, for the weakening of the capitalist world front and for the breaching of this front by the proletarians of various capitalist countries. He who does not understand this simple matter, understands nothing about the economic essence of monopoly capitalism. [36]

Because this individual country was isolated, any internal contradictions deriving from the workings of a capitalist economy could be resolved through the establishment of socialism in that individual country. For Stalin, the only remaining contradiction was external. This consisted of the co-existence of a socialist state and capitalist

countries. Complete socialism meant the overcoming of this external threat. According to Stalin world revolution was ultimately necessary not because this was the only way in which all contradictions could be solved, but because this was the only condition in which each socialist state would be safe and able to live in peace.

[37]

However, for Trotsky, this was not the case. His understanding of uneven development, in the era of the indivisibility of the world economy, thus provides the explanation for the connection between the full victory of socialism and revolution on a world scale which underpins Trotsky's second component of permanent revolution:

The socialist revolution begins on the national arena, develops on the international, and concludes on the world arena. Thus, the socialist revolution becomes permanent in a newer, wider sense of the word: it does not receive its completion until the definite triumph of the new society on the whole of our planet.

[38]

On this point permanent revolution does, however, point to the sources which provide the impetus towards universal socialist upheaval. It does so, once again, by operating as a political programme in the form of making predictions about the political form such a movement will take.

First, capitalism would find it impossible peacefully to co-exist with a workers' government. The two systems

would inevitably enter into conflict. Second, the Russian proletariat would only overcome the contradictions between being a radical force in a backward country through world revolution. This is why Trotsky claimed that the Russian proletariat would have to construct tactics for the overthrow of capitalism in the advanced nations. The emphasis would be on the conscious export of revolution:

Before the revolutionary power would stand the objective tasks of socialism, but at a certain stage their solutions would collide with the country's economic backwardness. It would be impossible to escape from these contradictions in the framework of a national revolution. From the beginning the task of a workers' government would be to unite its forces with the forces of the socialist proletariat of Western Europe. Only on this path would its temporary revolutionary supremacy become the prologue to the socialist dictatorship. Permanent revolution thus becomes, for the Russian proletariat, a demand for its class self-preservation. [39]

The Russian proletariat would be helped in this task by the revolutionary idealism of the proletariat in the advanced nations. This desire to help Russian workers would come from the revolutionary fervour caused by the Russian revolution:

The influence of the Russian revolution on the European proletariat is huge. Apart from the fact that it destroys the St. Petersburg absolutism, the main force of European reaction, it creates....the necessary revolutionary prerequisites in the consciousness and mood of the European working class....The Russian proletariat in power, although only the result of the temporary juncture of our bourgeois revolution, will meet with the organised hostility from world reaction and will be ready with the organised support from the world

proletariat. [40]

Although Trotsky tried to avoid predicting a spread of socialist revolution through certain nations in a certain order, [41] uneven development did lead him to hold such a view in two senses.

First, Trotsky stated that there would be a Soviet United States of Europe as a prologue to a World Socialist Republic. [42] For Trotsky, uneven development meant revolutions on a European scale before revolutions in other areas. This committed him to a schema for the progression of revolutions from one part of the world to another.

When Trotsky spoke of the need to create a United States of Europe in his article 'Our Political Slogan' (1915) he related this to the "only political form by which the proletariat can resolve the irreconcilable contradiction between modern forces of production and the national exclusiveness of the State organisation." [43] It was in response to Lenin's critique [44] of the notion of a United States of Europe that Trotsky argued that the slogan was in harmony with the law of uneven development. While Trotsky accepted Lenin's assertion that uneven development could lead to the victory of a socialist revolution in one country, the operation of the law still meant that Europe as a whole would most likely experience close to simultaneous socialist revolutions. This was

because, taken on a world scale, there was 'unevenness within the unevenness', and most notably this meant, for Trotsky, that one part of the world - Europe - was more united in maturity for socialist revolution than Africa or Asia:

That capitalist development of different countries is uneven is a completely uncontroversial consideration. But in itself this unevenness is highly uneven. The capitalist levels of England, Austria, Germany or France are unequal. But in comparison with Africa or Asia, all of these countries are a capitalist 'Europe' ripe for socialist revolution. That not one country should 'wait' for the others in its struggle is an elementary thought, which is useful and necessary to repeat....we continue our struggle on a national basis in the total assurance that our initiative will give a push to the struggle in other countries....the revolution [is] able to start on a national basis [but] is unable to be completed on its own under the present economic and military-political interdependency of the European states which has never been revealed so forcibly as precisely in the present war. This interdependency, which directly and immediately conditions the coordination of the activities of the European proletariat in the revolution, also gives expression to the slogan the United States of Europe. [45]

Trotsky was to repeat this argument in the The Third International after Lenin (1928), claiming that he had defended the idea of a United States of Europe from the perspective of a law of uneven development since 1915. [46] However, he was in fact referring to part of the series of articles which were originally written in 1916, revised in 1917, and published in their revised form in volume three of his collected works. [47]

Aside from the confusion over dates, Trotsky was correct in his 1928 work to point to his earlier acceptance of the law of uneven development when attacked by Stalin as being ignorant of this law. However, one can highlight both continuity and discontinuity in Trotsky's earlier and later usage of the law of uneven development. Continuity is present in the fact that in both 1916 and 1928 the claim was that Europe was ripe for socialist revolution. In 1916 this was substantiated by comparing Europe with Africa and Asia; in 1928 Trotsky argued that European nations were united at a lower level of development from that obtaining in America, with the consequence that revolution would occur in Europe before America. [48] (The political repercussions of this were outlined by Trotsky in a scenario of co-operation between the Russian and European workers, in which Russian food would save the European revolution from attacks by the American bourgeoisie). [49] Discontinuity derived from several differences. First, in 1916 Trotsky simply took over Lenin's relation of unevenness in economic and political development to an absolute law of capitalism. He was subsequently to extend the law of uneven development to a law for the whole history of mankind, and then to talk of its specific operation in the capitalist epoch. Second, in the Nashe Slovo article 'The position of the SocialDemocrat' (April, 1916) Trotsky referred to 'unevenness within the unevenness' without the fullness of definition which is expressed in his later work. There is

no mention of unevenness in tempo and level of development in 1916. Third, in the 1916 text there is no talk of how it is possible to derive a law of combined development from the operation of uneven development since the emergence of capitalism as a world system. Fourth, if in 1916 uneven development allowed revolution initially in one country then, for Trotsky, that country would be Germany, i.e., the most developed of the European nations. At that time Trotsky took the view that if revolution did not occur in other European countries then it would be a "hopeless thought - as witnessed by historical and theoretical considerations - that socialist Germany would be able to withstand bourgeois Russia and France." [50] However, in the revised version of this article published in 1917 Trotsky changed this text to take into account the fact that revolution had broken out first in Russia, i.e., the least developed of the nations under consideration. [51] This difference between the 1916 and 1917 versions was carried through to the 1927-28 writings when uneven development had led to a break in the "weakest link in the imperialist chain." [52] The 1916 article clearly expected a break in the strongest link.

From the 1928 text, which took into account the shift in emphasis from strong to weak links, one is able to derive a linear pattern of successive revolutions - backward countries, Europe, the World - which amounts to a view of revolution as progressing through societies of decreasing

backwardness. This was underpinned by the law of uneven development.

Second is the notion that although backward nations will have proletarian revolutions first, they will arrive at full socialism last. [53] Thus, on the second component of permanent revolution, Trotsky ended by expressing a rigid developmental pattern. This was based upon the law of uneven development.

The second part of permanent revolution is like the first in two respects. First, uneven development is the theory in that it provides the explanation for the necessity of world revolution. Second, it is Russo-centric in that it (eventually in relation to the texts surrounding the 'United States of Europe') took Russia as the starting-point for world revolution. The third part of permanent revolution is unique in that it only received explicit recognition as an element of permanent revolution in Permanent Revolution (1930); and in that it was divorced from Russia.

5. The End of Permanent Revolution

Trotsky claimed that permanent revolution consisted of continuous revolutions until all class distinctions had been abolished. [54] At such a time the need for new

revolutions would be over:

every real revolution....tends to transform itself into a permanent revolution, in other words, not to come to a halt at any of the stages that it reaches, not to confine itself up to the complete transformation of society, up to the final abolition of class distinctions, consequently, up to the complete and final suppression of the very possibility of new revolutions. [55]

Trotsky does not relate this to uneven development, but one can see how such a situation would also mean the end of unevenness. After all, it is uneven development which explains the need for permanent revolution; the elimination of one means the elimination of the other.

Section Two

The first thing to note is that there have been few, if any, coherent analyses of the way in which Trotsky's use of uneven and combined development relates to permanent revolution, highlighting the consequences of this use for permanent revolution's status as a theory. Thus, Deutscher describes uneven and combined development as,

a remarkable historical generalization closely connected with his theory of permanent revolution. [56]

However, he does not say what 'closely connected' means.

Commentaries on Trotsky's writings and the theme of uneven and combined development can be grouped into four categories. First, those which argue that Trotsky gave no clear exposition of the laws of uneven and combined development (D. Romagnolo). Second, those which omit an exposition of uneven and combined development (J. Molyneux, I. Howe, H. Schurer, R. Wistrich). Third, those which focus upon Lenin and uneven development and then compare Trotsky to Lenin (K. Mavrakis). Fourth, those which mention uneven and combined development, but not satisfactorily (B. D. Wolfe, D. Hallas, E. Mandel, B. Knei-Paz).

David Romagnolo [57] claims that the main difficulty in discussing uneven and combined development is that Trotsky, "had never taken the time to write in any detail on the substance of this idea", saying that this defect in Trotsky led him to rely on Novack's, [58] "systematic presentation of Trotsky's rather fragmentary and undeveloped conception." [59] Such a conclusion is drawn by being unfamiliar with Trotsky's works. After all, Novack summarises uneven and combined development in the following manner:

Its primary aspect deals with the different rates of growth among the various elements of social life. The second covers the concrete correlation of these unequally developed factors in the historic process. [60]

Both of these elements are explicitly stated by Trotsky,

and Novack writes that this "process is fully explained by Trotsky in his History of the Russian Revolution", [61] a work which is curiously omitted in Romagnolo's bibliography. [62]

Romagnolo emphasizes the importance which Trotsky placed on the universal nature of capitalism to substantiate a view of Trotsky as representing, "a concrete rejection of Marxism-Leninism". [63] Marxist-Leninism focuses upon the development of the mode of production internal to a society while, contrary to this, Trotsky placed external relations at the centre of his analysis. [64] However, although Trotsky did stress the international character of capitalism, he related this directly to its implications for the development or non-development of productive forces in Russia:

The law of unevenness led to the fact that the contradictions between the technique and property relations of capitalism broke at the weakest link in the world chain. [65]

If Marxism is concerned with the 'internal relations of the production process,' then Trotsky is still a Marxist.

John Molyneux both omits an exposition of uneven and combined development when mentioned, and fails to link uneven and combined development to permanent revolution. [66] This association is implicit in some of what Molyneux writes. For example, he criticizes Second International

Marxism as expressing,

a rigid stages theory of history, which allowed for neither uneven and combined development nor historical 'leaps', but expected all countries to follow mechanically in the footsteps of the most advanced; [67]

and in his appraisal of the significance of permanent revolution comments that permanent revolution was:

a major theoretical breakthrough because it challenged....[the] mechanical economic determinism which attempted to tie progress to socialism to a fixed timetable....Against this Trotsky made an important contribution....the transformation of revolution from a distant and vague aspiration into a determinant of current policy. [68]

Thus, Molyneux's view is that the source of mechanical economic determinism within Second International Marxism was omitting uneven and combined development, and that permanent revolution overcame this mechanical economic determinism. Therefore, Molyneux must be implying some sort of connection between permanent revolution and uneven and combined development. But he does not make this explicit.

Furthermore, ignoring combined development leads Molyneux into making a fundamental error. In Trotsky's work combined development caused the Russian working-class, in political terms, to be ideologically and organisationally advanced vis-a-vis the Western proletariat. Whereas Molyneux states that:

Trotsky's case was that it was precisely the contradiction between economic development and social and political backwardness that made revolution inevitable. [69]

When comparing 1905 with the History of the Russian Revolution Irving Howe [70] writes that:

1905 lacks the sustained narrative line of the History. It does not venture upon the ambitious theoretical generalizations of the History. [71]

The causal relationship between uneven development and combined development, and the consequences of these for Russia's social, economic and political development, was expounded by Trotsky in the History of the Russian Revolution. Given this, Howe might be referring to uneven and combined development when talking of the 'ambitious theoretical generalizations of the History'. But he does not define his thesis. What is certain is that Howe never mentions uneven and combined development.

Even when focussing only on an exposition of the main themes of 1905, Howe misses the importance of finance capital within Trotsky's analysis. Howe claims that Trotsky explained the centralized autocratic state and the lack of a strong indigenous Russian bourgeoisie by: "the special backwardness and isolation of Russian society." [72] However, in the first chapter of 1905 Trotsky emphasizes the connections between Russia and Europe:

It is difficult to say how the life of the Russian state would be composed if it had developed in isolation, only under the influence of its own internal tendencies. It is sufficient that this was not so. Russian social life was at that time - and the further, the greater - under the incessant pressure of the more developed social and state relations of Western Europe. [73]

In particular, Trotsky focuses on how Tsarism financed itself from the European stock exchange. Trotsky explicitly located the intensified growth of the Russian autocratic state on the influx of capital from the Western European money markets. [74] Similarly, for Trotsky, it was European finance capital which prevented the growth of a powerful Russian bourgeoisie. [75] First, European capital created Russian industry almost instantaneously. This meant that the Russian towns did not experience a gradual emergence and the concomitant period of artisanal trade which, according to Trotsky, was necessary for the establishment of a bourgeois democracy. Second, European finance capital benefited the European bourgeoisie and this left the Russian middle classes without any political influence. There was no harmony of interest within the international bourgeoisie. The Western capitalists had a vested interest in the survival of Tsarism - it guaranteed the rates of interest which they demanded.

Heinz Schurer's [76] main source for his interpretation of permanent revolution is Results and Prospects (1906). However, Schurer does write of Trotsky's later usage of combined development to explain the nature of Russia's

social and political development. [77] The fact that the explanation of permanent revolution becomes something other than a specific 'theory of permanent revolution' is approached, but not pursued. Moreover, Schurer does not refer the reader to any work by Trotsky in which combined development is expounded; nor does he give an example of the consequences for where explanation resides in Trotsky's presentation after the introduction of combined development. One example could have been the change from a view of the Soviets as spontaneous organizations consciously created by the proletariat, to the Soviets as a product of combined development..[78] Furthermore, uneven development is not mentioned; the relationship between uneven development and combined development is not explored.

Robert Wistrich [79] mentions uneven development only with reference to Lenin. Wistrich first cites Trotsky as arguing for a republican United States of Europe as a prelude to a republican United States of the World. Then Wistrich posits Lenin in opposition to such a notion if this idea meant that a Russian revolution would occur only as part of wider, simultaneous revolutions in all European nations. Wistrich gives no source for Lenin's usage of uneven development which is probably the following:

The unevenness of economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence it follows that it is possible for socialism to triumph initially in several or even

in one, taken separately, capitalist country.
[80]

Wistrich's failure to accredit uneven and combined development to Trotsky is surprising. The quote from Trotsky which Wistrich uses when giving an exposition of Trotsky and the republican United States of Europe is taken from Chapter Four of Isaac Deutscher's The Age of Permanent Revolution: A Trotsky Anthology. [81] In the very next chapter of Deutscher's book is a section entitled, 'The Law of Uneven and Combined Development'. One would have expected anyone concerned with Lenin and uneven development to take an interest in anything which linked Trotsky to uneven development, especially when he is writing a book on Trotsky. So Wistrich either did not read the whole of the anthology, or missed the contents of Chapter Five if he did.

Furthermore, if Wistrich did read Chapter Five then even more surprising is his inability to relate uneven and combined development to permanent revolution. For Deutscher prefaces the quotation from Trotsky's History of the Russian Revolution, Volume 1 - cited to illustrate Trotsky's usage of uneven and combined development - with a section in which he claims a close connection between uneven and combined development and permanent revolution. Even if Wistrich ignored Deutscher's preface to the quote one would still have expected him to connect uneven and combined development with permanent revolution. Simply

checking the title of the Trotsky chapter which Deutscher is quoting from - 'Peculiarities of Russia's Development' - should have led Wistrich to link uneven and combined development with permanent revolution. After all, Wistrich does stress the importance of Trotsky's recognition of Russian peculiarities when offering his interpretation of Trotsky and permanent revolution:

The theory of permanent revolution....Trotsky derived this conviction from a remarkable analysis of the 'peculiar character' of the Russian revolution which had been determined by a social and historical development sharply diverging from the Western model....Trotsky's revolutionary strategy, because it recognized the peculiarities of Russian historical development, did prove to have a greater predictive power than any other Marxist theory formulated before 1917. [82]

Kostas Mavrakis [83] argues that Trotsky accepted Lenin's usage of uneven development. However, for Mavrakis, Trotsky did not agree with two implications of the law. First, that:

with wars breaking out among the imperialist countries for the division of the world, the revolution can triumph first in a relatively backward country (the weakest link) such as Russia. [84]

Second, that:

The uneven ripening of the conditions for a revolutionary explosion excludes its simultaneous occurrence in every country. [85]

In making such claims Mavrakis involves himself in a

fundamental misrepresentation of Trotsky. First, Mavrakis merely asserts that Trotsky followed Lenin on uneven development without: (a) giving an exposition of Lenin and uneven development; (b) saying what Trotsky meant by uneven development; and (c) writing that Trotsky differed from Lenin in deriving a law of combined development from uneven development.

Second, Trotsky was quite explicit in talking of how uneven and combined development led to a proletarian revolution occurring first in Russia. This analysis involved the proposition that:

The proletariat of Czarist Russia could not have taken power in October if Russia had not been a link - the weakest link, but a link, nevertheless - in the chain of the world economy. [86]

And Tsarist Russia was the weakest link because the nature of combined development in Russia led to a correlation of class forces which was most favourable for proletarian revolution. Furthermore, when Lenin used the law of uneven development in 1915, he did not extrapolate a revolution in Russia on the basis of Russia being the weakest link in the imperialist chain. What Lenin did say was:

The victorious proletariat of this country, having expropriated the capitalists and having organized socialist production at home, would arise against the external capitalist world and attract to themselves the oppressed classes of other countries....It is impossible to freely

unite nations in socialism without a more or less prolonged, stubborn struggle of the socialist republics with the backward states. [87]

Third, Trotsky thought that revolution would proceed non-simultaneously. His schema for revolution involved emergence on the national arena, development on the international arena, and completion on the world arena. Trotsky spoke variously of the export of the Russian revolution to Europe, and co-operation between the Russian and European proletariat in the struggle for revolution in America.

Mavrakis contradicts himself when, fourteen pages after making the above accusations, he accepts that Trotsky thought that imperialism would be broken at its weakest link. However, Mavrakis tries to change this into a view of Trotsky as emphasizing advanced links. This attempt is substantiated by two further claims. The first that Trotsky granted, "an exorbitant privilege to the proletarians in the advanced countries in his idea of world revolution." [88] The second that Trotsky thus inverted Marx's opinion of the necessity for the liberation of workers in backward countries (Ireland) as the prelude to the liberation of workers in advanced countries (Britain). [89]

Once again Mavrakis is being unfair to Trotsky. After all, for Trotsky, it was the Russian workers who were to be the inspiration to the proletariat of Western Europe; it was

the Russian workers who would ensure that the American bourgeoisie could not starve the European proletariat into submission. On this issue Trotsky was far from being advanced-centric. Moreover, in his writings on China, Trotsky wrote of the connections between the development of proletarian revolution there and the prospects for proletarian revolution in England:

The war of China for its national independence is a progressive war, because it flows from the necessities of the economic and cultural development of China itself, as well as because it facilitates the development of the revolution of English proletariat and that of the whole world proletariat. [90]

Bertram D. Wolfe [91] claims that the law of combined development led Trotsky to make further "innumerable deductions, inferences, corollaries, and obiter dicta."

[92] He then cites a passage from Volume One of History of the Russian Revolution as being a typical example of this.

[93] In this passage Trotsky stated that the following formula constituted a law: the more liberal and tolerant a revolutionary government is to the forces of reaction, the more it is conservative and connected to the past; the more the revolutionary government destroys the old order, the more revolutionary and concentrated will its dictatorship be. From examining the meaning of 'tolerant', 'reaction' etc one could deduce the above formulation and claim the status of a law for it without needing to have any knowledge of a law of combined development. One would be on firmer ground by associating

the two laws as examples of Trotsky's way of expressing his thoughts in the form of 'laws'. This could be done under the category of 'obiter dicta', i.e., an incidental statement. But Wolfe is claiming something stronger. Namely, that the content of the law of combined development led to the formulation of another law. He might be implying the 'obiter dicta' interpretation given above, but he does not explicitly say so. Moreover, the fact that Trotsky was putting his ideas in the form of laws before he mentioned a law of combined development would still leave Wolfe with the problem of showing how the law of combined development led Trotsky to formulate another law, even if the two are related in the weak sense of being 'laws'. The results of Wolfe's interpretation are ambiguity and confusion.

Duncan Hallas [94] offers an exposition of uneven and combined development, although flawed. For Hallas uneven and combined development amounted to an interaction between capitalist powers and their colonies in which the backward nations were kept at a pre-industrial level of development:

the greater part of the world's population had not only not advanced socially and economically, but had been thrown backwards. [95]

On this view any gap which existed between advanced and backward nations would progressively increase. However, contrary to what Hallas says, in Trotsky's presentation

uneven and combined development had led to a levelling process between countries in which the distances between absolute measures of progress in culture and economics in the advanced and backward societies had diminished over time. Second, Trotsky did think that a society which had been subject to uneven and combined development had also experienced some economic advance. This is at the centre of combined development which consists of the introduction of the latest economic and technological practices into an archaic society.

Hallas is also confused on the nature of the relationship between uneven development and combined development. Hallas writes that the,

uneven development of capitalism leads to a combined development. [96]

But uneven development is the state of unevenness - which preceded capitalism - plus capitalism. The importance of capitalism as a constituent element of uneven development is that it is universal and acts on the state of unevenness to bring about a levelling process. It is out of this levelling process that combined development comes, and it is in this sense that combined development is derived from uneven development. And given that capitalism is one part of uneven development there is no 'uneven development of capitalism' as such within Trotsky's writings. There is, however, unevenness within

the levelling process, so that a feature of combined development is the uneven development of the levelling process caused by uneven development. This is what Trotsky calls 'unevenness within the unevenness' and what Hallas has labelled the 'uneven development of capitalism'. Thus, contrary to Hallas, the 'uneven development of capitalism' does not cause combined development. Rather the 'uneven development of capitalism' is an aspect of combined development.

Ernest Mandel [97] does see uneven and combined development as related to permanent revolution. Focussing upon the issue of world revolution he writes that,

Underpinning this notion of world revolution is obviously the concept of world economy and class struggle as a totality subject to uneven and combined development. [98]

However, this statement requires elaboration and clarification. Mandel does this poorly. He gives an exposition of Trotsky's claim that the Russian revolution would give a fillip to revolutions in other countries. In this way, the socialist revolution would start on the national arena, moving to completion on the international and, finally, the world arena. For Mandel, uneven and combined development underpins world revolution in this way. In illustrating this he thus uses 'permanent revolution as political programme', as defined in section one of this paper. However, in Trotsky's writings, the

way in which uneven and combined development provides the reasons for the necessity of world revolution is quite different from what Mandel writes. For example, for Trotsky, uneven development itself can be overcome only through the integration of all economies on a world, socialist, basis. Overcoming uneven development is important because then productive forces can develop freely and harmoniously. By concentrating on the idea of the Russian revolution acting as an impetus to forces of world socialist revolution Mandel misses this point entirely.

Moreover, Mandel's exposition of uneven and combined development is confused. He begins by talking about backward countries being unable to develop in the imperialist epoch because, "there was no more space for new big industrial powers on the capitalist world market." [99] He then claims to express this in Trotsky's own words by quoting History of the Russian Revolution, Volume One, Chapter One, where Trotsky explains how uneven and combined development relate to each other. [100] However, there is no connection between the passage cited and Mandel's previous argument. The link could have been made by quoting from The Revolution Betrayed. It was here that Trotsky claimed that the law of combined development meant that Russia could not develop for long on a capitalist basis. [101]

In The Social and Political Thought of Leon Trotsky (1978)

Baruch Knei-Paz describes combined development as a "sociological generalization" which, in Trotsky's work, was

meant to be linked directly -and was so linked in his writings- to a theory of the Russian revolution, specifically to what came to be known as 'the theory of permanent revolution'. [102]

However, Knei-Paz does not cite any passage from Trotsky in which the relationship between combined development and a specific 'theory of permanent revolution' was discussed. Furthermore, four pages later, Knei-Paz claims a distinction between combined development and permanent revolution. The proposed dichotomy takes the form of viewing combined development as a sociological and historical analysis of change which creates "disharmony, instability and a political situation which is potentially explosive"; and permanent revolution as the political analysis which "will show that these problems can be resolved only by revolution". [103]

So far this is compatible with the interpretation of Trotsky given in the first section if Knei-Paz is saying that permanent revolution, as a product of political analysis, amounted to a political programme which posited: (i) that the revolution in Russia, because of a particular correlation of class forces, would succeed as a proletarian revolution; (ii) that the proletariat in power

would implement socialist policies; and (iii) that this specifically Russian revolution would need to export revolution to the world in order for socialism to be fully constructed. The explanation for the pre-revolutionary balance of class forces, the radical ideology of the proletariat, the need for world revolution and how it will proceed is at the level of uneven and combined development. It is quite correct to posit a distinction between combined development and permanent revolution if one is clear on where explanation resides. But in presenting an exposition of permanent revolution under this framework Knei-Paz ends in contradiction. The source of this contradiction is Knei-Paz's claim that it is permanent revolution which provides the explanation of the Russian revolution. This view cannot be sustained because, in Trotsky's work, explanation is located at the level of uneven and combined development.

This is implicit in what Knei-Paz writes. For example, in the material devoted to permanent revolution (Chapter 4) Knei-Paz stresses the importance, for Trotsky, of the strategic position of the Russian proletariat in its pre-revolutionary industrial environment as the source of its revolutionary strength. [104] But the explanation, in Trotsky, for the creation of this situation is given by Knei-Paz in the preceding chapter which discusses combined development. The earlier chapter also includes an exposition of the effects of combined development in

producing a particular correlation of class forces within pre-revolutionary Russian society. [105] And it was the nature of the relative strengths of classes that, for Trotsky, made possible a successful proletarian revolution in Russia. So explanation resides at what Knei-Paz has labelled the level of sociological generalization, i.e., combined development. But Knei-Paz does not consider the implications of this for permanent revolution's status as a theory, writing that the consequences of combined development would

constitute the basis for Trotsky's reformulation of the Marxist theory of revolution. [106]

And, for Knei-Paz, this reformulation - permanent revolution - was, according to Trotsky, the explanation of the Russian revolution. But the political analysis, as expressed by Trotsky, was a political programme consisting of several propositions which in themselves had no explanatory value. Trotsky summarised permanent revolution as follows:

the task of strategic prognosis is not to deduce the concrete stages and episodes but to formulate the basic tendency of revolutionary development. This basic tendency is indicated by the formula of the permanent revolution, which is....Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the bourgeois democratic revolution passes over into the socialist revolution, which can triumph completely only as a link in the world revolution. [107]

Interpreting Trotsky's writings in their entirety means

that if one wants to maintain a view of permanent revolution as a 'theory' one has to show that permanent revolution explains something which uneven and combined development does not. But this is just not tenable. The distinction which Knei-Paz constructs cannot be sustained. After quoting a passage from Trotsky's History of the Russian Revolution, in which it is stated that combined development offers 'a key to the fundamental riddle of the Russian revolution', Knei-Paz ends by mixing terms saying,

Perhaps....Trotsky should have named it [permanent revolution] from the outset the theory of the 'combined revolution' [108]

However, Knei-Paz argues that combined development is used by Trotsky in all his writings from Results and Prospects onwards: "the later use of the term does not represent a new concept but simply the naming of an old one." [109] It is correct to claim that elements of the law of combined development, as expounded by Trotsky in History of the Russian Revolution, are to be found in Results and Prospects. For example, the importance of the meeting of backward and advanced forms on the international arena for the internal development of Russia; the role of the effects of finance capital as the means of interaction; capitalism as a world wide system; and the disappearance of the minimum into the maximum programme, are expressed in the 1906 work.

But these elements are not incorporated into a coherent

framework (consisting of an explicit presentation of laws of uneven development, combined development and how they relate to each other) which illustrates how those elements result from the operation of laws of development. It is the existence of this in History of the Russian Revolution, missing from Results and Prospects, which differentiates Trotsky's usage of the law of combined development from that which can be highlighted in his earlier writings as being a precursor to the law. There is both continuity and discontinuity in Trotsky. For example, in 1906, Trotsky explains why the minimum programme of Social-Democracy will collapse into the maximum with reference to the "very logic" of the proletariat in power. A proletarian hegemony in government equals socialist policies. But from where does the radical ideology of the Russian proletariat originate? Thus far there are no a priori reasons to substantiate Trotsky's conclusion. After all, Trotsky himself informs that others thought that a workers' executive could limit itself to bourgeois policies. Explanation for the predominance of Marxism in the working class is lacking in 1906, but is given - as an effect of combined development - in 1931.

Similarly, one can point to Trotsky's reference, in 1906, to the bourgeois democratic stage of the revolution growing uninterrupted into socialism as a combined development, of sorts. But, viewing Trotsky's writings as

a whole, this instance becomes an example of an effect of the operation of the law of combined development and, as such, occupies a lower level in the explanatory structure. It is only possible to read of the Russian revolution passing straight from the bourgeois democratic to the socialist stage as a consequence of the operation of laws of development after History of the Russian Revolution was written:

It is at first sight paradoxical that the first sacrifice for sins of the world-system was the bourgeoisie of a backward country but, in fact, the phenomenon was quite to be expected [zakonomeren]. [110]

It is clear that in the context of the History that zakonomernost' refers to the laws of uneven and combined development. And these laws were not mentioned in 1906. In Results and Prospects one can discover a description of a combined formation, in History of the Russian Revolution one finds combined development acting at a higher level as the explanation for that concrete example. Notions of continuity come from the same point at issue, and the conclusions surrounding it, being expressed in the early and the later texts, ideas about discontinuity originate from the shift in explanation.

In his latest (1988) article on permanent revolution Knei-Paz has changed his interpretation, in that permanent revolution becomes the 'sociological analysis'. Given that in his 1978 work it is implicit that, in Trotsky,

explanation for the Russian revolution is located at the level of 'sociological generalization' (combined development), and that Knei-Paz maintains that permanent revolution is a theory, it is perhaps not surprising that he has shifted terminology in this manner.

However, in the sentence devoted to the relationship between permanent revolution and uneven and combined development, it is still implicit that explanation for the Russian revolution is at the level of uneven and combined development. Knei-Paz writes that,

The theory of permanent revolution is rather a sociological analysis of the peculiarities of Russian history which...had evolved in accordance with what Trotsky called 'the law of uneven and combined development' [111]

If phenomena develop 'in accordance with' (i.e., in harmony) something called a 'law', then explanation for the nature of that phenomena must, in some sense, be located at the level of the 'law'. After all, if a 'law' is not defined within certain boundaries it encompasses every possibility and accounts for nothing. Given this, in regard to explanation, the content of the law, in relation to the nature of the phenomena in question, has higher explanatory value. Explanation ultimately resides with the law.

This is implicit in what Knei-Paz writes. For example, according to Knei-Paz, Russian development, for Trotsky,

was

uneven, because economic and social change was intensive but narrow, disrupting yet circumscribed; combined, because the consequent contradictions and anomalies necessitated policies which drew together the backward and the modern. [112]

So, the contradictions of uneven development made necessary conscious actions on the part of those in control of Russian state policy which, in turn, created a coexistence of modern and backward elements in Russian society. Thus far we have a hierarchy of explanation with uneven development at the top and combined development at the bottom. This is because combined development is dependent upon the existence of the contradictions emanating from uneven development. Knei-Paz then goes on to outline the specific nature of the 'necessitated policies', i.e., combined development. These amounted to,

a significant working class, large urban centres, a revolutionary intelligentsia and radical political demands and activities, even while leaving virtually untouched the predominantly agrarian and primitive character of Russian society. [113]

It was the contradiction between these two elements - the modern and the backward - which, Knei-Paz informs us, made Trotsky believe that

the only resolution...was not a bourgeois revolution but a 'permanent', i.e., uninterrupted, revolution combining bourgeois-democratic goals with the more advanced

proletarian-socialist aspirations [114]

If one extrapolates from what is implicit in Knei-Paz, there clearly emerges a hierarchy of explanation in Trotsky. Therefore, on this point, Knei-Paz's exposition can be viewed as being in agreement with the interpretation in section one. What needs to be explained is Trotsky's political assertion that, in Russia, a successful revolution would be both proletarian and socialist. The political prognosis was substantiated by reference to the nature of pre-revolutionary Russian society in which there existed a fundamental contradiction between modern and backward elements. In terms of locating explanation, the question to ask is, 'what creates the fundamental contradiction?' The answer - combined development. We have climbed a step in the explanatory ladder. The next puzzle is, 'from where does combined development originate?' The solution - uneven development. In Trotsky's presentation we have reached the top of the explanatory ladder.

However, Knei-Paz's definition of the relationship between uneven development and combined development is not in accord with that in Trotsky's texts. Combined development did not result from the unevenness internal to Russian society causing contradictions which necessitated a conscious state programme which drew together advanced and anachronistic forms. On the contrary combined development, according to Trotsky, was derived from a law

of uneven development - from which separate countries had unequal rates and levels of development - operating in the capitalist and imperialist epoch from which individual nations were placed into a system of inter-relationships. In this interaction the most modern elements were implanted into the most backward environments. It was from this that combined development emerged, a process over which the backward nation had no control. We can see that a crucial point in this analysis is the fact that, for Trotsky, countries were drawn into a system which inexorably bound them together:

Capitalism....prepares and, in a certain sense brings about the universality and permanency of mankind's development. This eliminates the possibility of a recurrence of forms of development in different nations. Forced by the pressure of the advanced countries, backward countries do not keep to that order: the privilege of historical backwardness - and such a privilege exists - allows, or rather compels the acquisition ahead of previous allotted times, leaping over a number of intermediate stages. Savages replace their bows for rifles at once, without following the path which lay between these weapons in the past....The development of a historically backward nation leads, of necessity, to a peculiar combination of the different stages of the historical process. Their orbit, as a whole, acquires a haphazard, complex, combined character. [115]

These interconnections do not emerge from Knei-Paz's presentation because he omits the law of uneven development in the capitalist era. Without this one cannot begin to talk of how Trotsky derived combined development from uneven development.

** ** ** ** **

In conclusion, analysing Trotsky's writings in their entirety means that one cannot talk of 'permanent revolution' as theory. Theory implies explanation; and Trotsky's explanation for the Russian revolution, i.e., the proletariat taking power before the bourgeoisie, and for the necessity of world revolution was the operation of laws of uneven and combined development. The notion of 'permanent revolution' can be retained, but as a political programme devoid of explanatory value.

1. L. Trotsky, Nasha revolyutsiya, (St. Petersburg, 1906), p 246.
2. L. Trotsky, 'Nashi raznoglasiya' (1908) in 1905, (Moscow, 1922), pp 280 & 272.
3. L. Trotsky, 'Uroki oktyabrya', 1917, Sochineniya, Vol. 3, (Moscow, nd), pp xvi-xvii. See also Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii, Vol. 1, (Berlin, 1931), p 506.
4. Ibid.
5. L. Trotsky, 'Nashi raznoglasiya', p 315.
6. Trotsky first used the law of uneven development in 1916 when defending the slogan of a 'United States of Europe' from Lenin's critique. For this usage, and how it was to differ when re-introduced into his later writings, see pp 23-26 of this chapter and note 48. For Lenin's critique see note 44.
7. L. Trotsky, The Third International after Lenin (1928), (New York, 1957) p 19. See also VII Meeting of the Enlarged ECCI, IPC (6 January 1927); Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii, Vol. 3, (Berlin, 1933), p 453; Chto takoe SSSR i kuda on idet ? (1936), (Paris, 1971), p 240.
8. See, for example, J. Stalin, Collected Works, Vol. 8, (London, 1954), pp 227-232; 264-269; 326-330; Collected Works, Vol. 9, (London, 1954), pp 30-36.
9. L. Trotsky, VII Meeting of the Enlarged ECCI.
10. L. Trotsky, The Third International after Lenin, p 19 & VII Meeting of the Enlarged ECCI.
11. L. Trotsky, Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii, Vol. 1, p 22. Max Eastman inserted the word 'culture' into the sentence 'Under the whip of external necessity their backward culture is compelled to make leaps.' (History of the Russian Revolution, London, 1967, Vol. 1, p 23.) In 'Uneven Development and the role of American Imperialism' (March 4, 1933), (Writings, 1932-33, New York, 1972, pp. 116-121) Trotsky stated that combined development is an attempt to explain uneven development by way of being a formula which highlights the consequences of uneven development.
12. Ibid., p 513. Here Eastman mistranslated the first sentence of this passage. His version reads: 'The Russian state encountered the military organisation of Western nations standing on a higher political and

cultural level' (Vol. 1, p 432). This is ambiguous in that it is not clear whether it is the 'Russian state' or the 'military organisation of the Western nations' which stands on a higher political and cultural level. If Eastman means the 'military organisation of the Western nations', then Trotsky's logic is faulty: it does not automatically follow that just because a country is politically and culturally backward it will be so in the economic field. If we read the sentence and conclude that it was the Russian state which was politically and economically advanced, then this would not be in harmony with Trotsky's earlier assertion that Russia was politically and economically backward. It is possible that Eastman omitted the word 'economic' from the first sentence -there in the original- because then Trotsky would have been presented as contradicting himself in this sense. However, Trotsky did write that the West was politically, culturally, and economically advanced when compared to the levels of Russian development, his logic did not need saving. As Trotsky wrote: "I carry no responsibility for the interpretations of Max Eastman. I hope that my readers will understand my ideas better than my translator" (Writings, 1936-37, New York, 1970, p 212.)

13. L. Trotsky, The Third International after Lenin, p 20.
14. L. Trotsky, Permanentnaya revolyutsiya, (Berlin, 1930), p 125.
15. L. Trotsky, Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii, Vol. 3, p 350.
16. L. Trotsky, Chto takoe SSSR i Kuda on idet ?, p 300.
17. L. Trotsky, In Defence of the October Revolution (Nov. 1932), (London, 1971), p 12.
18. L. Trotsky, Stalin, Vol. 2 (1941), (Vermont, 1985), p 283. Emphasis added.
19. L. Trotsky, Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii, Vol. 1, p 507.
20. L. Trotsky, 1905, p 23 & The Chinese Revolution: Problems and Perspectives (1938), (New York, 1969), p 3.
21. L. Trotsky, Chto takoe SSSR i kuda on idet ?, p 9.

22. L. Trotsky, Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii, Vol. 1, p 28.
23. K. Marx, Das Kapital, (Hamburg, 1867), p ix.
24. Trotsky claimed that the same mixture of advanced industry with backward consciousness arose in America as an effect of the operation of combined development there. See, 'Uneven Development and the role of American Imperialism', p. 117.
25. L. Trotsky, Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii, Vol. 1, p 31. From reading only the Max Eastman translation of this passage one would miss Trotsky's view of the Communist Party as playing a vanguard role: "...the revolution in the course of a few months placed the proletariat and the Communist Party in power." (Vol. 1, p 31.)
26. L. Trotsky, 'Nashi raznoglasiya', p 284. See also Nasha revolyutsiya, pp 249-259.
27. L. Trotsky, 'Predislovie k pervomu izdaniyu', 1905, p 7.
28. L. Trotsky, Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii, Vol. 1, p 28.
29. Ibid., pp 26-27.
30. L. Trotsky, The Third International after Lenin, p 40.
31. L. Trotsky, Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii, Vol. 3, pp 461-462. See also Permanentnaya revolyutsiya, pp 141-142.
32. L. Trotsky, The Third International after Lenin, pp 58-59.
33. Ibid., p 58.
34. Ibid., p 21.
35. The following exposition of Stalin's conception of the law of uneven development is based mainly upon J. Stalin, Collected Works, Vol. 8, pp 326-330; and Collected Works, Vol. 9, pp 105-116.
36. Ibid., p 110.
37. For the reasons for Stalin's belief that socialism had been created in the USSR see J. Stalin, Collected

Works, Vol. 8, pp 311-321; for the internal/external contradiction example see Ibid.: pp 264-278.

38. L. Trotsky, Permanentnaya revolyutsiya, p 167.
39. L. Trotsky, 'Nashi raznoglasiya', p 286.
40. L. Trotsky, Nasha revolyutsiya, p 285.
41. L. Trotsky, Problems of the Chinese Revolution (1928), (New York, 1932), p 176.
42. L. Trotsky, The Bolsheviki & World Peace (1918), (New York, 1918), p 28.
43. L. Trotsky, 'Nash" politicheskii lozung', Nashe Slovo, No. 23, 24th February, 1915.
44. The relevant passage from Lenin is as follows: "The unevenness of economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence it follows that it is possible for socialism to triumph initially in several or even in one, taken separately, distinct capitalist country" (V. I. Lenin, O lozunge soedinennykh shtatov Evropy, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Vol. 26, Moscow, 1961, p 354).
45. L. Trotsky, 'Pozitsiya sotsialdemokrata', Nashe Slovo, No. 87 (474), 12th April, 1916.
46. L. Trotsky, The Third International after Lenin, pp 14-16.
47. There is no complete collection of Nashe Slovo on microfilm. The original 1916 articles that I found were published on the following dates in that year: 29th January, No. 24 (411); 30th January, No. 25 (412); 3rd February, No. 28 (415); 11th April, No. 86 (473); 12th April, No. 87 (474). The revised 1917 versions of these articles are to be found on pp 70-94 of Vol. 3, (1917) Part 1 (Ot fevralya do oktyabrya) of Trotsky's Sochineniya, and on pp 459-82 of Vol. 2 of the collection Viona i revolyutsiya (Moscow, 1924). An English translation of the 1917 version is available on pp 2-21 of The Zimmerwald Manifesto (Ceylon, 1951). This work also makes the mistake of attributing the original articles to 1915-16.
48. Trotsky was to return to the idea of a 'United States of Europe' between the years 1916-17 and 1928 in the article 'O svoevremennosti lozunga "soedinennye shataty Evropy"' originally published in Pravda, No.

144, June 1923, and reprinted on pp 367-372 of Osnovnye voprosy proletarskoi revolyutsii, Sochineniya, Vol. 12, (Moscow, nd). This article is similar to the 1928 argument in that it stresses revolution as progressing from a backward country (Russia), through Europe (France and Germany), and then to America. However, while it is obvious that Trotsky is taking into account the fact that countries stand at different, uneven levels of development, the scenario for the progression of revolution is stated without explicit use of a law of uneven development or the notion of 'unevenness within the unevenness.' This distinguishes the 1923 article from both the 1916-17 and 1928 texts. The 1923 work differs from the 1916 article by focussing on weak links.

49. L. Trotsky, 'Radio, nauka, tekhnika i obshchestvo', Kul'tura perekhodnogo perioda, Sochineniya, Vol. 21, (Moscow, 1927), pp 422-423. See also: Osnovnye voprosy proletarskoi revolyutsii, pp 368 & 370.
50. L. Trotsky, 'Pozitsiya sotsialdemokrata.'
51. The 1917 version of the previous citation reads that it would be a "hopeless thought - as witnessed and experienced by history and theoretical considerations - that, for example, revolutionary Russia would be able to stand before the face of conservative Europe."
52. L. Trotsky, VII Meeting of the Enlarged ECCI
53. L. Trotsky, Permanentnaya revolyutsiya, p 168.
54. Ibid., pp 14-16.
55. L. Trotsky, Problems of the Chinese Revolution, p 163.
56. I. Deutscher, The Age of Permanent Revolution: A Trotsky Anthology, (New York, 1964), p 84.
57. D. Romagnolo, 'The So-Called 'Law' of Uneven and Combined Development', Latin American Perspectives, Spring 1975, pp 7-31.
58. G. Novack, Uneven and Combined Development in History, (New York, 1966).
59. D. Romagnolo, Op. cit., p 8.
60. G. Novack, Op. cit., p 5.

61. Ibid., p 8.
62. D. Romagnolo, Op. cit., p 31.
63. Ibid., p 30.
64. Ibid., pp 18-19, 30.
65. L. Trotsky, Chto takoe SSSR i kuda on idet ?, p 246.
See also Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii, Vol. 3, pp 415-416.
66. J. Molyneux, Leon Trotsky's Theory of Revolution, (Sussex, 1981), espec. Introduction and Chapter One.
67. Ibid., p 6.
68. Ibid., p 40.
69. Ibid., p 39.
70. I. Howe, Trotsky, (Sussex, 1978), espec. Chapter One.
71. Ibid., p 27.
72. Ibid., p 30.
73. L. Trotsky, 1905, p 17.
74. Ibid., p 19.
75. Ibid., for example see pp 46-47; 56.
76. H. Schurer, 'The Permanent Revolution: Lev Trotsky' in L. Labedz (ed), Revisionism, (London, 1962), pp 67-76.
77. Ibid., p 71.
78. Cmp. Nasha revolyutsiya, pp 242-243 & Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii, Vol. 1, p 31.
79. R. S. Wistrich, Trotsky, (London, 1979), espec. Chapter Four.
80. V. I. Lenin, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Vol. 26, p 354.
81. R. S. Wistrich, Op. cit., pp 76-77; 219.
82. Ibid., pp 53-62.

83. K. Mavrakis, On Trotskyism, (London, 1976).
84. Ibid., p 25.
85. Ibid.
86. L. Trotsky, The Third International after Lenin, p 51. See also In Defence of the October Revolution, (London, 1971), pp 9-10.
87. V. I. Lenin, Op. cit., pp 354-355.
88. K. Mavrakis, Op. cit., p 39.
89. Ibid.
90. L. Trotsky, Problems of the Chinese Revolution, p 26.
91. B. D. Wolfe, 'Leon Trotsky as Historian', Slavic Review, Vol 20, No. 3, 1961, pp 495-502.
92. Ibid., p 499
93. L. Trotsky, Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii, Vol. 1, p 267.
94. D. Hallas, Trotsky's Marxism, (London, 1979), espec. Chapter One.
95. Ibid., p 8.
96. Ibid., p 17.
97. E. Mandel, Trotsky. A Study in the Dynamism of His Thought, (London, 1979), espec. Chapters One-Three.
98. Ibid., p 34.
99. Ibid., p 14.
100. L. Trotsky, Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii, Vol. 1, p 22.
101. L. Trotsky, Chto takoe SSSR i kuda on idet ?, p 9.
102. B. Knei-Paz, The Social and Political Thought of Leon Trotsky, (Oxford, 1978), p 94.
103. Ibid., p 98.
104. Ibid., pp 118-122.
105. Ibid., pp 72-80 ff.

106. Ibid., p 86.
107. L. Trotsky, Writings 1933-34, (New York, 1972), pp 164-165.
108. B. Knei-Paz, Op. Cit., p 165.
109. Ibid., p 89.
110. L. Trotsky, Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii, Vol. 3, p 416.
111. B. Knei-Paz, 'Permanent revolution' in H. Shukman (ed) The Basil Blackwell Encyclopedia of the Russian Revolution, (Oxford, 1988), p 199. Emphasis added.
112. Ibid.
113. Ibid.
114. Ibid.
115. L. Trotsky, Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii, Vol. 1, p 21.

Chapter Two

Recent Soviet Writings on Leon Trotsky

In the Soviet press there has recently been a minor explosion of articles on Leon Trotsky. This has also included the republication of some of Trotsky's writings - so far mainly in the form of extracts from individual works - some of which are appearing in the Soviet Union for the first time. These writings and republications are part and parcel of an opening-up of Soviet historiography generated by the processes of reconstruction. [1] Specifically, this has meant the application of several principles to the study of history. First, that to present a one-sided view of the past is to damage the present. History provides lessons for today and tomorrow. Therefore, historical half-truths deny the possibilities that one can derive from historical study. Second, it follows from this that the Soviet people both have a right to know and to have access to all works from a particular period. Third, the contemporary processes of democratization demand and require an honest reevaluation of the past. These attitudes are nicely illustrated by a reader's letter to Izvestiya which complained of the absence of Trotsky's name from the fourth edition of the Soviet Encyclopedic Dictionary (1987). Such practices are criticised as an example of a Stalinist logic which says 'if there's a person, there's a problem. If there's no person, there's no problem.' For this reader,

[the] old tendency - to make the presence of a given name in encyclopedias dependent on the leadership and its attitude to the name - should be made a thing of the past. It's time to give

up hiding the truth from the people. [2]

In such an atmosphere one might expect a diversity of opinions to arise around Trotsky as much as on any other topic. This has indeed been the case, and the main focus of this paper will be to show how Soviet views on Trotsky are moving away from old stereotypes, i.e., that Trotsky was anti-communist and anti-proletarian. This view of Trotsky can be illustrated by summarising the official version of Trotsky's death in Pravda (24 August 1940): that Trotsky was killed by one of his own supporters by the methods of assassination and betrayal which he taught to others; that he died an enemy of the working-class. In his article 'Liquidation: who killed Trotsky and why' N. A. Vasetskii questions this account of Trotsky's assassination. [3] He assesses the contents of the notes which were discovered in Mercader's raincoat after the assassination. These claimed that Mercader killed Trotsky for partly political (his disappointment with Trotsky as a great revolutionary leader; Trotsky had tried to recruit him for terrorist acts in the USSR), and partly personal (Trotsky's supposed objections to Mercader's marriage to Agelof) reasons.

Vasetskii demolishes this case. The notes, he makes clear, were an obvious attempt to place full responsibility for the crime on Mercader using spurious ideological and personal considerations. Mercader justified his claim that Trotsky failed to meet his

criteria of a great revolutionary by asking the question: 'from where did Trotsky receive funds for the maintenance of his villa?' Vasetskii finds this reason totally unconvincing. It is pointed out that Trotsky had known Mercader for less than three months, and that their meetings lasted for less than an hour. Would Trotsky really have entrusted someone of such short acquaintance with a dangerous mission to the USSR? Even if he would, what could have been planned in conversations of such short duration? On the problem of Mercader's personal life it is doubted that Trotsky was so involved given that he rarely spoke to Agelof.

Vasetskii mentions that Western scholars have come to the unanimous conclusion that Stalin was the inspirer of the assassination. At the end of his article Vasetskii claims NKVD colonel Eitingon was the organiser. It was Eitingon who enlisted Mercader's mother in order to win over her son. He prepared the necessary documentation, and arranged to meet Mercader after the completion of the 'affair'. However, the assassin was arrested at the scene of the crime.

Other Soviet writers disagree on whether it was Eitingon or some other governmental official who had responsibility for organising Trotsky's death. For example, Vasetskii claims that Shatrov's play 'Forward...Forward...Forward' highlights Stalin; that D. Volkogonov in his article

'Demon of the Revolution' chooses Beria. However, the most important aspect of these writings is that by questioning the validity of the official version of Trotsky's death, all other aspects of Trotsky and his thought become subject to scepticism. If one can no longer believe Pravda of 24 August 1940, then what about such writings as the short biography of Trotsky presented in the notes to the later editions of Lenin's collected works? [4]

Indeed, a noticeable and important development in Soviet writings on Leon Trotsky occurred in 1989 with the appearance of articles which presented long, more factual-based accounts of Trotsky's biography. The first of this type of article was written by Roy Medvedev, and published as an introduction to the first Soviet publication of extracts from Deutscher's trilogy on Trotsky. [5]

Medvedev begins with a brief summary of Trotsky's schooling and his first involvement in the Social-Democratic movement. An account of Trotsky's 1902 split from Lenin is given and it is claimed that in the years following this Trotsky occupied an intermediary position, becoming neither Bolshevik nor Menshevik. Medvedev does not engage in vitriolics against Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution, merely stating that Trotsky attempted to convince both Bolsheviks and Mensheviks of its appositeness. The years 1912-13 are highlighted as

the period of most acute polemics between Lenin and Trotsky, and Medvedev points out that quotations from Lenin made during this period were used as ammunition against Trotsky in the inter-party struggles of the 1920s. According to Medvedev, Trotsky moved closer and closer to a Bolshevik position during the First World War and this enabled him to join the Bolsheviks soon after his return to Russia in 1917. Medvedev criticises commentators who he sees as either overestimating (Dashkovskii) or underestimating and falsifying (Mints) Trotsky's contributions both in 1917 and as a member of the first Bolshevik government. Trotsky is perceived as a revolutionary who did much for socialism. However, it is stressed that in 1917, in the civil war etc Trotsky was subordinate to Lenin. Medvedev omits an exposition of the inter-party struggles which occurred after Lenin's death, explaining that readers would encounter these events in the extract from Deutscher's book. Referring to Trotsky's final exile from his homeland, Medvedev claims that Trotsky received insufficient information to correctly analyse the processes that were occurring in the Soviet Union. However, Trotsky's argument that Hitler's victory was in part due to the mistaken policies of the Third International is interpreted as having some plausibility. History of the Russian Revolution is highlighted as the best of Trotsky's exile writings.

One interesting aspect of Medvedev's short account of

Trotsky's life is the argument that Lenin was superior to Trotsky. Given both that the ideological reference point in the Soviet Union is Lenin, and that Trotsky and Stalin directed criticism at each other on the basis of 'who is the true Leninist', it is not surprising that much of the recent Soviet writings on Trotsky focus on his relationship to Lenin.

At the time of the 70th anniversary of the 1917 October revolution this took the familiar form of listing those instances when Trotsky differed from Lenin. For example, in Trotsky's first mention in the third edition of the encyclopedia entitled The Great October Socialist Revolution [6] the journey through Trotsky's life can be summarised thus: (1) at the 1903 Congress of the RSDRP he became a Menshevik; (2) he 'opposed the Marxist-Leninist theory of socialist revolution with the theory of permanent revolution'; (3) during the First World War he opposed the Bolsheviks on 'questions of war, peace, and revolution'; (4) Lenin was sharply critical of Trotsky's proposals for the timing of the uprising in 1917; (5) it was Trotsky who placed the country in mortal danger by refusing to carry-out Lenin's orders to sign the Brest peace; (6) in 1920-21 Trotsky opposed Lenin on the trade union debate; (7) in 1923 he headed a Trotskyist opposition to the general party line; (8) Lenin mentioned his non-Bolshevism in his Letters to the Congress; (9) he led the Trotskyist-Zinovievist anti-party bloc from 1926;

(10) he was exiled from the Soviet Union in 1929 for anti-Soviet activities; (11) he fought against the Communist Party, the USSR, and the Comintern from abroad. In the same edition Stalin is criticised for creating a cult of personality, but praised both for retaining Lenin's plan for building socialism in the USSR, and for playing a huge role in defeating Trotskyism and right opportunism. [7]

In his article 'Repainting Judas' V. Ivanov focuses upon Trotsky's character as the source of his anti-Leninism. [8] For Ivanov, even before the 1903 Congress Trotsky merely utilized the Social-Democratic movement as a vehicle to pursue his own ambitions. His behaviour at the Second Congress is described as 'unscrupulous'. It is admitted that elements of Trotsky's character - audacity and decisiveness - were necessary for revolutionary work, but it is also claimed that his main weakness was a lack of ideological conviction. Given that the Trotsky of this article is opportunist, the main problem for Ivanov is the question, 'why then did Lenin accept Trotsky as a member of the Bolshevik government?' Ivanov himself sees this as a problem. He states that Trotsky had undoubted organisational ability. Given the situation of the young Soviet state - civil war, foreign intervention, post-war collapse - Lenin hoped to harness this ability to the advantage of the Bolshevik government. This involved the constant controlling hand of Lenin over Trotsky. Indeed, what could be highlighted as Trotsky's greatest

contribution to the survival of the Bolsheviks in power - his leadership in the civil war - is explained by Lenin's intervention in preventing Trotsky from making mistakes. After Lenin's death the majority of the Bolshevik Party came to the conclusion that Trotsky would have to be expelled and exiled. Trotsky's whole outlook - characterised by his petty-bourgeois idea of 'barrack-like communism' - was essentially anti-Bolshevik. Trotsky was always alien to the Bolshevik Party and its Central Committee. For Ivanov, the party completed a struggle against Trotsky which Lenin had waged throughout his life.

In the Soviet literature of the late 1980s and later there has been a definite departure from the unambiguous condemnation of Trotsky characteristic of Ivanov's interpretation. This has been replaced by two differing approaches. The first views Trotsky as a contradictory figure. The sources of his successes and failures are located to the 'good' and 'bad' sides of his persona. This approach is similar to the Ivanov thesis to the extent that it uses Trotsky's nature as explanation, and for his divergences from Lenin in particular. It is different in that it condemns the one-sided, misinformed view of Trotsky of the past. In general, it provides more information. [9] However, it shares at least one of the basic assumptions of Stalinist historiography to the extent that it evaluates what was positive and what was negative in Trotsky from the stand-point of 'was Trotsky

with Lenin or not?' Examples of this interpretation are V. Ulanov, L. M. Minaev, Vasetskii, Volkogonov, and U. Korablev.

In 'Trotsky. Towards a political biography' Ulanov admits that the traditional view of Trotsky was based upon a suppression of fact. [10] To redress the balance the article contains a section on Trotsky's co-operation in Iskra, with a short exposition of his contributions. The article stresses both that Lenin and Trotsky co-operated in the period leading up to the Second Congress, and that Lenin evaluated Trotsky's character very favourably. The continuity in Lenin's view of Trotsky, from the time of the first meeting in 1902 to Letters to the Congress of 1923, presented here is one of a mixture between emphasis on positive and negative character traits.

The reason for Trotsky's divergence from Lenin at the Second Congress is placed upon Trotsky's vacillitating nature. For example, on the question of the Bund Trotsky shared a Leninist position in rejecting federalism in the party, but departed from it in arguing for giving special recognition to the Bund for agitational work. It is regretted that Trotsky was not able to keep to his pre-Congress declaration of support for Iskra. In My Life Trotsky explains his attachment to what became the Menshevik group by the claim that he concentrated on personal factors, not fully understanding the true nature

and importance of Lenin's organisational stance. [11] This explanation is mentioned by Ivanov - Krupskaya's reminiscences of bad feelings towards Lenin and Plekhanov being generated at the Congress through suspicion of their motives for their stances and relations towards Zasluch and Akselrod are cited. Here Krupskaya says that many joined what they considered to be the offended people, and in so doing they lost sight of the essence of the disputed points. However, this is not pursued as the reason for the Lenin/Trotsky schism. An account of the disagreements over the issue of the Party Rules is given, and Martov's formulation is condemned on the grounds that one would not be able to differentiate between true revolutionaries and hangers-on. The clue to Trotsky's refusal to support Lenin is given by way of an exposition of Trotsky's movement from support for an editorial board of three, to a proposal to retain the old composition. This ends with an appeal to the reader to draw the appropriate conclusion. If the point has been missed the article concludes with a quote from Lenin of 1914 where Trotsky is labelled as a 'bird of flight'.

In his introduction to 'The Struggle for the Leadership and the Deformation of Leninism' [12] Minaev states that Trotsky had an 'extremely contradictory personality' which consisted both of great abilities and great faults. It is further argued that this duality was reflected in Trotsky's positive and negative contributions to the

revolution. On the one hand Trotsky achieved much through his talents as publicist, agitator, and orator; on the other hand, he caused harm both to the party and to Leninism. The rest of the article presents a critique of what it perceives to be Trotsky's philosophy.

For Minaev, Trotsky was a dogmatist who superimposed a theoretical framework on events. This is compared to Lenin's supposed concrete analytical approach. Moreover, Trotsky's dogmatism is used as the source for what is called Trotsky's 'misanthropy'. For, according to Minaev, any person who possesses a rigid theoretical framework for interpreting reality ends by departing from 'humanistic-moralistic' perceptions which lie at the centre of Marxism. This point is illustrated through a comparison of Trotsky's and Lenin's reactions to the Balkan wars. Trotsky used such 'soulless' phrases as 'powerlessness before fate' to express his impression of the suffering masses. Lenin was incapable of such disregard for people's feelings and concentrated on highlighting the real efforts made to overthrow the oppressive foreign enslavers.

After talking about the consequences which follow from the possession of a dogma, Minaev defines the content of Trotsky's philosophy. It is claimed that Trotsky believed that world economic development predetermined politics, culture, and the destiny of the nation. In short, he

'fetishized the economy'. It was this 'super-determinism' that led Trotsky to hold mistaken opinions on the true meaning of the nation and internationalism. For Minaev, Trotsky over-exaggerated the extent to which capitalism was uniting the economies of individual nations into a world system. It was upon this false perception that Trotsky argued that the nation-state was too narrow a basis both for the development of the productive forces and for a dictatorship of the proletariat. However, this thesis ignored Lenin's law of uneven development which stated that a victorious socialist revolution was first possible in several countries, or even in one nation taken separately. Lenin realised that an isolated socialist state would be subject to difficulties and contradictions but he also saw that it was possible to overcome these. In contrast, Trotsky stubbornly repeated his idea that a revolution beginning in one nation would, of necessity, have to break the boundaries of its own national frontiers. This was why Trotsky had no real feelings for the fate of the Russian revolution. For him it was only a base for permanent revolution. By refusing to consider the real problems of the nation Trotsky departed both from the feelings of the masses, and demands for democratic solutions to the national question. Through claiming that an isolated socialist society could not withstand the pressure of an all-powerful international capital Trotsky expressed both his non-belief in the creative capacity of the working class, and his non-understanding of Bolshevik

optimism. In short, Trotsky's internationalism was 'bourgeois nationalism'.

Minaev admits that much of Trotsky's criticism of Stalin's crimes was correct. However, there are good reasons, for Minaev, to doubt the sincerity of his use of the phrases 'Soviet democracy' and 'party democracy'. Did these not really amount to nothing more than the placement into power of people who were convinced of the correctness of Trotsky's ideas? Would Trotsky really have permitted democracy for those who opposed his proposals for the militarisation of labour or the incorporation of trade unions into the state? The real problem with Trotsky was that he was guided by

abstract laws existing in neither time nor space. In his work there lives singular eternal truths...with which it is impossible to make anything either today or tomorrow. [13]

It was the belief in the correctness of these abstractions that provides the reason for Trotsky's anti-democratic nature. For Trotsky, democracy was not an arithmetical sum concerned with the number of individuals expressing a view, but amounted to the victory of those who perceived 'progress', no matter how small this group of people. For Minaev, when abstract notions of progress are foremost in a politician the perception that politics is the fate of millions of people disappears. Specifically, this results in ignoring the connection between human means to achieve

human ends. The politics of Gorbachev's perestroika is based upon such a connection and, as such, stands in contradiction to Trotsky's outlook. Ultimately,

Trotsky's failure was the failure of an individualist in politics, a failure of a personality who attempted to subordinate the workers' movement to his own personal aims and interests. [14]

Vasetskii also stresses complexities in Trotsky when assessing his career. [15] He is quite clear in blaming Stalinist historiography for distorting Trotsky's biography. The view of a Trotsky totally isolated from the Bolshevik movement post-1903 is rejected. [16] For Vasetskii, after 1903 Trotsky occupied an intermediary position between the two groupings. He was a Menshevik in that he rejected the Bolshevik party organisation, but was a Bolshevik in his irritation with the timid political stances of the Mensheviks. This dual approach permeates Vasetskii's interpretation.

On the question of the preparations for the October revolution it is stated that whatever the disagreements which existed between Lenin and Trotsky on the timing of the armed uprising, Trotsky did follow the correct course that the revolution was to take by supporting Lenin's resolution of 10th October 1917 which proposed that the Bolsheviks seize power. Although it is argued that Trotsky made a number of important independent initiatives - his help in organising the defeat of the Kerensky-

Krasnov revolt, speaking against the Zinoviev-Kamenev suggestions to invite other groupings to participate in power, which concludes with quoting Lenin's 'there is no better Bolshevik than Trotsky' - Vasetskii stresses that Trotsky played a subordinate role to Lenin in two senses. First, at the level of practice, Vasetskii argues that Trotsky remained within the parliamentary illusions of Kamenev and Zinoviev to the extent that Trotsky insisted that the timing of the uprising should coincide with the meeting of the Congress of Soviets. [17] And, as Lenin said, 'waiting for the Congress of Soviets is a childish play in formalism...a treachery of the revolution.' [18]

Second, at the level of theory, October was a confirmation of the Leninist, and not the Trotskyist, theory of revolution. [19] According to Vasetskii, Lenin held to Marx and Engels' idea of 'uninterrupted revolution', i.e., the stages of development from a bourgeois-democratic to a socialist revolution and its subsequent entry onto the world arena. Trotsky, on the other hand, ignored the bourgeois-democratic stage believing that the revolution should be transferred from one country to another: 'Trotsky recognised only one side of the marxist conception of uninterrupted revolution - the external, the international and ignored the internal, the national.' [20] Lenin and Trotsky were eventually able to cooperate because the February revolution eliminated the theoretical differences between them. However, for Vasetskii, Trotsky

was never able to explain the character, forces and aims of the February revolution. Ultimately, the revolutionary events of 1917 amounted to an 'annihilation of Trotskyism. After February, when the preparations for the socialist revolution had begun, Trotskyism did not hinder Leninism.'

[21]

Vasetskii cites My Life where Trotsky both differentiated his position from Lenin's and admitted that Lenin was correct. However, this does not justify the version that the Short Course (1938) presents of a Trotsky who deliberately tried to hinder the uprising. [22] Indeed, Stalin is criticised both for his overestimation of Trotsky's contribution to the preparations for the October revolution in his article of 6th November 1918, and for subsequently changing this view to 'Trotsky as a complete enemy of the revolution' expressed by the Short Course. [23] In praising Trotsky's organisational ability Vasetskii mentions the sheet of paper, used as evidence by Trotsky in My Life for Lenin's trust in him, which Lenin gave to Trotsky as a carte blanche during the civil war. [24] Any version of the Lenin/Trotsky relationship which is based upon the notion of Lenin constantly guiding Trotsky, e.g., Ivanov, is inevitably weakened.

However, Vasetskii himself does not abandon this view totally. After focussing upon Trotsky's darker side - his excessive ruthlessness during the civil war, his vanity,

his ideological mistakes which led him to support barrack socialism - it is claimed that one has to see Trotsky in the light of different 'Trotskys', of which there are three. [25] The 'October Trotsky' worked for the revolution. The 'post-October Trotsky' was used by Lenin in the interests of socialism. The 'exiled Trotsky' was both isolated and mistaken. It is a schema which is shared, at least in parts, by other writers. Volkogonov states that Trotsky was right that one day - i.e., now - socialist initiative would come into conflict with bureaucracy. However, in works like Stalin Trotsky struggled with Stalin as a person rather than with Stalinism as a phenomenon, an approach which is criticised as being 'unscientific'. According to Volkogonov, Trotsky's programme which he constructed in exile was removed from reality and his activities, by splitting the communist movement, were 'objectively' of help only to Hitler. [26]

For Vasetskii, it is Trotsky's contradictory character which explains his rise and fall. On the one hand Trotsky is praised for possessing political intuition in highlighting the growing contradiction between the masses and the party apparatus as early as 1923. On the other hand Trotsky is also seen as part of the problem. Thus, it is argued that Stalin's cult of the personality had definite historical precedents in Trotsky's actions. Rule 41 of the political regulations of the Red Army which

stated that,

Comrade Trotsky is leader and organiser of the Red Army. Standing as leader of the Red Army Comrade Trotsky leads it to victory over all enemies of the Soviet Republic. [27]

is cited as evidence of Trotsky's creation of his own cult of personality. It is claimed that the language of Rule 41 was to be repeated as a form of expression under Stalin. [28] Vasetskii uses notions of Trotsky's ambitiousness to explain why he lost in the power struggle with Stalin. [29] Volkogonov focuses on the differences between Lenin and Trotsky's political testaments as a way of illustrating his view on Trotsky's character. Lenin's political testament was for the people, the Party, and the Central Committee. Trotsky, in trying to imitate Lenin, ended by talking only about himself and his principles. [30]

Vasetskii sees Stalin and Trotsky as sharing common ground during the inter-party struggles of the 1920s. Both used anti-Leninist tactics of forming fractions and indulging in intrigue. As such they stood in contradiction to the 10th Party Congress resolution 'On Party Unity'. [31] Moreover, Stalin and Trotsky were alike in that they were convinced both in the righteousness of their conceptions of 'happiness', and in their determination to thrust these visions upon people. [32]

In 'Demon of the Revolution' Volkogonov claims that Stalin implemented Trotsky's methods for economic change contained within Trotsky's phrases 'workers' army', 'militarised labour', etc. In this respect Trotsky was correct when he wrote of Stalin's 'imitations'. [33] Vasetskii agrees with this analysis when considering the eventual form that Stalin's economic policy was to take. Thus, according to Vasetskii, Stalin realised Trotsky's idea of a 'command-administrative economy'. [34] However, when Trotsky first expressed these views - during the 1920s - the party was right to exile him and to reject his economic policies.

Vasetskii writes that the stance of the Left Opposition was composed of two closely related elements. [35] A theoretical element of Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution, and an economic strategy which followed from this. However it is argued that because the theory was mistaken, the economics were flawed. For Vasetskii the theory of permanent revolution is an example of an inflexible way of thinking from which dialectics are absent. For example, uneven development was not taken into account, and this led to a belief that the proletariat could do everything - defeat the bourgeoisie, establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, conduct world revolution - simultaneously. This clearly ignored concrete conditions and the necessity to build socialism in the USSR. This inability to adapt their beliefs to new

situations led to economic proposals which would have had several dire consequences, including a rise in the price of manufactured goods, a weakening of peasant/proletarian ties, and a threat to the purchasing power of the rouble. Ultimately one should assess Trotsky's defeat and expulsion not only from the deficiencies of his analysis, but also focus upon the positive fact that a good lesson was learned from it. Both the party and the working class became convinced of the need to build socialism in the USSR. Gorbachev's 70th anniversary speech, which justified the defeat of Trotsky on the grounds that it was necessary to expose his 'anti-socialist essence', is quoted with approval. Volkogonov does not launch his attack on permanent revolution from the level of theory. He quotes Trotsky's article of 1940, 'The USSR in War'. Here Trotsky said that if the eruptions of the Second World War did not lead to victorious proletarian revolutions, then the Marxist interpretation of history would have to be re-evaluated. For Volkogonov, the years of defeat which followed the Second World War have not been able to leave Trotsky's predictions unmarked. Permanent revolution is labelled as 'illusory'. [36] Vasetskii's final words on Trotsky's career are,

wherever Trotsky appeared as an acknowledged leader of the masses, a responsible leader of the Party and Soviet State, his activities were in step with ours and understandable to us. But also, when he opposed Leninism and the party line with his own conceptions and personal ambitions, his path departed from the party's. Such is the logic of historical development. [37]

This framework of interpretation in which one is able to admit that previous historiography falsified Trotsky's positive contributions to the revolution, while stating that these activities were only so because Trotsky was either under the control of, or in line with, the Central Committee headed by Lenin is also expressed by Korablev's article 'Why Trotsky? A Historian answers Readers questions.' [38] This article focuses on the civil war period. The author blames the lack of source materials for the previous failure of historians to construct objective accounts of Trotsky's role in the civil war. However, after highlighting the foreign publication of The Trotsky Papers, 1917-22 (1964) as one source from which Soviet historians had learnt many new facts, Korablev states that now there are sufficient documents available for an objective evaluation of the events of the civil war period. The particular 'blank spot' which Korablev sees himself as eradicating is the question 'why was Trotsky offered the post of war leader?' The explanation given is that Lenin was faced with a situation in which the Brest peace had taught of the necessity for the immediate construction of an army. Moreover, this construction should be based upon the latest principles of 'military science'. In practical terms this meant recruiting war specialists from the former army of the tsar. Unfortunately, Krylenko and others at the Peoples Commissariat for Military Affairs disagreed with this and

resigned. Lenin possessed the ability truthfully to evaluate the abilities of the people around him and chose Trotsky as leader of the army because of Trotsky's organizational ability.

Calling the civil war years Trotsky's 'golden hour' Korablev devotes little space to elaborating upon Trotsky's positive contributions. These seem to amount to the following: (1) wrote declarations and directives on the Red Army; (2) organised the building of the military under orders from the Central Committee and Lenin; (3) when travelling on his train was able to act on his own initiative in dangerous moments at the front to convince the masses of the necessity for action. Korablev gives an exposition of differences between Lenin and Trotsky over some aspects of war strategy and shows how these were falsified by subsequent Soviet historiography into damning critiques of Trotsky by Lenin. For Korablev, although disputes did exist, evidence points to the fact that Lenin retained his high evaluation of Trotsky. Gorky's remembrances of conversations with Lenin in which Trotsky was praised are cited. However, towards the end of the article the interpretation becomes less favourable. The author draws attention to what he sees as Trotsky's dictatorial manner, belief in the force of orders, reliance on repression, and inability to conduct comradely relations with other communists as the source of his mistakes in practical war activity. While one has to admit

that Trotsky played his part, one should not allow oneself to fall into the trap of 'bourgeois Sovietologists' like Isaac Deutscher who, in The Prophet Armed, claimed that Trotsky was the sole organiser of the Red Army. In fact, according to Korablev, the Red Army was guided in policy and strategy by the collective leadership of the Communist Party Central Committee which was headed by V. I. Lenin.

The second, and most recent reinterpretation of Trotsky to be published in the Soviet Union amounts to a complete negation of Trotsky's life presented in The Great October Socialist Revolution, and, to the extent that they retain the Lenin/Trotsky dichotomy of the past, the work of Vasetskii et al. Examples of this approach include V. Rogovin, V. I. Startsev and Vladimir Billik. Some of their writings are most notable for the explicit assertion that Trotsky has to be seen as being on a par with Lenin.

In his introduction to the republication of extracts from Trotsky's Literature and Revolution, [39] for instance, Rogovin argues that Trotsky's philosophy expressed humanistic ideals and support for pluralism in art. In Rogovin's view Trotsky thought that the Communist Party should not interfere in the cultural realm, imposing dogmatic notions of what a socialist art should be. Trotsky's approach included a concern that there should be sufficient freedom in art and science to make aesthetic strivings meaningful and new scientific discoveries

possible. For Rogovin, this stands in stark contrast to 'Stalinism with its coarse administration and ignorant interference in high art.' [40] Indeed, Trotsky saw that artistic ideas could be both divorced from politics, and give a fillip to social progress. In supporting pluralism in art Trotsky talked about 'the mighty force of competition.' In so doing he differentiated between 'market' competition and 'socialist' competition - the former resulting in 'economic individualism', the later expressing 'the progressive side of individualism, above all in the spiritual life of society as a struggle "for its opinions, for its projects, for its tastes."' [41] This included the recognition that, first, there were different groups - proletariat, peasantry, intellectuals - working towards socialism, and that, second, these groups might express their own strivings in diverse artistic forms. It was these recognitions that led Trotsky both to place special emphasis on peasant art, and to his evaluations of peasant writers Esenin and Klyuev which were at odds with those of several party theorists. For Rogovin, this compares favourably with Stalin's 'barrack-like' approach to the peasantry.

The aim of Trotsky's philosophy is perceived as being an attempt to enable each individual to be creative. This potential would be passed to every person through the dictatorship of the proletariat. The transitional period of the dictatorship of the proletariat would lay the

foundations for the social-cultural system of the future non-class society by teaching the 'accumulated human knowledge and ability in all fields of material and spiritual creativity.' [42] According to Rogovin, Trotsky's writings on art amount to the most profound contribution to Marxist literary analysis of the humanistic aspects of socialist and communist ideals. And, 'without such an analysis questions about the criteria of socialism, the degree of its development, hang in mid-air.' [43] One thus gains a very different view of Trotsky's philosophy from that expressed by Minaev's article. Apart from the Trotsky as dogmatist/misanthrope (Minaev) versus Trotsky as pluralist/humanist (Rogovin) dichotomy the two articles clash in their perceptions of Trotsky in relation to other commentators on art. Minaev draws frequently from Lunarcharsky's work as evidence for his view of Trotsky. Rogovin claims that Trotsky was close to the ideas of other Marxist literary critics, including those of Lunarcharsky.

Rogovin also addresses the issue of world revolution and socialism. In the space available to him the possibility of answering the question 'to what extent can the different development of the twentieth-century be explained by the re-evaluation by the Communists of the revolutionary possibilities in Europe and Asia in the 1920's' is denied. However, Rogovin's perception of the whole period from 1920-40 is interesting in that he sees

this as being a time of profound crisis for capitalism - an assumption which is crucial both for the credibility of Trotsky's proposals for world revolution in this era, and for the claim that Stalin's international strategy in these years was a betrayal of world revolution. Indeed, for Rogovin, it was Stalinism that drained the blood from the revolutionary power of the working class, it was Stalinism that dealt serious blows both to the cause of building socialism in the USSR, and to the international communist movement. Ultimately, historical development has not falsified Trotsky's statement that if all countries did not have a proletarian revolution then humanity would suffocate in its contradictions.

Rogovin presented a Trotsky who believed in competition in the cultural realm. Two articles concerning the lives and activities of two Soviet Trotskyists convey a view of a democratic Trotsky who believed in the competition of ideas in the political realm. However, this competition would be confined to the CPSU. In his article on Ivar Smilga, [44] S. Burni defines a socialist 'spirit' which he sees as a prerequisite for 'socialism with a human face'. This 'spirit' consists of sincerity, purity, and a concern for the rights of others to hold and express views different from one's own. For Burni, Stalinism was the antithesis of this spirit, building its socialism through deception and slanders. It is admitted that Trotsky believed in the right of the leadership to have 'iron

rule'; and that, in the event of Trotsky's victory, lawlessness and repressions would still have occurred. However, according to Burni, Trotsky would have confined lawlessness and repression within certain limits - limits that Stalin did not recognize. Thus, it is claimed that the scale of repression would have been much less under Trotsky's leadership. Moreover, the limits set by Trotsky would have guaranteed the preservation of the socialist 'spirit'. For Burni, the defeat of the opposition at the 15th Party Congress (December 1927) amounted to the passing of the last chance for Stalinist socialism to cleanse itself of its impurities and acquire a 'human spirit'. The link between the defeat of a Trotskyist opposition and the burying of humane socialism is also made by surviving Soviet Trotskyist, Ivan Vrachev, in an interview published in Argumenty i fakty. [45] However, he differs from Burni in one respect. Vrachev locates the beginnings of the victory of Stalinist socialism over a democratic Trotskyist socialism with the defeat of the 'Declaration of the 46' at the 13th Party Congress in 1923. For Vrachev, the recently elected Congress of Peoples' Deputies represents a return to pre-1923 Soviet Democracy.

In an interview in the weekly paper Sobesednik Billik states that if one wants to criticise Trotsky for harshness during the civil war, then one has to extend the critique to Lenin. [46] For, it is argued, that Lenin

supported Trotsky during the whole period from 1917-24. In comparison with the fundamental unity of these two men during 1917-24 any differences, for example those over the trade union debates, pale into insignificance. Any attempt to link the various divergencies between Lenin and Trotsky into the framework of a single explanation has to be rejected. Billik emphasizes that each issue has to be examined separately, in detail, and take into account a full context. On a specific issue this means that if one is considering the debates over the Brest peace, one has to admit that Trotsky's 'No war, no peace' strategy did have a majority of support in the Central Committee. If he made a mistake, then so did others.

By closely connecting Lenin and Trotsky the basic assumptions which support the arguments of the Vasetskii and Volkogonov writings crumble, and with the foundations the conclusions also fall. Vasetskii and Volkogonov linked Stalin and Trotsky through joint support of a command economy, comparing them both to Lenin's belief in independent action from below. Although Vasetskii does not make this connection explicitly, he is obviously referring to NEP. Volkogonov links Stalin and Trotsky on the use of terror, with the conclusion that Stalin was a bigger Trotskyist than Trotsky himself. He then focuses on Stalin's actions stating that Lenin's ideas on NEP and on democracy in building the party and state were "buried into oblivion". [47] In contrast to this Billik states

that Trotsky suggested NEP a full year before its adoption, denying that Stalin took such ideas as forced collectivization from Trotsky. Indeed, for Billik, Trotsky was not in favour of forcing anything. Was it not Trotsky who wrote of the need for respectful relations in the Red Army? The Volkogonov view of a Trotsky defeated in the power struggle through being blinded by his own ambitiousness is rejected. Billik asks how this interpretation can be sustained given that Trotsky already occupied the highest posts in the party and state. However, the reasons for Trotsky's defeat still retain a personality element: it was a case of talent (Trotsky) losing to mediocrity (Stalin). In particular, Trotsky could not adapt himself to Stalinist intrigue. This explanation is interesting when taken in conjunction with Billik's interpretation of the 1903 Congress. In 1903 Trotsky opposed Lenin's wording for Rule 1 because he saw that it would be possible for the apparatus to have excessive control over individual party members. This was fraught with the danger of leading to the dictatorship of one man. This did not happen under Lenin but after his death....Here Billik is implicitly arguing that Trotsky was right in 1903. This is not related to Trotsky's famous notion of 'substitutionism' expressed in Our Political Tasks, but the use of this argument by Billik would place him in contradiction to Trotsky himself. After all, 'substitutionism' is conspicuous by its absence from Trotsky's critique of Stalinism.

Another central plank for Vasetskii's Lenin versus Trotsky interpretation is the supposed disagreements between the two on permanent revolution. Trotsky devoted much of his writings to expounding how he and Lenin were in agreement on this issue, including the assertion that he - Trotsky - was well aware of, and had indeed based permanent revolution upon, a law of uneven development. [48] While Vasetskii has definitely departed from his previous emphatic anti-Trotsky stance of 1985, [49] he has retained the standard Stalinist critique of permanent revolution as a body of thought which ignores Lenin's law of uneven development. By stating that, after 1916, Lenin and Trotsky were also unanimous on permanent revolution - although he gives no detail or substantiation - Billik prepares the way for the claim that in the post-exile years Trotsky was not anti-Soviet. Anti-Stalinist, certainly. But one cannot equate what Billik labels 'Stalin's pseudo-Marxist system of dictatorship' with true socialism. If 'socialism in one country' and a 'command economy' are both anti-Leninist and anti-Trotskyist, then Billik has turned Stalinist historiography totally on its head. He has, in effect, redefined the true ideological heritage of the Soviet Union which would mean, if a contemporary Soviet government was to remain true to a pristine doctrine, the incorporation of world revolution into the fundamental aims of the Soviet government and people. This is obviously the last thing that President

Gorbachev would want, and any article which would take Billik's arguments to their logical conclusion has, to my knowledge, yet to appear.

Vitalii Startsev offers a more complex analysis of the reasons for Trotsky's defeat in the power struggle against Stalin. [50] Startsev claims that in the months preceding his death Lenin was forming an alliance with Trotsky to remove Stalin from the post of General Secretary. If this plan would have succeeded then, for Startsev, the whole of subsequent Soviet history would have been different. However, he does not say in what senses. The Lenin/Trotsky alliance did not succeed because of several factors. First, the vacillations of Kamenev and Zinoviev. Second, an underestimation of the negative aspects of Stalin's character. Third, and most important, the stroke which deprived Lenin of the power of speech. In these conditions Trotsky remained the most honest and critical, but isolated. Lessons of October is described as an 'accurate' work which was, at the time, interpreted as an attack on leading members of the Central Committee. It was then that the accusations of Trotsky attempting to replace 'Leninism' with 'Trotskyism' began. In his version of the events which led up to the October revolution Startsev challenges the view that Lenin was the main character in the story. [51] For him October was a compromise between Lenin and Trotsky. Lenin wanted the revolution to take place before the Congress of Soviets, Trotsky after the

Congress had met. But in real life the uprising started prior to the opening of the Congress (Lenin), and concluded while it was still in progress (Trotsky). This is important in that it puts Trotsky where he claimed, and Stalinist historiography denied, he was - at the centre of the revolution. Vasetskii criticises Trotsky for his belief that the Bolsheviks went over to permanent revolution as much as he went over to the Bolsheviks. [52] Startsev gives Trotsky a place in the ideology of October by arguing that Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution was 'quite appropriate' to the events between February and October.

It was from this theoretical stance that Trotsky was immediately drawn to the side of Lenin. It was because of this that both were in agreement after their first meeting in 1917. Previous historiography which had stressed differences between the two was wrong. However, Startsev does remain within the 'Lenin as the figure in October' approach in that he does not go as far as Trotsky's statement of 1935. [53] Here Trotsky claimed that the success of the revolution depended upon the presence of either him or Lenin. For Startsev, without Lenin the October revolution would not have taken place whereas, without Trotsky, there would have been no difference. Moreover, in his introduction to the reprint of Trotsky's article 'Nationalism in Lenin' (23rd April 1920), Startsev rejects a central point in any Trotskyist programme - that of

world revolution. He says that the article is useful only as an illustration of the then Bolshevnik approach to the necessity of world revolution, of which even Lenin believed. [54] Now, the article is of historical interest only. Its argument was the product of a historical situation (the fact that Soviet Russia stood alone in a capitalist world) which is no longer relevant today. Indeed, after the experience of the years 1917-20 - the defeat of the Red Army in the Russo-Polish war; the collapse of the plans for a communist revolution in Germany - Lenin re-examined the prospects for world revolution.

The two interpretations outlined above are notable for their differing perceptions of the relationship between Lenin, Stalin, and Trotsky. Vasetskii and Volkogonov placed Lenin and Trotsky together when, and only when, the later supported the former. The continuity stressed is between Lenin and Stalin through the claims that, on the one hand, permanent revolution was anti-Leninist - one had to build socialism within the USSR; and, on the other, by arguing that Trotsky's critiques of the Soviet Union were misguided. Billik and Startsev see Lenin and Trotsky as sharing views, and Stalin as being a deviation from these. Leonid Radzikhovskii's article is interesting in that he has a definition of Leninism which centres on an understanding of NEP, and argues that not only Stalin and Trotsky, but Bukharin, Rykov, Zinoviev and Kamenev stood

outside Leninism. [55]

For Radzikhovskii the twentieth century has taught us that in the case of democracy, if one is to give any meaning to the term, one has to give freedom of choice and expression to all forces in society. Lenin knew this. NEP was an attempt to realize the perception that political and economic freedom go together. One cannot have an economic dictatorship and a political democracy, and vice versa. Therefore, before his death, Lenin was not simply proposing the removal of Stalin from the post of General Secretary as a struggle against the bureaucracy as Trotsky thought. It was also an attempt to reform the whole political system. This stemmed from a conception of socialism which recognized that one needed freedom both in the party and in society as a whole. However, Trotsky did not understand this stance, nor did he want to. This derived from Trotsky's obsession with the possibility of a Thermidorian reaction, defined as the restoration of capitalism, in the Soviet Union.

For Trotsky, in Radzikhovskii's view, the path that the USSR had to follow in its fight for socialism consisted of an economic component - absence of the market, distribution from the centre - and a political programme of a dictatorship of the party. It was from this position that NEP with its specialists, nepmen (or speculators) and market relations contained the dangers of a Thermidor.

This danger could be realised from processes affecting the state or the party. Specifically, if either became separated from the proletarian masses then it would become the tool of bourgeois forces. For Trotsky, this occurred after Lenin's death. The main duty of each revolutionary therefore was to fight the sources of Thermidor, both in the party and without. However, for Radzikhovskii, Trotsky's arguments were flawed. For example, on the issue of the party Trotsky's solution was the reintroduction of party democracy. But this would not have been really democratic for several reasons. First, Trotsky, like all other possible leaders of the time, was only for democracy to the extent that it would have given his views primacy within the party. This amounted to nothing more than a dictatorship with its own definition of inter-party democracy. Second, Trotsky was clearly for superindustrialisation and a dictatorship in economics. A political dictatorship followed on from this. At least Stalin was logical in the policy that he pursued. Third, in 1928-30 Stalin destroyed the social forces that Trotsky saw as leading to the Thermidor. This resulted in something which was not foreseen - a rule of the bureaucracy. If Trotsky had been leader then one would most probably have seen a Trotskyist, rather than a Stalinist, bureaucracy.

It could be argued that world revolution under Trotsky's leadership would have generated a different course of

development for the Soviet Union. Radzikhovskii would dismiss this for two reasons. First, world revolution was a theoretical issue. The real issue of dispute was the question of Thermidor which demanded political action and political programmes. Second, in the concrete conditions of the 1920s world revolution was not feasible. World revolution cannot be made to order, and after 1921 the proletariat was taking a 'second breath'. The choice then was between social, economic, and political democracy in the USSR, i.e., full-blown NEP, or a new war communism. Trotsky, unlike Lenin, did not understand this choice. For Trotsky, democracy outside the limits that he would set would be false and bourgeois. Thus, he wanted to maintain inter-party democracy with a wider dictatorship. This, however, was, and is, impossible. At best Trotsky was a dictator with a pseudo-democratic exterior. In exile Trotsky thought that he was struggling against Stalinism. In reality his actions had the same effect in exile as they did during the power struggle - the strengthening of Stalin's position.

Radzikhovskii argues that any dictator needs to introduce a 'siege mentality' in order to justify his position. In the USSR this was done with reference to various enemies. Externally it was capitalist Britain and France. Internally it was petty-bourgeois elements in society, and splitters -Trotskyists - in the party. Stalin rose to power with the gradual acceptance of this reasoning among

party members. Stalin had authority neither in the party, the country, nor in the international workers movement both before the revolution and during the civil war. It only arrived through the defeat of Trotsky and the continued defence of the party from this doctrine. As long as this situation was maintained Stalin could subject the party, and through the party the country, to his will. Indeed, it was as a strengthening of the struggle against Trotskyists that Stalin justified the beginning of his purges in 1937.

Trotskyists will not like the fundamental suppositions and findings of Radzikhovskii's article. Namely, that Trotsky was a 'Stalinist' in that he rejected Lenin's linking of economic and political freedom. Given this connection, Trotsky's ideas on internal party democracy within an economic and political dictatorship were false. However, Radzikhovskii is sophisticated and his arguments are coherent. Given his definition of Leninism, the conclusion that Trotsky's misconceptions were derived from his fear of democracy follow. Radzikhovskii's critique is also an indicator of new ways of presenting debates in that his sources include summaries of writings of the Bulletin of the Opposition. This is a clear departure from the approach of the past which consisted of listing familiar quotes from Lenin when he had attacked Trotsky as though this in itself was proof of Trotsky's anti-Leninism. [56]. If another Soviet historian wanted to argue

against Radzikhovskii's interpretation then the possibility to do this is there. Indeed, A. V. Pantsov's comparative analysis of the economics of Trotsky and Preobrazhenskii [57] and Aleksandr Podshchekoldin's introduction to the New Course provide alternative views to many of Radzikhovskii's arguments. [58]

Pantsov shares two of Radzikhovskii's beliefs: first, that Trotsky was mistaken in thinking that capitalism was in a state of continual decline; second, that Trotsky was in error when he rejected the expansion of NEP as constituting a threat of 'Thermidor'. However, Pantsov's interpretation is interesting in that he does not come to the standard conclusion of those Soviet writers who see Trotsky and NEP as opposed, namely that Trotsky provided the command-economy industrialization model that Stalin was to adopt from 1929 onwards. For Pantsov, Preobrazhenskii's economic ideas were the intellectual source of Stalinist construction. Thus, it was Preobrazhenskii who thought that capital could be accumulated by means of unequivalent exchange between town and country, i.e., socialist accumulation in Soviet Russia would occur through the exploitation of pre-socialist economic forms. According to Pantsov, this thought constituted Preobrazhenskii's 'basic law' which was to function in the socialist sector; a law in contradiction with the law of value which regulates the private sector. Trotsky's economic strategy is interpreted as being more

flexible. The importance of Trotsky's economic thinking is that he argued, first, that Soviet Russia should exploit all possibilities that the world market offered; and, second, that there should be a co-ordination between the law of value and socialist accumulation in the context of the world market.

For Podshchekoldin, in the past Soviet history became a tool in the hands of the party leadership. Specifically, this process of distortion occurred with the ascendancy of the bureaucracy. This amounted to a departure from Leninist theory and practice. History became nothing more than a dogmatic apology for this. Significantly, Podshchekoldin locates the beginnings of this falsification not in 1938 with the appearance of the Short Course, but in the period leading up to the 13th Party Congress of 1924 where opposition to Stalin was labelled 'anti-Leninist' and a 'petty-bourgeois deviation'. It was in 1922-24 that the foundations for the Stalinist model of socialism were laid. It was this Stalinist system that was to have such tragic consequences for the country. This is an important break from the views of historians, including Gorbachev's 70th anniversary speech, which support Stalin's actions against Trotsky in the 1920s. Ivanov's 1987 article discussed above is attacked both for its uncritical acceptance of the 'Trotsky was a fractionalist' viewpoint, and for stating that further discussion on this topic was not needed for all documents

leading to this conclusion were widely known. It is pointed out that many writings of the period, and in particular Trotsky's, had never been read by the majority of Soviet people.

Podshchekoldin's article includes a summary of Trotsky's life very different from that in The Great October Socialist Revolution. For example, Trotsky moved closer and closer to Lenin during the First World War from an intermediary position in 1903-14; Trotsky played a great role in preparing and realising the October Revolution; despite differences on the question of the trade unions Trotsky was the main supporter of Lenin to the extent that, in 1923, most party members sincerely thought that he would succeed Lenin. Podshchekoldin's survey is also important in that it pin-points the years 1907-13 as the period from which quotes were taken from Lenin out of context for the purpose of the power struggle, i.e., in order to prove that Trotsky was anti-Leninist.

After his examination of the documents of the period Podshchekoldin's conclusion is that the struggle of 1922-24 was between bureaucratic elements (Zinoviev, Stalin, Kamenev) and democratic tendencies (Trotsky) involving principled economic and political questions. Fractionalism was started by Stalin and associates in order to prevent the realisation of a Lenin-Trotsky bloc. This bloc was formed on the basis of issues ranging from nationalism

(the 'Georgian affair') and struggles with bureaucracy to a reform of the political system. This obviously differs from Radzikhovskii's view of a Trotsky who did not fully understand the nature of Lenin's proposals.

One element which is central to all of the interpretations discussed above is the notion of a democratic, socialist 'good' Lenin. One recent development has been the appearance of articles which are critical of Lenin. For example, Radzikhovskii, in an article celebrating 120 years since the birth of Lenin, links Lenin and Stalin by arguing that Lenin was powerless against forces which flowed from the system which he himself had created. [59] In a February 1990 interview published in Moskovskie novosti Volkogonov also links Lenin with full-blown Stalinism by connecting the destruction of political pluralism under Lenin with the emergence of Stalinism. [60] These publications have consequences for Soviet debates on Trotsky.

First, the interpretations which attempt to present a democratic Trotsky by linking him with a democratic Lenin are weakened. Indeed, a contemporary twist of fate could be that Soviet commentators are at last admitting what Trotsky claimed as truth - that Trotsky was a good Leninist - as true when statues of Lenin are beginning to be destroyed. In a situation in which the Marxist-Bolshevik heritage is being rejected Trotsky, as part of

that ideology, falls with it. The contemporary task is to try to draw lessons from this experience for the future. This approach is expressed by Radzikhovskii in an article published in Sobesednik in March of this year. [61] Radzikhovskii claims that post-revolution all of the Bolsheviks degenerated into a new bureaucracy, placing what amounted to a new autocrat on the throne. The source of Bolshevik autocracy is located to the Bolshevik world outlook. According to Radzikhovskii, this outlook consisted in the belief in the inevitability of the revolution and its humanizing mission as flowing from iron laws of history. This fuelled the belief in the absolute correctness of their aims and of the party as the historical instrument for the realisation of those aims. Everything was permitted if it was 'historically justified' and Radzikhovskii points to this as explanation for the Bolshevik willingness to use terror. Trotsky is cited from the 13th Party Congress where he stated that one cannot be right against the party. It is argued that such attitudes provided the basis for the accusations of the 1920s. The lessons, for Radzikhovskii, are a rejection of the Bolshevik outlook with its dire consequences for morality and a realisation of the connection between means and ends. If means other than force of argument are used, then this signifies that politicians do not believe in the persuasiveness of their own ideas.

Second, the Vasetskii et al critique of Trotsky as being 'bad' for his anti-Leninism is also weakened. In a situation where critiques of Lenin become more and more popular and even dominant, the continuation of the Vasetskii thesis could have the unintended consequence of making Trotsky popular. For example, perhaps waiting for the Congress of Soviets before seizing power would have been a better idea since the revolution would have had firmer democratic foundations from the very beginning. Indeed, it may even be possible that some Soviet writers would try to make Trotsky popular by this 'indirect mean'. However, this would be a dubious strategy and could even result in the attitude, 'Lenin was bad and Trotsky worse'. The way to make the case for Trotsky would be by writing that Lenin was undemocratic and mistaken, Trotsky was democratic and correct and that Trotsky is the source of the best way forward. An article which pursues this line has yet to appear, and this could be for two possible reasons. First, nobody believes that it is true. Second, external or internal censorship is not allowing the open publication of an article which would argue that Trotsky was superior to Lenin.

However, the arguments of those Soviet writers who do link Lenin and Trotsky on the assumption that both were democratic have implications for the question of Trotsky's possible rehabilitation in the CPSU. For example, by locating the origins of the victory of bureaucratization

in 1922-24, by opposing Lenin and Trotsky's democratization to Stalin's bureaucratization, Podshchekoldin's interpretation would also pave the way for Trotsky's rehabilitation in the party. After all, when O. Lacis was questioned about such a possibility he drew a distinction between two types of rehabilitation, i.e., civic and political. [62]

Civic rehabilitation amounts to a situation where people are allowed to read Trotsky and to draw their own conclusions about him. This process has begun, and its consequences have been far-reaching. For example, one significant change from talk of Trotsky in the past concerns the use of Trotsky in the contemporary Soviet press. It has become acceptable to use Trotsky as a source both as a commentary on a topic, and as evidence. Thus, in his article on Kerensky, Zvyagin quotes Trotsky's view of Kerensky as a 'chance figure'; while Razinskii cites Trotsky as supporting evidence for the claim that Lenin and Sverdlov took the decision to execute the tsar and his family.. [63]

Moreover, Trotsky has also become a subject around which polemics are forming. For example, in an interview published in Pravda (15.4.88) V. Belov stated that Trotsky was an enemy of the Russian state and of the peasantry in particular. [64] It was the Trotskyist peasant programme of excessive taxation, forced seizure of

their property, and repression that Stalin was to adopt from 1928 onwards. In this sense, for Belov, Stalin was the main Trotskyist in Soviet history. Eighteen months later in the radical magazine Ogonek I. Pantin and E. Plimak launched an attack on Belov's interpretation. [65] They ask why Belov remained silent on the fact that between 1919-22 Lenin announced full solidarity with Trotsky's approach to the peasantry. Moreover, did Belov not know that the 12th Party Congress accepted Trotsky's resolution that industry should not be developed at the expense of agriculture? Pantin and Plimak cite Bulletin of the Opposition of February-March 1930 where Trotsky rejected Stalin's peasant policies. The critique of Belov concludes with a plea to Soviet historians to base their research on documents and facts, otherwise Soviet democracy would turn into a meaningless rubbish heap.

In December 1989 Literaturnaya Rossiya published an article by Vasetskii and Ivanov which claimed to judge who was closer to the truth - 'the writer Vasilii Belov or the authors of Ogonek'. [66] After writing that both Belov and Pantin and Plimak failed to provide sufficient evidence for their conflicting interpretations, Vasetskii and Ivanov support Belov's approach. Thus, Pantin and Plimak are accused of writing history 'according to Trotsky', a bad idea since the book The Stalin School of Falsification could be called The Trotsky School of Falsification. Vasetskii and Ivanov argue that it is impossible to link

the views of Trotsky and Lenin on the peasantry since Trotsky highlighted the predominance of countryside over town as the cause of Russian backwardness, while Lenin believed that the base of the Soviet state was a worker-peasant alliance. The fact that Trotsky criticised Stalin's peasant policy in the Bulletin of the Opposition did not mean that he shared a Leninist position. If Pantin and Plimak had quoted Trotsky further then they would have been able to fully present Trotsky's thesis that, 'the contradiction between town and country can be solved only in the framework of international revolution', i.e., a solution based upon a rejection of Lenin's theory of building socialism in one country. Moreover, Trotsky, in 1923, was the first to criticise Lenin's NEP. Furthermore, Vasetskii and Ivanov cite Bulletin of the Opposition of October 1936 where Trotsky himself wrote that Stalin's economic policy was composed from the ideas of the left opposition of 1926-27. In several of his 1990 articles Vasetskii has attacked those Soviet writers who present Trotsky as being democratic. [67] To counter this view Vasetskii cites Trotsky from the October 1923 Plenum where Trotsky declared, 'You, comrades, know well that I have never been a 'democrat''.

In the most favourable interpretation of Trotsky's life to date, Pantsov launched into the first critique of Vasetskii. [68] Pantsov quickly demolished Ivanov's 1987 article 'Repainting Judas'; placing it in the tradition of

the Short Course, and arguing that Ivanov's approach "mitigates against any serious attempt to objectively understand Trotsky's political biography." [69] Vasetskii and Volkogonov are linked as members of a school which states that Trotsky loved himself more than the revolution. In response to the rhetorical question 'how can one sustain the Vasetskii et al thesis?' Pantsov lists four examples of Lenin's positive behaviour towards Trotsky: describing Trotsky as 'perhaps the most able man in the present Central Committee'; nominating Trotsky in preference over many old Bolsheviki for membership of the Central Committee in 1917; declaring agreement with Trotsky's pro-NEP arguments of November 1922; towards the end of his life turning to Trotsky in order to form an anti-bureaucratic bloc.

Moreover, on the question of the peasantry, Pantsov stresses the continuity of Trotsky's pro-peasant stances. Thus, at the Second RSDRP Congress of 1903, Trotsky "actively defended Lenin's principles on the agrarian part of the programme." [70] For Pantsov, the theory of permanent revolution did not deny the revolutionary role of the peasantry. Indeed, it specified that only "a workers' government, supported by the peasantry, could solve all the complex problems which stood before the revolution." [71] In the civil war years Trotsky formed an army which was composed mainly of peasants. Observing their activities only strengthened Trotsky's appreciation

of the necessity for a firm worker/peasant bloc. Furthermore, Trotsky was both one of the first to recognize the detrimental effects of war communism on the peasantry, and to articulate policies which, when elaborated, became NEP.

Several of Pantsov's other arguments are notable both for their pro-Trotsky nature, and for their clear rejection of the Vasetskii approach. First, Trotsky is presented not only as the main organizer of the October 1917 revolution, but also as its theoretician. Results and Prospects is highlighted as the work in which Trotsky, before Lenin,

expressed the idea not only of the possibility, but also the inevitability of the victory of the socialist revolution in one country; precisely in the country which was backward in social-economic and political relations, the country of the weakest link in the world capitalist system. [72]

Second, at the time of the debates of the peace with Germany, Trotsky's 'no peace, no war' strategy is praised for bridging the gap between Lenin and the left-communists. For Pantsov, this saved the Bolshevik party from what would have been a disastrous split. It is pointed out that Trotsky could not have foreseen the consequences of a renewed German advance; at the time his position was perceived as the best way to promote world revolution. Third, in the power struggle with Stalin, it is argued that Trotsky expressed the case for inter-party democracy. However, the superiority of his positions both

on this question, and on the issue of socialism in one country, was defeated by a,

party-government bureaucracy which preferred the immediate strengthening of its position of supremacy over the abstract interests of world revolution. Stalin's theory of isolated economic and political development expressed this perspective....with clear and angry warnings about the dangers of the bureaucratic degeneration of Soviet power he [Trotsky] turned to the very apparatus which was all the more becoming bureaucratized. [73]

Finally, and in comparison to Volkogonov and Vasetskii, Pantsov states that Trotsky's exile activities can only be represented as anti-Soviet and anti-working class if one views Stalin as both unconnected with the bureaucratic degeneration of the Soviet Union, and as having no negative influence of the world communist movement. However, according to Pantsov, such perceptions are without a basis in reality:

Right up until the middle of the 1920s Trotsky was known in Soviet Russia as the hero of October, the organiser of the Red Army, the second person after Lenin in the party leadership....he was and remained a revolutionary, practically the only person from Lenin's closest supporters who did not bow his head before Stalin's dictatorship. [74]

Political rehabilitation meant reinstatement in the CPSU. For Lacis, this will not occur because Trotsky was anti-Party and anti-Leninist. However, if the Podshchekoldin approach gained ascendancy then the Party would, ostensibly, have no reason not to rehabilitate Trotsky.

But there are several reasons to doubt whether this will occur. [75]

First, the textual evidence from contemporary Soviet news media does not suggest that this will happen. The most recent article to appear on this question, by A. Nenarokov, argued that Trotsky should not be rehabilitated because rehabilitation in the party is not necessary for the restoration of one's good name. [76] Moreover, posthumous rehabilitation carries with it the possibility of posthumous expulsion. This, for Nenarokov, is a throwback to the times when one was frightened to pass any comment on a person until one knew the position of that person in relation to the party. Rehabilitation should be reserved for those still alive and requesting it.

Second, the nature of Trotsky's biography adds extra difficulties for the CPSU when considering the possibility of Trotsky's party rehabilitation. For example, Trotsky, unlike Bukharin, did not return to the Soviet Union and participate in the show trials. Trotsky had a particular oppositional programme which he voiced vociferously. One of the most important points of Trotsky's writings was that one cannot have socialism in one country. The CPSU still justifies its existence on the basis that it is doing precisely what Trotsky denied. Second, if the party were to rehabilitate Trotsky they would have to do so in a form similar to 'his views on the world revolution were

incorrect, but he was right on Stalin's crimes'. For Trotsky, this would probably amount to a meaningless rehabilitation. Trotsky would be rehabilitated, and he would not be rehabilitated. This, in turn, raises a question of the relationship between civic and political rehabilitation. The free availability of Trotsky's works would pose a threat to the CPSU in its present form. This threat was taken seriously in the past - why else suppress Trotsky's writings and distort his biography? There are reasons to believe that this remains the case today. For example, the introduction of a 'new' Trotsky has been both at a slow pace and contained within certain limits. So far the republication of Trotsky's writings would not allow a reader to appreciate the full content of Trotsky's thought - excerpts from anti-Stalin writings, thoughts on literature, on Lenin, and works from the inter-party struggle of 1924. [77] Permanent Revolution has not been published. Indeed, it is possible to view current Soviet writings/republications as a use of Trotsky to the advantage of perestroika's general attack on Stalinism.

The most favourable view of Trotsky that can be constructed from current Soviet writings is as follows. Trotsky was a revolutionary within the Marxist tradition. He is also part of the October tradition in that he played a vital role in the successful realization of the 1917 Bolshevik revolution; occupied some of the highest posts in the Bolshevik government; helped sustain that

government in power with his contribution in the civil war of which the creation of the Red Army is the most notable example. He was democratic and supported Lenin for greater democracy in the Soviet Union. Far from being anti-NEP he was one of the first to call for its implementation. However, he was incorrect on his main theme, that of the necessity for world revolution. This can be illustrated through an exposition of the arguments expressed by two recently published writings. The first, by People's Deputy A. Emel'yanov, concerns Trotsky, Gorbachev and political change. The second, by Rogovin, is relevant to Trotsky, Gorbachev and economic change.

In his notes to the publication of extracts from Trotsky's The Revolution Betrayed [78] Emel'yanov writes that Trotsky was, 'objectively right about the formation in the country of a social system, the tendencies of its movement to inevitable crisis, and how to escape from that crisis.' [79] According to the author, the social system that Trotsky correctly analysed was one of 'bureaucratic absolutism.' Trotsky is then posited as a precursor to perestroika in several senses. The first sense is introduced by way of a critique of Trotsky's distinction between a 'political' and 'social' revolution. Trotsky had written of the need for a 'second revolution' in the USSR. However, this revolution should be political, i.e., a revolution against bureaucratic power and privileges through the reintroduction of genuine proletarian

democracy. In arguing for the necessity of a second revolution Trotsky predicted perestroika for, according to Emel'yanov, perestroika is the second revolution. However, it is also argued that there is one essential difference between the programmes of Gorbachev and Trotsky. Gorbachev is, in fact, being more radical than Trotsky because he is implementing what Trotsky denied - a social revolution, i.e., changes in forms of ownership. However, if these changes in ownership amount to private enterprise then Gorbachev, in Western terms, is obviously standing both to the 'left' (political and social revolution) and to the 'right' (private enterprise) of Trotsky.

The second sense in which Trotsky's politics and perestroika are linked is through the claim that both are essentially democratic phenomenon. Thus, the author stresses that Trotsky argued for the displacement of bureaucracy not by terroristic acts, but through the introduction of full democracy. Emel'yanov says that democracy ensures that a weak and inefficient leadership is not able to ruin both the country and itself as a leadership. In other words, the fate of society is in the hands of all, not just depending upon the personal qualities of a few people in government. Having identified the connections between Trotsky and perestroika in relation to the content of change in the Soviet Union Emel'yanov highlights a third link when discussing the

nature of that change. The author claims that Trotsky wrote that the defeat of bureaucracy would be possible only through a brave and decisive onslaught. And, 'the practice of perestroika shows that half-way measures slow-down the revolutionary processes of the renewal of society.' [80]

Rogovin draws entirely from stenographic notes of the 12th Party Congress of 1923 for his discussion of Trotsky's support for NEP. [81] The article begins by summarising Trotsky's arguments for the adoption of NEP. First, the economic level of the Soviet Union was not sufficient for a centrally planned economy. Second, NEP and market relations would push the productive forces forward, providing the preconditions for economic life in general. In particular, NEP would regulate the relations between town and country. The transition from a failed war communism to NEP would be characterised by a movement away from centralism in the economy; an attack on 'superfluous' unproductive bureaucracy and labour; the acquisition of profits through the sale of Russian bread on the world market'; and independent enterprises run on the basis of cost-accountancy (khozraschet). Cost-accountancy in the economy would both provide the basis for a correlation between the state budget, trusts, enterprises and the market; and work against wasteful practices and stealing. All enterprises would be run on the basis of cost-accountancy, and make their own decisions about who to

trade with, how to achieve the most advantageous terms for exchange, what to do with profits etc. Indeed, it is claimed that Trotsky thought that these attitudes amount to a 'spirit' which acts as an incentive to produce better. Any industrial manager who proved incapable of fulfilling the obligations of cost-accountancy would be sacked. Unprofitable enterprises would be closed by way of decisions made by financial institutions on whether to grant or withhold credit.

However, the introduction of the market would not mean the abolition either of all planning, or of all state enterprises. Problems with planning methods arise not only when they are applied to unprepared economic areas, but also when they are denied when conditions for their application are ripe. For Trotsky, planning was appropriate for the army, transport and heavy industry. Trotsky also realised that the market would have negative effects in that there would be social differentiation and the growth of classes hostile to socialism. However, for Trotsky, as for Lenin, NEP was a long-term strategy that would not last for ever. The Communist Party would retain state power, nationalised means of production would remain for the 'three whales' (army, heavy industry, transport), and there would be a monopoly of external trade. Indeed, the Communist Party would introduce the laws of market operation to use them for economic gain but also simultaneously advance and broaden the planning principle

so that the market would be gradually absorbed. In this way NEP would be controlled and converted into socialism.

The relevance of Rogovin's presentation of 'Trotsky and NEP in 1923' for the processes occurring in contemporary Soviet political economy is obvious. Gorbachev's economic strategy involves a transition from centralism to decentralism and the introduction of cost-accountancy. The problem with this approach is that it is open to attack for being 'non-socialist'. Reference to Trotsky's notion of an introduction of the market to kill the market would be one way of answering this critique from a socialist position.

So, Trotsky has been neatly packaged into a box which fits the present ideological requirements of the Gorbachev regime, i.e., a democratic, market-orientated Marxist tradition which has meant particular attention being focussed on Lenin's last writings. If the complete Trotsky were available in the Soviet Union, this would raise the possibility of a movement being guided by his revolutionary thought, perhaps even a mass movement. This would be a danger to a party based on socialism in one country. However, if a multi-party system were to develop in the Soviet Union then this would have several consequences for the debate on Trotsky in the USSR. [82] First, the whole issue of Trotsky's rehabilitation in the CPSU would lose any meaning it once had. A Trotskyist

Communist Party would presumably engage in a battle of interpretation over Trotsky, the Russian revolution, 'true' communism etc with several other parties - some of which might retain a socialist framework, others not. Second, Trotskyist critiques of the Soviet Union would have to move beyond the 'degenerated workers' state' thesis. For example, the object of Trotskyist analysis would no longer be concentrated purely on a Stalinist bureaucracy and the necessity for its abolition through a political revolution. Thus, the Trotskyist critique that the Stalinist CPSU protected itself from by not publishing Trotsky would be marginalised by a functioning multi-party system. The old rationale for suppressing Trotsky would disappear.

Third, a multi-party system assumes that diverse political groups will have access to such sources of information dissemination as printing presses. With this equipment out of the control of the CPSU a Trotskyist party (or publisher who thought that a profit could be made) could print any part of Trotsky's work available to it. In the flow of information between political groups and the electorate perhaps the Soviet Trotskyist party would achieve as much electoral success as its Western counterparts have attained. If the complete Trotsky is published and distributed in the Soviet Union then the clue to why this would occur lies not only in the ideas of

openness applied to history expounded in the introduction to this chapter. Radzikhovskii stated that Stalin used Trotsky to bolster his position. Perhaps the present Soviet regime, and a future one that would remove any restrictions that would prevent the publication of all his writings, looks upon Trotsky as being of no danger, of no relevance. [83] It might also be upon suppositions of harmlessness that current Soviet debates can continue upon whatever road they choose. [84]

1. See, for example, 'Istoriya i npravstvennost' Pravda, 28th January 1988; M. S. Gorbachev, 'Oktyabr', perestroika: revolyutsiya prodolzhaestya' Izvestiya, 3rd November 1987; 'Oktyabr', perestroika i sovremennyi mir', Pravda, 4th November 1987, p 8; 'V press-tsentre 70-letiya velikogo oktyabrya', Pravda, 5th November 1987, p 11.
2. V. Pozdnyakov, 'Net cheloveka, net problemy...' Izvestiya, 3rd August 1988, p 6. See also I. Kosyakov's letter 'Nezasluzhenno zabytyi' in Dialog, No. 7, 1990. Here, Kosyakov comments on an article published in Dialog, No. 2, 1990 by N. Pishchulin and S. Sokol. They informed that, in the results of their survey, only 6% of Soviet citizens had favourably evaluated Trotsky's activities. Kosyakov states that one has to understand these responses against a background of lies told about Trotsky since the time of Lenin's death. For Kosyakov, Soviet readers should have access to all of Trotsky's writings, and contemporary Soviet books on Trotsky should tell the truth.
3. N. A. Vasetskii, 'Likvidatsiya. kto i pochemu ubil Trotskogo', Literaturnaya gazeta, 4th January 1990, No. 1., p 13.
4. V. I. Lenin, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Moscow 5th edition, 1962, Vol. 27, p 606.
5. R. Medvedev, 'Trotskii: shtrikhi k politicheskomu portretu' Inostrannaya literatura, No. 3, 1989, pp 167-174.
6. Velikaya oktyar'skaya sotsialisticheskaya revolyutsiya, Moscow, 1987, p 530.
7. Ibid., p 500.
8. V. Ivanov, 'Perekrashivayut Iudushku' Sovetskaya Rossiya, 27th September 1987, p 4.
9. This point is also true of the general approach towards Trotsky in the contemporary Soviet media. For example, in an interview published in Argumenty i fakty (No. 28, 1989) Ivan Vrachev gave the following account of why Trotsky did not attend Lenin's funeral. Trotsky was on a train journey and received news of Lenin's death at Tiflis station. Trotsky sent a telegram to the Central Committee asking if there was time to return for the funeral. Stalin replied saying that the funeral was on Saturday, which meant that Trotsky did not have sufficient time. However,

Stalin deliberately lied to Trotsky - the funeral was on Sunday.

The use of false accusations of having contact with Trotsky as a method of proving guilt of anti-Soviet activity during the show-trials is described by Zavorotnyi's 'Poshchechina Stalina', Komsomol'skaya pravda, 6th July 1989, p 4. Here, Zavorotnyi writes of the origins of the false charge levelled at Piatakov: that he received orders from Trotsky at a meeting between the two in 1935.

For an account of the events leading up to Trotsky's exile from the Soviet Union see M. Panteleev, 'Izgnanie', Moskovskie novosti, No. 9, 4th March 1990, p 16.

For an exposition of Trotsky's early literary contributions to the journal Eastern Review see V. N. Shaposhnikov, 'Trotskii sotrudnik <<Vostochnogo Obozreniya>>', Izvestiya sibirskogo otdeleniya akademii nauk SSSR, seriya istoriya, filologiya i filosofiya, No. 3, 1989, pp 66-71.

A contemporary Soviet bibliographical survey of Trotsky's writings, with a short favourable biographical introduction, has been compiled by V. V. Krylov, 'Passazhir parokhoda 'Il'ich'', Sovetskaya bibliografiya, No. 1, 1990, pp 76-93.

10. V. Ulanov, 'Trotskii. K politicheskoi biografii' Leningradskaya pravda, 23rd July 1989, pp 2-3.
11. L. Trotsky, My Life, (New York, 1970), pp 160-162.
12. L. M. Minaev, 'Bor'ba za liderstvo i deformatsiya oblika Leninizma' Voprosy istorii KPSS, No. 12, 1989, pp 98-115.
13. Ibid., p 114
14. Ibid.
15. N. A. Vasetskii, 'Shtrikhi k portretu Trotskogo' Komsomol'skaya pravda, 19th May 1989.
16. N. A. Vasetskii, 'L. D. Trotskii: politicheskii portret' Novaya i noveishaya istoriya, No. 3, 1989, p 140.
17. N. A. Vasetskii, 'Fragmenty iz knigi L. D. Trotskogo <<istoriya russkoi revolyutsii>>' Istoriya SSSR, No. 2, 1990, p 161 ff. See also N. A. Vasetskii, 'Lenin i Trotskii' Kommunist ukrainy, No. 1, 1990, pp 33-34.
18. cited in N. A. Vasetskii, 'Fragmenty iz knigi...', p 163 & 'Lenin i Trotskii', p 34.

19. N. A. Vasetskii, 'Fragmenty iz knigi...', p 157. See also N. A. Vasetskii, 'Posleslovie' Novaya i noveishaya istoriya, No. 2, 1990, p 202.
20. N. A. Vasetskii, 'Fragmenty iz knigi...', p 157.
21. Ibid. See also 'Posleslovie', p 202, 'Lenin i Trotskii', pp 32-33.
22. N. A. Vasetskii, 'Fragmenty iz knigi', p 162.
23. N. A. Vasetskii, 'L.D. Trotskii: politicheskii portret', pp 145-148 & op. cit.
24. Ibid., p 149.
25. N. A. Vasetskii, 'Shriki k portretu Trotskogo'.
26. D. Volkogonov, 'Chelovek planety bez pasporta i visy' Rodina, No. 7, 1989, p 30.
27. cited in N. A. Vasetskii, 'L. D. Trotskii: politicheskii portret', p 150. The rule was introduced in 1922.
28. Ibid., pp 149-151.
29. This interpretation is also used by Volkogonov. For example, in an interview with D. Kasutinym (Moskovskie novosti, 25th February 1990, pp 8-9) Volkogonov says that Trotsky's excessive self-confidence and strong radicalism repelled many Bolsheviks. However, Volkogonov also appears as being more conciliatory towards Trotsky, stating that he was the 'second person' (after Lenin) of October, and that it is possible for Soviet historians to learn much from his writings.
30. D. Volkogonov, 'Chelovek planety bez pasporta i visy', p 32.
31. Op. cit., p 149.
32. N. A. Vasetskii, 'Shriki k portretu Trotskogo'.
33. D. Volkogonov, 'Demon revolyutsii' Sputnik, No. 5, 1989, pp 85-87. Indeed, in his article 'Fenomon Stalina' (Literaturnaya gazeta, 9th December 1987, p 13) Volkogonov argues that life would have been harder under Trotsky given his lack of a "clear and scientific programme of building socialism in the USSR."

34. N. A. Vasetskii, 'L. D. Trotskii: politicheskii portret', p 162.
35. Ibid., pp 152-155.
36. D. Volkogonov, 'Chelovek planety bez pasporta i visy', pp 30-31
37. Op. cit., p 165.
38. U. Korablev, 'Pochemu Trotskii? Na voprosy chitatelei otvechaet istorik' Politicheskoe obrazovanie, No. 2, 1989, pp 57-62. Korablev's views in this article are more favourable towards Trotsky than those earlier expressed in the article 'Zashchita revolyutsii', Sovetskaya Rossiya, 21st February 1988, p 3. In the 1988 article Korablev stated that in the civil war: (i) Trotsky merely carried-out the orders of the Central Committee; (ii) he made many serious errors in executing his orders; (iii) was 'adventuristic' in many of his acts; (iv) had to be reprimanded by the Central Committee for his harsh character. For an exposition of the joint approaches of Lenin and Trotsky to the questions of the need to attract war specialists to the Red Army; the notion of an armed 'workers' army' organised as a regular army; the necessity for discipline; and how these joint policies were expressions of the ideas of Marx and Engels see M. A. Molodtsygin, 'Iz istorii perekhoda k stroitel'stvy massovoi regul'yarnoi krasnoi armii'. Voенно istoricheskii zhurnal, No. 8, 1989, pp 47-62 & 10, 1989, pp 37-55. For an approach similar to, but more favourable than, Korablev's 1989 article about Trotsky's civil war activities see, V. N. Rostal'noi & D. V. Tabachnik, 'Krasnyi lev revolyutsii', Filosofskaya i sotsiologicheskaya mysl', No. 9, 1989, pp 80-93, espec. pp 83 ff.
39. V. Rogovin, 'Lev Trotskii. Stat'i ob iskusstve' Teatr, No. 8, 1989, pp 82-85.
40. Ibid., p 82.
41. Ibid., p 84.
42. Ibid., p 83.
43. Ibid., p 84.
44. S. Burni, 'Poslednii shans', Sobesednik, No. 40, September, 1989.

45. 'Delegat 1 s'ezda Sovetov', Argumenty i fakty, No. 28, 1989.
46. V. I. Billik, 'Trotskii. Na puti k pravde o nem' Sobesednik, No. 33, August, 1989, pp 12-13.
47. Op. cit., pp 28-29.
48. See, for example, L. Trotsky, The Third International after Lenin (New York, 1957), espec. Chapter One. For an exposition of the relationship between uneven development and permanent revolution see I. D. Thatcher, 'Uneven and Combined Development: The relationship to permanent revolution'. Paper read to the PSA MSG, University of London, 12th September 1989; and Chapter One of this thesis.
49. See, for example, N. A. Vasetskii, V konflikte c epokhoi. Trotskizm protiv real'nogo sotsializma, (Moscow, 1985), espec. Chapter One.
50. V. I. Startsev, Introduction to L. Trotsky, Stalinskaya shkola fal'sifikatsii, Voprosy istorii, No. 7, 1989, pp 135-137.
51. V. I. Startsev, 'Lenin i Trotskii' Moskovskie novosti, No. 45, 5th November 1989, p 9.
52. Op. cit., p 148.
53. L. Trotsky, Dneviki i pis'ma, (New York, 1986), p 84.
54. V. I. Startsev, Rodina, No. 7, 1989, p 32.
55. L. A. Radzikhovskii, 'Boyazn' demokratii', Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya No. 3, 1989, pp 81, 85-86.
56. See, for example, Nemarksistskie kontsepsii sotsializma, (Moscow, 1986), p 140.
57. A. V. Pantsov, 'Trotskii i Preobrazhenskii', EKO, No. 1, 1990, pp 63-66.
58. A. Podshchekoldin, 'Novyi kurs: prolog tragedii' Molodoi kommunist, No. 8, 1989, pp 45-50. For the democratic nature of Trotsky's anti-bureaucratic stances in the inter-party struggles of the 1920's see also, V. Rogovin, 'Vnutripartiinaya bor'ba 20-kh godov: prichiny i uroki', Politicheskoe obrazovanie, No. 14, 1989, pp 90-98, espec. pp 96-97.

59. L. Radzikhovskii, 'Zaveshchanie. k 120-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya V.I. Lenina', Moscovskie novosti, No. 16, 22nd April 1990, p 6.
60. D. Volkogonov, Moscovskie novosti, 25th February 1990, pp 8-9. For a fuller exposition of the arguments in this interview see footnote 82.
61. L. Radzikhovskii, '<<Staraya gvardiya>> pered novym sudom?' Sobesednik, No. 11, March 1990.
62. 'Garantii demokratii', Komsomol'skaya pravda, 28th June 1988, p 1.
63. V. Zvyagin, 'Ya khochu idti poseredine', Moscovskie novosti, No. 45, 5th November 1989, p 16. E. Radzinskii, 'Rasstrel v Yekaterinburge', Ogonek, No. 2, 1990, p 27.
64. V. Belov, 'Vozrodit' v krest'yanstve krest'yanskoe...' Pravda, 15th April 1988, p 3.
65. I. Pantin & E. Plimak, 'Vremena obnovleniya i fantomy proshlogo' Ogonek, No. 45, 1989, pp 10-12.
66. N. A. Vasetskii & V. Ivanov, 'Bumerang usechennykh tsitat' Literaturnaya Rossiya, No. 50, 15th December 1989.
67. See, for example, N. A. Vasetskii, 'Posleslovie', p 204; 'Fragmenti iz knigi', p 156; 'Lenin i Trotskii', p 19.
68. A. V. Pantsov, 'Lev Davidovich Trotskii', Voprosy istorii, No. 5, 1990, pp 65-87.
69. Ibid., p 65.
70. Ibid., p 68.
71. Ibid., p 70.
72. Ibid., p 71.
73. Ibid., p 85.
74. Ibid., p 87.
75. Trotsky's grandson and great granddaughter sent a request to the Supreme Court SSSR for Trotsky's juridical rehabilitation. However, the chairman of the Supreme Court SSSR, E. Smolentsev, has said that this is impossible given that no juridical decision

was ever taken on Trotsky. Moskovskie novosti, No. 9, 4th March 1990, p 16.

76. A. Nenarokov, 'Vozvrashchenie imeni' Moskovskie novosti, No. 9, 4th March 1990, p 16.
77. The list of Trotsky's writings recently published in the USSR that I have compiled is as follows:
 Excerpts from O Lenine: Materialy dlya biografii (Moscow, 1924); Iz vospominaniy o Lenine, (Tiflis, 1924); Moya zhizn', (Vol. 2, Berlin, 1930). Ogonek, No. 17, April 1989, pp 3-7. Short editorial introduction which claims that Trotsky's excerpts show how one can 'break with Leninism while simultaneously having genuine love and respect for Lenin.'
 'Iosif Stalin. Opyt kharakteristiki' (September, 1939) Gorizont, No. 5, 1989, pp 51-62. The article is introduced by N. A. Vasetskii 'On byl zakhvanchen bor'boi protiv Stalina...', pp 47-51. Vasetskii also provides footnotes, pp 62-64.
 Excerpts from Stalinskaya shkola fal'sifikatsii (Berlin, 1932). Kommunist, No. 10, July 1989, pp 101-103. These are edited excerpts from pp 21-31 in the original text.
 Excerpts from 'Novyi kurs' (January, 1924). Molodoi kommunist, No. 8, 1989, pp 51-68. Introduced by Aleksandr Podshchekoldin's 'Novyi kurs: prolog tragedii', pp 45-50.
 Excerpts from Stalin. Argumenty i fakty, No. 34, 1989, pp 4-6. Introduced and footnoted by N. A. Vasetskii.
 Excerpts from Stalin. Argumenty i fakty, No. 37, 1989, pp 5-6. Footnoted by N. A. Vasetskii.
 Excerpts from 'Tuda i obratno' (1907), Sovershenno sekretno, No. 4, 1989, pp 14-16.
 'Natsional'noe v Lenine' (Pravda, April 23, 1920). Rodina, No. 7, 1989, p 33. This article is introduced by Vitalii Startsev, p 32.
 Excerpts from Stalinskaya shkola fal'sifikatsii (Berlin, 1932). Voprosy istorii, No. 7, 1989, pp 137-153. Introduced by V. I. Startsev, pp 135-137. The excerpts are pp 5-38 of the original text. The publication of Stalinskaya shkola fal'sifikatsii has continued in Voprosy istorii in the following numbers: 8 (1989), pp 125-139 (pages 38-68 of the original); 9 (1989), pp 112-133 (pages 68-111 of the original); 10 (1989), pp 117-135 (pages 112-131 & 165-179 of the original); 12 (1989), pp 84-101 (pages 132-164 of the original).
 Excerpts from Literatura i revolyutsiya (Moscow, 1923). Voprosy literatury, No. 7, 1989, pp 189-228. Introduced by N. Trifonov, pp 183-189. These

excerpts are pp 34-40; 55-65; 119-135; and 255-69 of the original text.

Excerpts from Literatura i revolyutsiya (Moscow, 1923). Teatr, No. 8, 1989, pp 85-102. Introduced by V. Rogovin, pp 82-85. These excerpts are pages 136-190 of the original text.

Excerpts from 'Nashi raznoglasiya' (30th November, 1924). Nedelya, No. 37, 11-17 September 1989, pp 14-15. Short introduction by V. Sirotkin. This text was translated in The Challenge of the Left Opposition, 1923-25, (New York, 1981), and was previously available in Russian only in the Harvard archives.

'Nasha politika v dele sozdaniya armii'. Speech to the VIII Party Congress, 20-21st March 1919.

Reprinted in Izvestiya Ts.K KPSS, No. 9, 1989, pp 175-181.

Excerpts from Chto takoe SSSR i kuda on idet ? (Paris, 1989). Voprosy ekonomiki, No. 12, 1989, pp 123-125. Commentary by A. Emel'yanov, pp 125-127.

It is claimed by Voprosy ekonomiki that the excerpts are reprinted from the Paris, 1936 edition published by Slovo. However, the reprints are from the Slovo, 1989 edition. The first Russian edition of Chto takoe... was published in Paris, in 1971, by the 4th International. The first available edition was in french, published by Grasset in 1936. The excerpts are pages 233-238 (1971 edition), and pages 288-293 (1989 edition) of the original text.

'Iosif Stalin. Opyt kharakteristiki.' (September, 1939) and 'Sverkh-bordzhia v kremle' (October, 1939). Osmyslit' Kult' Stalina, (Moscow, 1989), pp 624-647.

'Nashi rasnoglasiya' (30 November 1924). Novaya i noveishaya istoriya, No. 2, 1990, pp 171-197.

Introduced by V. G. Sirotkin, pp 168-171. Afterword by N. A. Vasetskii, pp 198-204.

Excerpts from Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii (1931), Istoriya SSSR, No. 2, 1990, pp 164-173. Introduced by N. A. Vasetskii, pp 156-164.

'Germano-Sovetskii Soyuz' (September 1939), Daugava, No. 3, 1990, pp 111-113.

'V sekretariat Ts.K' (24th October 1927), Rodina, No. 3, 1990, p 59.

'Yadro voprosa' (Summer 1927), Slovo, No. 4, 1990, pp 16-17. Previously published as the chapter

'Raznoglasiya s Leninym' in L. Trotsky, Portrety revolyutsionerov, Benson, 1988, pp 40-47.

'L. D. Trotskii V. I. Leniny' (5th June 1921), 'L. D. Trotskii V. M. Molotovy' (5th June 1921), Izvestiya Ts.K. KPSS, No. 4, 1990, pp 178-179.

'L. D. Trotskii chlenam politbyuro Ts.K. RKP(b)' (15th May 1922), Ibid., pp 196-197. The letter from Trotsky to Lenin of 5th June 1921 had previously been published in The Trotsky Papers, (The Hauge, 1971), Vol. 2, p 462.

'Pis'mo L. D. Trotskogo chlenam Ts.K. i Ts.K.K. RKP(b)' (8 October 1923) Izvestiya Ts.K. KPSS, No. 5, 1990, pp 165-175. This is the first full publication of this letter. Extracts from the letter were previously published in Sotsialiticheski vestnik, No. 11, 24th March 1924 and in Molodoi kommunist, No. 8, 1989, p 49.

'L. D. Trotskii zashchishchaetsya', Voprosy istorii KPSS, No. 5, 1990, pp 32-43. This is a publication of Boris Bazhanov's notes of Trotsky's 26th October 1923 speech to the Joint Plenum of the Ts.K. and Ts.K.K. The editorial claims that the "publication of this document witnesses not only to Trotsky's presence at the Plenum -which for a long time was in doubt- but also, along with other documents, testifies to the fact that Trotsky attended all meetings between 25-27 October 1923, speaking at them on four occasions." (p 33) It is pointed out that in My Life Trotsky spoke unclearly about the events of October-November 1923 due to the fact that, according to him, at that time, he was suffering from a strong cold caught on an autumn hunt. Deutscher is cited as confirming that Trotsky, "in the course of those decisive months was confined to bed with a temperature"; and Broue is quoted as saying that Trotsky was absent from the meetings of 25-27 October "because of a cold and high temperature." (ibid).

'Rech L. D. Trotskogo na mogile A. A. Ioffe na novodevich'em kladbishche v Moskve 19-go noyabrya 1927 goda' Novaya i noveishaya istoriya, No. 3, 1990, pp 108-109.

'Ya umry s nepokolebimoi veroi', Moskovskie novosti, No. 29, 22nd July 1990, p 16. Extracts from Trotsky's 'testament'.

'Ssylka, vycylka, shitaniya, smert'' Znamaya, July, 1990, pp 173-190. Sections of the material that make-up this publications were previously available in L. Trotsky Dnevnik i pis'ma, (New Jersey, 1986), pp 25-27, 31-35, 44-55.

78. A. Emel'yanov, 'S pozitsii segodnyashnego dnya', Voprosy ekonomiki, No. 12, 1989, pp 125-127.
79. Ibid., p 125.
80. Ibid., p 126.
81. V. Rogovin, 'L. D. Trotskii o NEPE', Ekonomicheskie nauki, No. 1, 1990, pp 94-102.
82. It is too early to know what form a Soviet multi-party system will take. Especially uncertain is the scenario that I construct, in which parties can be

formed and act in a manner similar to, for example, those in Britain. The likelihood of a Soviet multi-party system is expressed by the Platform of the CC KPSS to the 28th Party Congress published in Izvestiya, 13th February 1990, p 1: 'The democratization of our society is accompanied by the growth of new social-political citizens' organizations. The development of society does not exclude the possibility to form parties.' However, it is also pointed out that these parties will be formed in accordance with laws of the constitution of the USSR, laws that will also contain restrictions: '....in the legislative order the formation, and activities, of organizations and movements which advocate force, international discord, and which follow extreme anti-constitutional aims should be forbidden.' This provision could be used to suppress, among others, a Trotskyist revolutionary organization. The argument that a multi-party system is necessary to overcome the evils of Stalinism has implications for the analysis of the origins of Stalinism. These implications are expressed by Volkogonov in an interview with him published in Moskovskie novosti, 25th February 1990, pp 8-9. Here, in his explanation of Stalinism, Volkogonov comes close to using Trotsky's notion of 'substitutionism'. Volkogonov refers to the destruction of political pluralism in July 1918 (when the left-SRs were outlawed) as an event which led to Stalinism in two senses. First, when a single-party system exists there is an accompanying demand for a monopoly of thought. This, in turn, has a logic which leads to the domination of one man. Second, the left-SR's represented the interests of the peasantry. If they had remained as part of the government, then Stalin would not have gained supreme power. However, Volkogonov's belief in pluralism does not mean that his general interpretation has become more favourable towards Trotsky. For example, he differentiates three Bolshevik tendencies: Leninism, Stalinism, and Trotskyism. Lenin was able to reevaluate and correct his views. Thus, from the period of war communism to NEP, Lenin changed his opinions on the issues of world revolution (pro to anti), market relations (anti to pro), and cooperation (anti to pro). Stalin and Trotsky remained trapped within their own misconceptions - the former holding the absurd notion of 'communism in one country', the latter full of the romance of world revolution. Lenin's misfortune was that he did not have sufficient time for a 'second correction', i.e., the implementation of political reforms. It was the absence of this 'second correction' that enabled a monopoly of power and

thought.

83. This thought was expressed by Igor Klyamkin in his article 'Kakaya ulitsa vedet k khramu?' Novyi mir, No. 11, 1987, pp 150-188: "Among the 'erased' he, as is well-known, is the most 'erased'. This corresponded to the political situation at the end of the 1920s: Trotsky was the strongest and most influential among the opponents to the government course. But to what would he be a danger to today?" (p 177)
84. In her article 'The Prophet Returned?' (Revolutionary History, No. 2, 1989, pp 54-56) Judith Shapiro says that, "I would agree with Tariq Ali that resistance to greater historical honesty flows not from fear of the power of Trotskyist ideas, but in the threat to party legitimacy such real debate has already posed." However, the logic expressed here is questionable. If being honest about Trotsky's thought means that the legitimacy of the party is threatened, then there is a power to Trotsky's thought. After all, to what else could Trotsky's thought be a danger to apart from a CPSU and state apparatus which expresses/expounds socialism in one country? The basis of Trotsky's critique was that a country could not be both isolated and socialist. This inevitably questions the legitimacy of the CPSU. One cannot sustain the distinction that Shapiro uses.

Chapter Three

Trotsky's Philosophy

This chapter will examine Trotsky's philosophy. Included in the term 'philosophy' are all notions which act as tools for perceiving reality and assumptions/ideas which form a body of thought which, in turn, mean that reality will be viewed in a certain way. In his 'Testament' Trotsky said that he would die both a 'Marxist' and 'dialectical materialist'. [1] The basis for Trotsky's belief in the superiority of Marxism was his assurance of two things. First, Marxism is 'objective', i.e., it provides a means for the study of society which produces results which are a summary/reflection of objective facts. In other words, Marxism enables a person to see the world as it really is. Second, this objectivity gives the Marxist the power of foresight. [2] For Trotsky, it was Marxist doctrine that enabled him to foresee the inevitability of the Soviet Thermidor, to break away from the Thermidorian bureaucracy and continue to serve the cause of international socialism. [3] According to Trotsky, Marxism consists of three component parts: first, the dialectical method; second, historical materialism; third, a systemization of the laws of capitalist economy. [4]

Trotsky's writings on Marx's laws of capitalist economy consisted of both an exposition of the theory of surplus value, immiserization, crisis of capitalist production and so on, and of statements of their continuing validity. [5] Such texts are of obvious importance in highlighting the

source of Trotsky's belief in Marxism and the likely collapse of capitalism. However, in attempting to analyze Trotsky's basic approach to reality this chapter will focus primarily on his writings on the dialectic. This is for several reasons. First, there is more material on this topic. Second, Trotsky's writings on the dialectic are interesting in that they are both ambiguous (his work on Marx's laws of capitalist economy is not), and raise questions about how his emphasis on dialectics relates to his emphasis on economic determinism, i.e., what exactly was Trotsky's method? Third, most commentators have interpreted Trotsky's works as having little or no philosophical content. However, detailed consideration of Trotsky's texts that do talk explicitly about philosophy are omitted. Thus, for example, Knei-Paz claims that Trotsky lacked the personal qualities necessary for philosophy; the "merest glance" at Trotsky's writings on the dialectic is sufficient to see that they are the product of Trotsky at his "dogmatic, horatory worst." [6] However, Knei-Paz's discussion of Trotsky and dialectical materialism is limited to the statement that:

As to the substantive part of Trotsky's argument, who could take seriously the almost naive, and certainly absurd, explanation of scientific phenomena in terms of dialectical processes? [7]

For Trotsky, formal logic and dialectics are the only two systems of logic worthy of attention. For him, formal logic means viewing the world as composed of a series of

static things. The guiding principle is 'A' is equal to 'A'. Contrary to this, dialectics is the study of things which are in a constant state of change. According to Trotsky, the dialectic is composed of two basic thoughts. First, every concept, idea, notion about the world is connected to some other concept, idea, etc. In particular, concepts are joined by what Trotsky called their 'dialectical negation':

Every concept seems to be independent and complete (formal logic operates with them in this way), in reality every stitch has two ends, which connect it with adjacent stitches. If pulled at the end it unravels - the dialectical negation of a concept [8]

If by this Trotsky means that concepts are linked in the sense that we can have no real understanding of a concept without placing it in relation to another concept, then 'dialectical negation' need not be in conflict with formal logic. After all, the process of definition of concepts through a comparison to opposite concepts - for example, defining 'good' through a discussion of 'bad' - necessitates the separation of those concepts, i.e., we retain 'good' and 'bad' as individual entities. For example, in Their Morals and Ours (1938) Trotsky denied the possibility of constructing absolute morals as a point of reference when posing the question, 'what means are acceptable in the achievement of a particular end?' For Trotsky, this question assumes the independence of the concepts 'means' and 'ends':

the principle, the end justifies the means, naturally raises the question: And what justifies the end? In practical life as in the historical movement, the end and the means constantly change places. A machine under construction is an 'end' of production only that upon entering the factory it may become the 'means.' Democracy in certain periods is the 'end' of the class struggle only that later it may be transformed into its 'means.'...the so-called 'Jesuit' principle fails....to resolve the moral problem. [9]

However, Trotsky's argument does not dissolve the notion of independent concepts. In his examples it is the substantiation ('machine', 'democracy') of mean and end which can apply to both concepts, but the abstract concepts of 'mean' and 'end' remain. Moreover, Trotsky's solution to the issue of 'morals' was itself underpinned by a separation of 'mean' and 'end.' Thus, Trotsky, perceiving communism as the end, wrote that,

Only that which prepares the complete and final overthrow of imperialist bestiality is moral, and nothing else. The welfare of the revolution - that is the supreme law! [10]

Furthermore, for Trotsky, the observer of phenomena cannot arbitrarily link any two concepts. According to Trotsky, Marxism is materialist and this has implications for the way in which concepts are to be viewed, i.e., conceptions as either explainable in terms of matter: "The human brain is a product of the development of matter" [11]; or as a product of a material base:

the consciousness of people is not a free,

independent psychological process, but is a function of the material economic basis; that is, it is conditioned by it and serves it. [12]

Both understandings of the nature of materialism are present in Trotsky's writings. However, if, for Trotsky, 'dialectical negation' is the means by which concepts are linked then, in his writings, Trotsky connects concepts to the economic base. Thus, for instance, in Their Morals and Ours Trotsky stresses that the era of liberal capitalism has its own corresponding system of democratic morality. As the capitalist mode of production experiences birth, development, and death so to do its ideological reflections:

morality is a function of the class struggle.... democratic morality corresponds to the epoch of liberal and progressive capitalism.... The decay of capitalism denotes the decay of contemporary society with its laws and morals. [13]

This explanatory schema follows from Trotsky's belief that economics determines all "in the last analysis", [14] a belief which lay at the core of Trotsky's analysis of Soviet society in the 1930s as a 'degenerated workers' state'. Thus, Trotsky insisted that the existence of a nationalised economy guaranteed both the progressive nature of the Soviet Union and the gains of October. In this way the USSR remained, in part, a workers' state. Any change in the Soviet Union would have to be of a political, not a social nature. [15] However, one can question the extent to which a base/superstructure

approach is compatible with the statement that concepts are linked by their 'dialectical negation'. After all, in the Logic Hegel states that negation refers to a condition whereby an entity has an opposite within itself:

Essential difference is therefore Opposition; according to which the difference is not confronted by any other but by its other. That is, either of these two (Positive and Negative) is stamped with a characteristic of its own only in relation to the other: the one is reflected into itself as it is reflected into the other. And so with the other. Either in this way is the other's own other.... Whatever exists is concrete, with difference and opposition within itself. [16]

So, following Hegel, one would expect that the negation to morality would be something within morality itself, for instance - immorality, amorality, or another form of morality. The same would apply to law, politics, art etc. But in a base/superstructure explanatory framework it is possible to link all as reflections of the economic base. If one wanted to retain a notion of 'dialectical negation', then the economic base would serve as a sort of universal negator. However, this seems far removed from Hegel's definition of negation as something internal to a thing, and raises the question of whether a base/superstructure explanatory schema is either compatible with 'dialectical negation' or requires a notion of dialectics at all. Trotsky may be operating with a different definition of negation, but the problem remains that he never presented a clear exposition of his conception of 'dialectical negation'.

Furthermore, Trotsky's two understandings of materialism are in conflict to the extent that a singular explanation of the roots of human consciousness is demanded, i.e., is it matter or is it material economic base?; but they are both related and complimentary in that they are used to support the idea of a homogeneity of human consciousness. This can be illustrated as follows.

First, Trotsky thought that there was a "unity of matter." Human consciousness, as a product of the material world should reflect the nature, i.e., unity, of that world. Indeed, Trotsky wrote that "human consciousness....tends toward a certain homogeneity." [17] The great advantage of Marxism, for Trotsky, is that it provides a total world view which is suited to the nature of consciousness:

in consciousness there are numerous quantities of impenetrable partitions: in one sector, or even in a dozen sectors, there may reside the most revolutionary scientific thinking; but behind another partition there resides philistinism of the highest degree. This is the great significance of Marxism, as thought which synthesizes, generalizes all human experience: that in the integrity of its world outlook it helps to demolish internal partitions of consciousness....Marxism transcended the theory of factors to arrive at historical monism. [18]

So, given the advantages of Marxism, what is there to prevent people from recognizing these advantages and becoming Marxists? At this point, one can introduce the second way in which Trotsky perceived the roots of

consciousness, i.e., as a function of the economic base. For Trotsky, homogeneity of consciousness could not be achieved within the workings of a capitalist free market economic order. For example, Trotsky argued that the attempts of eighteenth century philosophers to subordinate thinking to the dictates of reason was vitiated by the existence of a free flow of economic forces which were non-rational. In the same way, Marxism as a doctrine could exist but an anti-Marxist economic system would prevent its advantages being brought to all. Only socialism, with its rational planning of the economy, would enable reason to triumph in the human mind. Notions of fragmentation of consciousness, society etc were, for Trotsky, anti-socialist. Thus, Trotsky claimed that the Soviet bureaucracy had an interest in theories of multiple causality. According to Trotsky, multiple causality atomizes society into separate, distinct areas and this view underpins the bureaucratic structure "with all its ministries and departments." [19] However, by stressing rational planning of the economy as a prerequisite to rational thought processes, Trotsky here utilizes a base/superstructure method from which 'dialectical negation' appears absent.

In Trotsky's presentation the second guiding thought for the dialectician is that of 'A' is not equal to 'A'. Trotsky saw dialectics as being superior to formal logic, claiming that: "The dialectic and formal logic bear a

relationship similar to that between higher and lower mathematics." [20]

However, on this point, there are several problems with Trotsky's argument which appears to be nonsense. After all, in the formal logic and dialectical equations 'A' is a variable to which we can assign anything. For example, on formal logic 'a cow' is equal to 'a cow' ($A = A$). Assigning the variable in the same way to the dialectical equation we end thus: 'a cow' is not 'a cow'. Nonsense. Trotsky illustrates his case by assigning 'a pound of sugar' to 'A':

in reality a pound of sugar is never equal to a pound of sugar - a more delicate scale always discloses a difference....one can object: but a pound of sugar is equal to itself. Neither is this true - all bodies change uninterruptedly in size, weight, colour, etc. They are never equal to themselves. [21]

So, Trotsky's objections to 'a pound of sugar' equals 'a pound of sugar' (formal logic) are twofold: first, the practical impossibility of pouring two exactly equal amounts of sugar; second, that one amount of sugar is not equal to itself because it is in a constant state of change. However, what Trotsky does not consider is that fact that 'sugar' is equal to 'sugar', i.e., outside the quantitative problem of whether we can pour two exactly equal amounts of sugar so that they weigh the same, there is a substance called sugar which is sugar. Taking this into account formal logic is superior to dialectics in

that it makes sense. Trotsky could counter with the claim that even sugar is not sugar because it is in a constant state of change, i.e., it is always in a state of becoming without ever being. However, this would leave the problem of how to make any sense of the world and ourselves when one denies the possibility of a 'pound of sugar' equalling 'a pound of sugar', 'a cow' equalling 'a cow' etc. This problem was recognized by Trotsky himself. For example, he said that when the changes occurring in a thing are "negligible for the task in hand we can presume that 'A' is equal to 'A'". [22] However, on this point, there is a tension in Trotsky's work. For example, in the Notebooks, 1933-35 Trotsky wrote that 'A' is equal to 'A' at any given moment and that 'A' is not equal to 'A' at two different moments. [23] But he also ridiculed the very idea of 'at any given moment' thus:

How should we really conceive the word 'moment'? If it is an infinitesimal interval of time, then ['A']...is subjected during the course of that 'moment' to inevitable changes. Or is this 'moment' a purely mathematical abstraction, that is, a zero of time? But everything exists in time...the axiom 'A' is equal to 'A' signifies that a thing is equal to itself if it does not change, that is, if it does not exist. [24]

Thus, Trotsky never satisfactorily reconciled formal logic and dialectics, but he did recognize that formal logic was necessary. So, rather than dialectics being superior to formal logic in their respective starting-points, dialectics collapses back into formal logic. One can admit that 'A' is in a state of change and yet 'A' can

still equal 'A'. Indeed, one must assume that this is the case if one is to talk about the world in a way that is meaningful. This is what Trotsky might have meant by his unelaborated statement in 'Who is Leading the Comintern Today?' (September, 1928) that,

Dialectics does not do away with formal logic, just as synthesis does not do away with analysis, but is, on the contrary, supported by it. [25]

In other words, formal logic does not itself admit the superiority of dialectics; rather it saves the dialectician from having nothing solid to talk about at all.

Perhaps the advantage of the dialectical method lies not in the fact that it teaches that 'A' is not equal to 'A', but in its way of explaining change.

Trotsky mentioned several laws of the dialectic, established by Hegel, which help us to understand the nature of changing reality:

change of quantity into quality, development through contradictions, conflict of content and form, interruption of continuity, change of possibility into certainty, etc. [26]

For Trotsky, the most important of these laws was that of change of quantity into quality which he called the "fundamental law of the dialectics." [27] For example, he thought that the conflict of content and form and the

change of possibility into inevitability were other expressions of the change of quantity into quality. [28] Considering the law of change of quantity into quality Trotsky stated that everyone is, at minimum, an unconscious dialectician. He illustrated this point through an example in which an illiterate peasant woman preparing soup is guided by the law of transformation of quantity into quality. In this scenario salt acts as the quantitative fact, soup the qualitative entity which experiences a qualitative change. Trotsky claimed that the peasant woman knew that adding a little salt would make the soup tasty and agreeable, too much salt and the soup would become unpalatable. Therefore, "an illiterate peasant woman guides herself in cooking soup by the Hegelian law of transformation of quantity into quality." [29] The continual addition of a given quantity (salt) led to a qualitative change (edible soup becoming inedible soup). However, there are several problems with Trotsky's illustration.

First, the equation is not simply one of continual addition of a quantitative thing until a qualitative change occurs. Salt is itself a qualitative substance with certain properties. The soup, in turn, is a combination of ingredients each of which is a qualitative entity in its own right. So, we begin with edible soup, i.e., a mixture of qualitative elements which has a feature 'taste'. We add a certain other qualitative thing

(salt), until the original qualitative mixture becomes such that feature 'taste' is lost. This process occurred through a given quantity of a qualitative thing coming to have such a predominance that the original quality became something else. The quantity in Trotsky's example (salt) is in itself a quality. One cannot talk in simple quantity/quality terms. Quality permeates the whole process, but not in Trotsky's presentation.

Even setting objection one aside a second problem remains of when the qualitative change occurred. Marxism, on Trotsky's argument, is superior because it enables reality to be perceived objectively. But how is this possible in the given case when edible soup experienced the qualitative change of becoming inedible soup? After all, Fred likes soup with no more than one teaspoon of salt, Jane with no more than two, the illiterate peasant woman with no less than two and no more than four, Harry with no less than five. Let us assume that the peasant woman makes the soup in accordance with her tastes. The soup became inedible for some of these people at different times. Indeed, it never becomes edible for Harry! So, even accepting Trotsky's scenario, one is left with a large amount of subjective perceptions far removed from 'objective fact' observable by all.

A subjectivist could incorporate dialectics by saying that change does occur along the lines of 'quantity into

quality' and that this happens at a specific 'objective' point. The problem is that subjective perceptions mean that there is difficulty in locating the 'objective point' precisely. However, Trotsky thought that this task could be completed successfully:

Dialectical thinking analyzes all things and phenomena in their continuous change, while determining in the material conditions of those changes that critical limit beyond which A ceases to be A, a workers' state ceases to be a workers' state. [30]

Accepting that subjectivism moves beyond the problem of interpreting objective phenomena into the realm of 'your objective phenomena is in itself a subjective thing', removes objectivism from the notion of quantity/quality. For example, one can question the very existence of a workers' state - even before issues concerning its transformation arise - on the grounds that it was never a reality to begin with, i.e., it was only real for you through your imagination. In the same way Harry can doubt Fred's account of the soup experiencing an edible/inedible qualitative change through quantitative changes on the basis that the soup was never edible in the first place!

Trotsky attempted to show that the dialectic was not just a subjective construction through claiming that it was an expression "of the actual inter-relationships in nature itself." [31] He illustrated this by means of the following example:

When the....fox....encounters the first animal which exceeds it in size, for example, a wolf, it quickly concludes that quantity passes into quality, and turns to flee. Clearly, the legs of a fox are equipped with Hegelian tendencies, even if not fully conscious ones. [32]

But, again, Trotsky's illustration is not convincing. For him, the quantitative difference between the fox and the wolf, i.e., the wolf being bigger than the fox, led to a qualitative difference which meant, in turn, the fox fleeing from the wolf. But one could just as easily explain this by a variety of reasons, none of which need involve the quantity/quality theme. For example, the fox might have turned away because of instinct. Or, the fox might know that it has a certain quality, the wolf has a quality, that these qualitative differences are both natural and that it should run away from a wolf. In other words there are certain qualitative differences which are not related to quantitative differences. In the case of animals, these qualitative differences are just given. For example, a scorpion (small) can kill a man (big). Therefore, one can imagine a man fleeing a scorpion. Basing oneself on Trotsky's illustration where a bigger size meant a qualitative difference, one would not be able to explain the qualitative difference between a scorpion and a man. Moreover, there are many instances where difference in size (quantity) do not have qualitative consequences. Thus, from the viewpoint of an elephant, do the differences in size between a mouse and a dog matter?

Furthermore, there are instances in nature when animals do not draw the conclusions that Trotsky drew for them. Against all odds, animals can stand and fight. This may take the form of 'special cases', for example, a cat protecting its kittens from a wolf, but these do illustrate how animals can consciously overcome semi-conscious Hegelian tendencies. Finally, Trotsky's examples of soup and from nature are non-comparable. For Trotsky, dialectics is the analysis of phenomena in a constant state of change. In his soup illustration one can say that he attempted to explain a change internal to an entity through quantity/quality. However, in the nature example there is no equivalent process of change taking place. Rather, it is a case of simple comparison between two separate animals.

Trotsky also included the triad as an element of the change of quantity into quality. He said that the triad was "the 'mechanism' of the transformation of quantity into quality." [33] The triad consists of the idea that change occurs through the pattern of 'thesis - antithesis - synthesis'. Trotsky illustrated this by using it as a way of explaining developments in human thinking. He claimed that humans form their conceptions about the world on the basis of experience. These conceptions form an original thesis. However, humans continually accumulate experience until it reaches such a quantity that the thesis becomes outgrown. At this point the thesis becomes

negated by an antithesis. The antithesis is attained when the quantity of accumulated experience necessitates its existence. Once the antithesis is a reality, the conflict between thesis and antithesis is reconciled by the formation of a new concept - synthesis. This synthesis encompasses both those elements of the thesis which were worth retaining, and the accumulated experience which led to antithesis. It was because of the preservation of the old through the process of change that Trotsky claimed that dialectics cannot be imposed upon phenomenon from without. They have to be learnt by studying phenomena from within:

One cannot impose dialectics upon facts; one must derive them from the facts, from their nature and from their development....One can apply dialectical materialism to new fields of knowledge only by mastering them from within. The purging of bourgeois science presupposes a mastering of bourgeois science. [34]

However, thus far one can imagine the process of thesis - antithesis - synthesis occurring in either a peaceful, evolutionary fashion or through a sudden revolutionary 'jump', in which the synthesis is achieved through upheaval and collapse. One would expect a revolutionary to be more inclined towards the latter option. After all, the dialectic could then serve as a philosophical underpinning for revolutionary politics, i.e., one has to support a strategy for revolution because this is how change occurs. This was certainly present in Marx's understanding of the dialectic. For example, in the

Afterword to the Second German Edition of Capital Marx wrote that the "essence" of the dialectic was "critical and revolutionary." [35] However, in Trotsky's writings on the dialectic there are notions of the dialectic working in both a revolutionary and evolutionary way. Thus in the Notebooks, 1933-35 Trotsky said that the synthesis is reached not by an,

evolutionary character but are accompanied by breaks in gradualness, that is, by small or large intellectual catastrophes. In sum, this also means that the development of cognition has a dialectical character. [36]

In this text the 'dialectical character' is revolutionary, conforming to what Trotsky had written in Our Political Tasks (1904). Here Trotsky specified the,

revolutionary aspect of the materialist dialectic: all forms of social relations from themselves develop their own contradictions which, in the last analysis, they fall victim to. [37]

This, in turn, relates to Trotsky's point about dialectics constituting the study of reality which is in a constant state of change. For Trotsky specified that phenomena subject to continuous transformations would be transformed in a certain way: "Dialectics....takes all phenomena, institutions and norms in their rise, development and decay." [38]

However, for the revolutionary, there is a problem with

this understanding of the dialectic. It fits well into the revolutionaries mentality pre-revolution. But once the revolution has taken place and the process of building socialism begun, notions both of transformation through collapse and that everything goes through rise, development and decay are uncomfortable. When Trotsky was a member of the Bolshevik government he talked about 'dialectical dependence', i.e., the dialectic operating in an evolutionary, peaceful fashion. For example, in 1923, Trotsky wrote that promoting rationalization of production leads to an increase in socialist morality; an increase in socialist morality leads to an increase in the rationalization of production, and so on. [39] It would be through this gradual process of 'dialectical dependence' that socialism would be achieved by Bolshevik policies:

the smallest success in the field of morals, by raising the culture of the cultural level of the working man and woman, quickly increases the possibility for rationalizing industry. This has the consequence of a more rapid socialist accumulation. This, in its turn, opens the possibility of making fresh conquests in the sphere of morals. The dependence is dialectical. [40]

Apart from the questionable supposition that more rationalization of production leads to higher moral standards and vice versa, Trotsky is here operating with an understanding of the dialectic which perceives a gradual, reciprocal, peaceful process. This 1923 notion of evolution and the dialectic was to be contradicted by Trotsky in The Living Thoughts of Karl Marx of 1940, i.e.,

when Trotsky was once again in opposition:

Marx's method is dialectic, because it regards both nature and society as they evolve, and evolution itself as the constant struggle of conflicting forces [41]

Dialectical dependence also illustrates many of the problems raised earlier relating to Trotsky's writings on the dialectic. First, there is the issue of negation. There is no obvious connection between the economy as a negator to morality, in the same way that morality/immorality, law/arbitrary judgement, culture/philistinism etc appear as negators to each other. Trotsky did link concepts by way of the dialectic which conform to this 'common sense' understanding of 'opposites', 'negation' and so on:

When the Futurists propose to throw overboard the old literature of individualism, not only because it has become old fashioned in form, but also because....it contradicts the collectivist nature of the proletariat, they display highly an insufficient understanding of the dialectical nature of the contradiction between individualism and collectivism. [42]

The base/superstructure model as applied in 'dialectical negation' does not utilize this 'common sense' understanding of negation. Thus, economic determinism and dialectical negation may not be compatible, i.e., one can use one without the other. This, in turn, raises the problem of how concepts are to be linked and how to explain their change and development, i.e., is it

base/superstructure or is it dialectical negation?

Second, there is the question of quantity/quality. In dialectical dependence is it a matter of quantitative changes in the economy causing a qualitative leap in culture, or vice versa or both? In Literature and Revolution (1923) Trotsky wrote that as culture becomes available to more and more people (quantity), culture experiences a qualitative change. This involves culture developing through quantity/quality, but the process of development occurs internal to culture. [43] So, as in the case of dialectical negation, quantity/quality may be distinct from base/superstructure. Given that Trotsky called the change of quantity in quality 'the fundamental law of the dialectics', one can say that in his work on culture Trotsky at some points used a base/superstructure explanation and, at others, applied dialectics.

Third, there was no talk of the prospect of a birth, rise and decay of socialist morality operating within the notion of dialectical dependence. The image generated is one of an upward spiral that continues upward and onward.

In his article 'Flood-tide' (1921) Trotsky said that "between the economic conjuncture and the class struggle there exists not a mechanical, but a complex dialectical interrelation." [44] Trotsky defined the economic conjuncture as the process of "cyclical

oscillations....rise, fall, crisis, a checking of the crisis, improvement, rise, fall, and so on...[which] accompany capitalist society in its youth, in its maturity and its decay." [45] Trotsky's emphasis on the class struggle in relation to the economic conjuncture relates to his argument that, at any specific economic conjuncture, the chances for proletarian revolution,

are determined by the entire existing political situation and by those events which precede and accompany the crisis, especially the battles, successes and failures of the working class prior to the crisis. Under one set of conditions the crisis may give a mighty impulse to the revolutionary activity of the working masses; under a different set of circumstances it may completely paralyze the offensive of the proletariat. [46]

Trotsky's use of 'dialectical interrelation' in this article differs from his other writings both on the dialectic and on economic determinism. The latter is clearly rejected as primacy is given to political factors. Thus, prospects for revolution can be equally as good irrespective of the state of the economic conjuncture. The former is irrelevant as Trotsky makes no mention of the laws of transformation of quantity into quality, the triad and so on. Indeed, according to the Trotsky of this article, recognizing the particular dialectical interrelation between the economic conjuncture and the class struggle leads to a denial of foresight:

It goes without saying that one cannot foretell at which point of development there will occur

such a combination of objective and subjective conditions as will produce a revolutionary overturn....It is sufficient for us that the tempo of development does to a significant degree depend upon us, upon our party, upon its tactics.
[47]

Given that dialectical interrelation here concludes with the primacy of politics and political tactics, one wonders about the centrality and importance of the dialectic that Trotsky, in his explicit tracts on the dialectic, was to assign to it. Indeed, in The Revolution Betrayed (1936) Trotsky wrote that the supremacy of socialism would be "not in the language of dialectics, but in the language of steel, cement and electricity." [48] To reiterate, with emphasis on the prosaic what use dialectics?

Trotsky thought that a correct understanding of dialectics was of supreme importance. Without such an understanding a person would remain within, or desert to, the camps of 'opportunism' and 'bourgeois reaction'. [49] However, his own writings on the dialectic failed, first, to show the superiority of dialectics over formal logic; second, to present a clear and consistent exposition of what dialectics is; and, third, to successfully illustrate how dialectics could lead to objective analysis.

Moreover, Trotsky gave no exposition of how a dialectical approach informed his other writings, leading him to particular conclusions. The reader has to make these connections himself, with the concomitant danger of

imposing something into Trotsky that was never there to begin with. This is a trap fallen into by George Novack in his attempt to illustrate how Trotsky's pre-1917 writings on the course of the Russian revolution were dialectical:

In working out his prognosis of the Russian revolution, Trotsky utilized the law of uneven and combined development which he was later to formulate in general terms. This generalization of the dialectical intertwining of the backward and the advanced features of the historical process is one of the most valuable instruments for deciphering the complex relations and contradictory trends of civilized society. [50]

However, one can question the extent to which uneven and combined development is dialectical. For instance, Novack defines dialectics as, "the conflict of antagonistic forces which at a certain point in a slow accumulation of changes explode[s] the old formations." [51] But in uneven and combined development the advanced does not conflict with the backward. Rather, Trotsky talked of how the introduction of advanced technology into a backward society has implications for the correlation of class forces in that society. At this level, Trotsky's application of uneven and combined development is straight social analysis. Moreover, Trotsky did not specify that a given quantity of advancedness in relation to backwardness would lead to a qualitative change, i.e., capitalist Russia to socialist Russia. His writings on the Russian revolution stressed the correlation of class forces and not the transformation of quantity into quality. Given

that Trotsky used different methods at different times - at one point highlighting a particular interpretation of the dialectic (dialectical dependence, interrelation, negation); at another stressing economic determinism - Novack's difficulty in attempting underwrite permanent revolution with a particular definition of the dialectic is not surprising. The connections and possible contradictions between these various methods were not expounded upon by Trotsky himself. The commentator searching for Trotsky's underlying philosophical method is left in a maze of possible confusions.

1. L. Trotsky, Dnevnik i pis'ma, (New Jersey, 1986), p 166.
2. L. Trotsky, 'D. I. Mendeleev i marksizm', Sochineniya, Vol. 21, 'Kul'tura perekhodnogo perioda', (Moscow, 1927), pp 273-274, 282. See also Literatura i revolyutsiya, (Moscow, 1923), pp 71-72; Transitional Program, (New York, 1973), p 107.
3. L. Trotsky, Their Morals and Ours, (New York, 1939), pp 20-21.
4. L. Trotsky, Challenge of the Left Opposition, 1928-29, (New York, 1981), pp 396-398.
5. For Trotsky on Marx's laws of capitalist economy see L. Trotsky, 'Ninety Years of the Communist Manifesto' in I. Deutscher, The Age of Permanent Revolution: A Trotsky Anthology, (New York, 1964), pp 285-295; The Living Thoughts of Karl Marx, (London, 1940), p 6 ff.
6. B. Knei-Paz, The Social and Political Thought of Leon Trotsky, (Oxford, 1978), p 488. For Knei-Paz's discussion of Trotsky's philosophy see pp 476-494.
7. Ibid., p 489. Isaac Deutscher states that there was "nothing of the professional philosopher about Trotsky....He attempted no systematic exposition of the principles of dialectics.", The Prophet Unarmed, (Oxford, 1959), p 172. David Law views Trotsky's Marxism as being practical, active and revolutionary, claiming that, "such philosophical work as he did produce, particularly In Defence of Marxism, shows that this was not his talent." 'Trotsky's Marxism', Critique, 20-21, p 116. See also D. Law, 'How Not To Interpret Trotsky', Critique, 20-21, pp 183-193. Books on Trotsky by J. Carmichael, Trotsky: An Appreciation of His Life (London, 1975); D. Hallas, Trotsky's Marxism (London, 1979); I. Howe, Trotsky (Sussex, 1978); E. Mandel, Trotsky. A Study in the Dynamic of His Thought, (London, 1979); and R. S. Wistrich, Trotsky, (London, 1979) do not discuss Trotsky's writings on the dialectic. Nor do the following, all of which make certain claims about Trotsky's philosophy: K. Mavrakis, On Trotskyism, (London, 1976), according to whom Trotsky was "anti-dialectical" Ibid., p 5. See also p 179; N. Krasso argues that the unity in Trotsky's writings is provided by his 'sociologism', 'Trotsky's Marxism', New Left Review, No. 44, July-August 1967, pp 64-86; and J. Molyneux's, Leon Trotsky's Theory of Revolution, (Sussex, 1981) which states that Trotsky's "interest and forte was....not philosophy....he did

not break with....mechanical materialist philosophy"
Ibid., pp 196 & 11.

For a critique of Trotsky's defence of dialectical materialism see M. Eastman, Marxism Is It a Science ?, (London, 1941), pp 275-297.

For a critique of Trotsky's marxism see P. Beilharz, 'Trotsky's Marxism - Permanent Involution?', Telos, No. 39, Spring 1979, pp 137-152.

8. L. Trotsky, Trotsky's Notebooks, 1933-35, (New York, 1986), pp 75-77.
9. L. Trotsky, Their Morals and Ours, pp 14-15.
10. Ibid., p 63. See also Transitional Program, p 107.
11. L. Trotsky, 'Radio, nauka, tekhnika i obshchestvo', Sochineniya, Vol. 21, p 414.
12. L. Trotsky, 'Vnimanie k teorii', Sochineniya, Vol. 21, pp 258-259.
13. L. Trotsky, Their Morals and Ours, pp 18-19.
14. L. Trotsky, 'O krivoi kapitalisticheskogo razvitiya', Vestnik sotsialisticheskoi akademii, Book 4, April-July 1923, (Moscow, 1923), p 10.
15. For Trotsky's analysis of Soviet society in the 1930's see, for example, L. Trotsky, 'The Class nature of the Soviet State' in Writings, 1933-34, (New York, 1972), pp 101-123; 'The Class nature of the Soviet State' in Writings, 1935-36, (New York, 1970), pp 223-225; Chto takoe SSSR i kuda on idet ?, (Paris, 1971) espec. Chapters 1 & 9; Transitional Program, p 102; In Defence of Marxism, (London, 1971), pp 3-26, 29-39.
16. G. W. F. Hegel, Logic, (Oxford, 1892), pp 220-223.
17. L. Trotsky, Problems of Everyday Life, (New York, 1973), p 328.
18. L. Trotsky, 'Radio, nauka, tekhnika i obshchestvo', p 416 & Challenge of the Left Opposition, 1928-29, p 394.
19. L. Trotsky, Challenge of the Left Opposition, 1928-29, p 392.
20. L. Trotsky, In Defence of Marxism, p 63.
21. Ibid., p 64.

22. Ibid.
23. L. Trotsky, Trotsky's Notebooks, 1933-35, p 87.
24. L. Trotsky, In Defence of Marxism, p 66.
25. L. Trotsky, Challenge of the Left Opposition, 1928-29, p 203.
26. L. Trotsky, In Defence of Marxism, p 66.
27. L. Trotsky, Trotsky's Notebooks, 1933-35, p 88.
28. Ibid., pp 90-91.
29. L. Trotsky, In Defence of Marxism, p 106.
30. Ibid., p 65.
31. Ibid., p 107.
32. Ibid., p 106.
33. L. Trotsky, Trotsky's Notebooks, 1933-35, p 99.
34. L. Trotsky, 'Kul'tura i sotsializm', Sochineniya, Vol. 21, p 429.
35. K. Marx, Capital, (London, 1954), Vol. 1, p 29.
36. L. Trotsky, Trotsky's Notebooks, 1933-35, p 101.
37. L. Trotsky, Nashi politicheskiya zadachi, (Geneva, 1904), p 10.
38. L. Trotsky, Their Morals and Ours, p 21. See also In Defence of Marxism, p 91.
39. L. Trotsky, 'Chtoby perestroit' byt, nado poznat ego', Pravda, 11th July 1923, p 2. See also 'Kul'tura i sotsializm', pp 423-446.
40. L. Trotsky, 'Chtoby perestroit' byt, nado poznat ego'.
41. L. Trotsky, The Living Thoughts of Karl Marx, p 5.
42. L. Trotsky, Literatura i revolyutsiya, p 166.
43. Ibid., p 142.
44. L. Trotsky, 'Priliv', Pravda, 25th December 1921, p 3.
45. Ibid.

46. Ibid., p 2.
47. Ibid., p 3.
48. L. Trotsky, Chto takoe SSSR i kuda on idet ?, p 11.
49. See, for example, L. Trotsky, In Defence of Marxism, pp 61 ff, 73, 94-95, 98, 103.
50. G. Novack, 'Trotsky's Views on Dialectical Materialism', in J. Hansen (et al), Leon Trotsky: The Man and His Work, (New York, 1969), p 97.
51. Ibid., p 95.

Bibliography

- Ali, T. (ed) The Stalinist Legacy Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1984.
- Anderson, P. 'Trotsky's Interpretation of Stalinism', in Ali, T. (ed).
- Avineri, S. (ed) The Varieties of Marxism, The Hague, 1977.
- Baron, S. H. 'Plekhanov, Trotsky and the development of Soviet Historiography', Soviet Studies, No. 26, July 1974, pp 212-236.
- Beilharz, P. 'Trotsky's Marxism - Permanent Involution?', Telos, No. 39, Spring 1979, pp 137-152.
- Beilharz, P. 'Trotsky as Historian', History Workshop Journal, No. 20, 1985, pp 36-55.
- Beilharz, P. Trotsky, Trotskyism and the Transition to Socialism, London, 1987.
- Belov, V. '<<Vozrodit' v krest'yanstve krest'yanskoe...>>', Pravda, 15th April, 1988, p 3.
- Billik, V. I. 'Trotskii. Na puti k pravde o nem', Sobesednik, No. 33, August 1989, pp 12-13.
- Broue, P. 'Glavy iz knigi <<Trotskii>>', EKO, No. 9, 1989, pp 159-174; No. 10, 1989, pp 102-118; No. 11, 1989, pp 156-170.
- Burni, S. 'Poslednii shans', Sobesednik, No. 40, September 1989.
- Carlo, A. 'Trotsky and the Organization Problem', Critique, No. 7, 1976, pp 19-29.
- Carmichael, J. 'Trotsky's Agony', Encounter, No. 38, May 1972, pp 30-41.
- Carmichael, J. 'Trotsky's Agony', Encounter, No. 38, Jun 1972, pp 28-36.

- Carmichael, J. Trotsky: An Appreciation of His Life, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1975.
- Danilov, V. P. 'My nachinaem poznavat' Trotskogo', EKO, No. 1, 1990, pp 47-62.
- Day, R. B. 'Leon Trotsky on the Problems of the Smychka and Forced Collectivization', Critique, No. 13, 1981, pp 55-68.
- Day, R. B. Leon Trotsky and the Politics of Economic Isolation, CUP, London, 1973.
- Deutscher, I. The Prophet Armed, OUP, London, 1954.
- Deutscher, I. The Prophet Unarmed, OUP, London, 1959.
- Deutscher, I. The Prophet Unarmed, OUP, London, 1963.
- Deutscher, I. (ed) The Age of Permanent Revolution: A Trotsky Anthology, Dell Publishing Co., New York, 1964.
- Deutscher, I. Stalin, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1966.
- Dolgov, V. 'How the "little red devils" fell for Trotsky', Soviet Weekly, November 19th, 1988, p 15.
- Eastman, M. Marxism Is It a Science ?, George Allen & Unwin, London, 1941.
- Emel'yanov, A. 'S pozitsii segodnyashnego dnya', Voprosy ekonomiki, No. 12, 1989, pp 125-127
- Getty, J. A. 'Trotsky in Exile: the founding of the Fourth International', Soviet Studies, No. 38, January 1986, pp 24-35.
- Gorbachev, M. S. 'Oktyabr', perestroika: revolyutsiya prodolzhaetsya', Izvestiya, 3rd November 1987.

- Gribov, I. 'Sikeiros protiv Trotskogo', Agitator, No. 18, 1989, pp 38-40.
- Gusev, S. 'Kak Trotskii i k razvalivali flot', Voenno-istoricheskii zhurnal, No. 3, 1990, pp 52-57.
- Hallas, D. Trotsky's Marxism, Pluto Press, London, 1979.
- Hansen, J. (et al) Leon Trotsky: The Man and His Work, Merit, New York, 1969.
- Hegel, G. W. F. Logic, Trans. W. Wallace, The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1892.
- Hodgson, G. Trotsky and Fatalistic Marxism, Nottingham, 1975.
- Howe, I. Trotsky, Harvester Press, Sussex, 1978.
- Ivanov, V. 'Perekrashivayut Iudushku', Sovetskaya Rossiya, 27th September 1987, p 4.
- Johnstone, M. 'Trotsky and the debate on Socialism in One Country', New Left Review, No. 50, 1968, pp 113-125.
- Klyamkin, I. 'Kakaya ulitsa vedet k khramu?', Novi mir, No. 11, 1987, pp 150-188.
- Knei-Paz, B. 'Trotsky, Marxism and the Revolution of Backwardness' in Avineri, S. (ed).
- Knei-Paz, B. The Social and Political Thought of Leon Trotsky, OUP, London, 1978.
- Knei-Paz, B. 'Permanent Revolution' in Schuhman, H. (ed).
- Kolakowski, L. Main Currents of Marxism, Three Vols., Trans. P. S. Fallo, OUP, London, 1978.
- Kol'tsov, M. 'Krasnyi kitezh Trotskii', Rodnik, No. 12, 1989, pp 38-39.

- Korablev, U. 'Zashchita revolyutsii', Sovetskaya Rossiya, 21st February 1988, p 3.
- Korablev, U. 'Pochemu Trotskii? Na voprosy chitateli otvechaet istorik', Politicheskoe obrazovanie, No. 2, 1989, pp 57-62.
- Krasso, N. 'Trotsky's Marxism', New Left Review, No. 44, July-August 1967, pp 64-86.
- Krasso, N. (ed) Trotsky: The Great Debate Renewed, St Louis, 1972.
- Krylov, V. V. 'Passazhir parokhoda 'Il'ich'', Sovetskaya bibliografiya, No. 1, 1990, pp 76-93.
- Law, D. 'Studies on Trotsky', Journal of Communist Studies, Vol. 2, No. 1, March 1986, pp 83-90.
- Law, D. 'Trotsky's Marxism', Critique, Nos. 20-21, 1987, pp 115-117.
- Law, D. 'How Not to Interpret Trotsky', Critique, Nos. 20-21, 1987, pp 183-193.
- Lenin, V. I. Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Moscow, 5th edition, 1962.
- Lenin, V. I. Collected Works, Forty-five Vols., Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1960-1970.
- Lenin, V. I. Selected Works, Three Vols., Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977.
- Levine, S. 'Trotsky on China: The Exile Period', Papers On China, Vol. 18, Harvard, 1964.
- Lichtheim, G. The Concept of Ideology, Vintage Books, New York, 1967.
- Lovell, D. W. Trotsky's Analysis of Soviet Bureaucratization, Croom Helm, London, 1985.
- Lowy, M. The politics of Combined and

- Uneven Development and the theory of Permanent Revolution, Verso, London, 1981.
- McLellan, D. Marxism after Marx, Macmillan Press Ltd, London, 1979.
- McNeal, R. H. 'Trotskyist Interpretations of Stalinism', in Tucker, R. C. (ed).
- Maitan, L. 'The Theory of Permanent Revolution' in Mandel, E. (ed).
- Mandel, E. (ed) Fifty Years of World Revolution, New York, 1968.
- Mandel, E. Trotsky: A Study in the Dynamic of his Thought, New Left Books, London, 1979.
- Marx, K. Das Kapital, Hamburg, 1867.
- Marx, K. Capital, Trans. S. Moore & E. Aveling, Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1954.
- Mavrakis, K. On Trotskyism, Trans. J. McGreal, RKP, London, 1976.
- Medvedev, R. 'Trotskii: shtrikhi k politicheskomu portretu', Inostrannaya literatura, No. 3, 1989, pp 167-174.
- Minaev, L. M. 'Bor'ba za liderstvo i deformatsiya oblika Leninizma', Voprosy istorii KPSS, No. 12, 1989, pp 98-115.
- Molodttsygin, M. A. 'Iz istorii perekhoda k stroitel'stvu massovoi reglyarnoi krasnoi armii', Voenno-istoricheskii zhurnal, No. 8, 1989, pp 47-62; No. 10, 1989, pp 37-55.
- Molyneux, J. Leon Trotsky's Theory of Revolution, Harvester Press, Sussex, 1981.
- Mosley, N. The Assassination of Trotsky, London, 1972.

- Nelson, H. W. Leon Trotsky and the Art of Insurrection, 1905-1917, Frank Cass, London, 1988.
- Nenarokov, A. 'Vozvrashchenie imenii', Moskovskie novosti, No. 9, 4th March, 1990, p 16.
- Novack, G. Uneven and Combined Development in History, Merit Publishers, New York, 1966.
- Novack, G. 'Trotsky's Views on Dialectical Materialism', in Hansen, J. (et al).
- Nove, A. 'A Note On Trotsky and the "Left Opposition" 1929-1931', Soviet Studies, No. 29, 1977, pp 576-589.
- Nutsch, J. G. 'Trotsky and the Peasants', Survey, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp 110-121.
- Panteleev, M. 'Izgananie', Moskovskie novosti, No. 9, 4th March, 1990, p 16.
- Pantin, I. & Plimak, E. 'Vremena obnovleniya i fantomy proshlogo', Ogonek, No. 45, 1989, pp 10-12.
- Pantsov, A. V. 'Trotskii i Preobrazhenskii', EKO, No. 1, 1990, pp 63-66.
- Pantsov, A. V. 'Lev Davidovich Trotskii', Voprosy istorii, No. 5, 1990, pp 65-87.
- Patrikeeff, P. 'The Idea of World Revolution' in Schuhman, H. (ed).
- Podshchekoldin, A. 'Novyi kurs: prolog tragedii', Molodoi kommunist, No. 8, 1989, pp 45-50.
- Pozdnyakov, V. 'Net cheloveka, net problemy...', Izvestiya, 3rd August 1988, p 6.
- Radzikhovskii, L. A. 'Boyazn' demokratii', Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya, No. 3, 1989, pp 75-88.
- Radzikhovskii, L. A. '<<Staraya gvardiya>> pered novym

- sudom?', Sobesednik, No. 11, March 1990, pp 2-3.
- Radzikhovskii, L. A. 'Zaveshchanie. k 120-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya V. I. Lenina', Moskovskie novosti, No. 16, 22nd April 1990, p 6.
- Radzinskii, E. 'Rasstrel v Yekaterinburge', Ogonek, No. 2, 1990, pp 25-28.
- Rogovin, V. 'Lev Trotskii. Stat'i ob iskusstve', Teatr, No. 8, 1989, pp 82-85.
- Rogovin, V. 'Vnutripartiinaya bor'ba 20-kh godov: prichiny i uroki', Politicheskoe obrazovanie, No. 14, 1989, pp 90-98.
- Rogovin, V. 'L. D. Trotskii o NEPe', Ekonomicheskie nauki, No. 1, 1990, pp 94-102.
- Romagnolo, D. 'The So-Called 'Law' of Uneven and Combined Development', Latin American Perspectives, No. 4, 11 (1), Spring 1975, pp 7-31.
- Rostal'noi, V. N. & Tabachnik, D. V. 'Krasnyi lev revolyutsii', Filosofskaya i sotsiologicheskaya mysl', No. 9, 1989, pp 80-93.
- RuhleGerstel, A. 'No Verses for Trotsky: A Diary in Mexico (1937)', Encounter, No. 58, April 1982, pp 26-41.
- Schapiro, L. 'Trotsky', Government and Opposition, No. 17, Summer 1982, pp 259-267.
- Schuhman, H. (ed) The Blackwell Encyclopedia of the Russian Revolution, Blackwell, Oxford, 1988.
- Schurer, H. 'The Permanent Revolution: Lev Trotsky', in Labeledz, L. (ed).
- Shabunin, A. 'Vriio narkomputi Lev Trotskii', Gudok, 24th June 1989.
- Shapiro, J. 'The Prophet Returned?',

- Revolutionary History, No. 2,
1989, pp 54-56.
- Shaposhnikov, V. N. 'Trotskii sotrudnik <<Vostochnogo obozreniya>>', Izvestiya sibirskogo otdeleniya akademii nauk SSSR, seriya istoriya, filologiya i filosofiya, No. 3, 1989, pp 66-71.
- Sinclair, L. Leon Trotsky: A Bibliography, Stanford, 1972.
- Sinclair, L. Trotsky: A Bibliography, Two Vols., Scholar Press, Aldershot, 1989.
- Sirotkin, V. G. 'Vstypitel'naya stat'ya', Istoriya SSSR, No. 2, 1990, pp 168-171.
- Smith, I. H. (ed) Trotsky, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1973.
- Stalin, J. Collected Works, Thirteen Vols., Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1954-1958.
- Startsev, V. I. Introduction to Trotsky, L., 'Natsional'noe v Lenine', Rodina, No. 7, 1989, p 32.
- Startsev, V. I. Introduction to Trotsky, L., Stalinskaya shkola fal'sifikatsii, Voprosy istorii, No. 7, 1989, pp 135-137.
- Startsev, V. I. 'Lenin i Trotskii', Moskovskie novosti, No. 45, 5th November 1989, p 9.
- Teper, E. 'Terkakt Ramona Makadera', Neva, No. 3, 1989, pp 201-208.
- Thatcher, I. D. 'Recent Soviet Writings on Leon Trotsky', Coexistence, 27(3), 1990, pp 141-167.
- Ticktin, H. H. 'Trotsky and the Social Forces Leading to Bureaucracy', Firenze, 1982.
- Trotsky, L. 1917, Sochineniya, Vol. 3, Moscow, nd.

- Trotsky, L. Osnovnye voprosy proletarskoi revolyutsii, Sochineniya, Vol. 12, Moscow, nd.
- Trotsky, L. Nashi politicheskiya zadachi, Geneva, 1904
- Trotsky, L. Nasha revolyutsiya, St. Petersburg, 1906.
- Trotsky, L. 'Nash' politicheskii lozung', Nashe Slovo, No. 23, 24th February 1915.
- Trotsky, L. 'Pozitsiya sotsialdemokrata', Nashe Slovo, No. 87 (474), 12th April 1916.
- Trotsky, L. The Bolsheviki and World Peace, Beni & Liveright, New York, 1918.
- Trotsky, L. Our Revolution, Trans. M. Olgin, Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1918.
- Trotsky, L. 'Priliv'', Pravda, 25th December 1921, p 3.
- Trotsky, L. 1905, Moscow, 1922.
- Trotsky, L. 'O krivoi kapitalisticheskogo razvitiya', Vestnik sotsialisticheskoi akademii, Book 4, April-July 1923, Moscow, 1923.
- Trotsky, L. 'O svoevremennosti lozunga "soedinennye shataty Evropy"', Pravda, No. 144, June 1923.
- Trotsky, L. 'Chtoby perestroit' byt, nado poznat ego', Pravda, 11th July 1923, p 2.
- Trotsky, L. Literatura i revolyutsiya, Moscow, 1923.
- Trotsky, L. Voina i revolyutsiya, Moscow, 1924.
- Trotsky, L. Kul'tura perekhodnogo perioda, Sochineniya, Vol. 21, Moscow, 1927.

- Trotsky, L. 'VII Meeting of the Enlarged E.C.C.I.', IPC, 2, 6th January 1927.
- Trotsky, L. Permanentnaya revolyutsiya, Berlin, 1930.
- Trotsky, L. Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii, Vol. 1., Berlin, 1931.
- Trotsky, L. Stalinskaya shkola fal'sifikatsii, Berlin, 1932.
- Trotsky, L. Problems of the Chinese Revolution Trans. M. Shachtman, Pioneer Publishers, New York, 1932.
- Trotsky, L. Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii, Vols. 2 & 3, Berlin, 1933.
- Trotsky, L. History of the Russian Revolution, Three Vols., Trans. M. Eastman, Sphere Books Ltd, 1932-33.
- Trotsky, L. Lessons of October, Pioneer Publishers, New York, 1937.
- Trotsky, L. Their Morals and Ours, Pathfinder Press, New York, 1939.
- Trotsky, L. The Zimmerwald Manifesto, Ceylon, 1951.
- Trotsky, L. The Third International after Lenin, Trans. J. G. Wright, Pioneer Publishers, New York, 1957.
- Trotsky, L. Results and Prospects, New Park Publications, London, 1962.
- Trotsky, L. The Permanent Revolution, Trans. J. G. Wright & B. Pearce, New Park Publications, London, 1962.
- Trotsky, L. The Trotsky Papers, Vol. 1, 1917-1919, Mouton & Co., The Hague, 1964.
- Trotsky, L. The Chinese Revolution: Problems and Perspectives, Pathfinder Press, New York, 1969.

- Trotsky, L. Stalin, Two Vols., Trans. C. Malamuth, Panther Books, London, 1969.
- Trotsky, L. My Life, Pathfinder Press, New York, 1970.
- Trotsky, L. The Revolution Betrayed, Trans. M. Eastman, Pathfinder Press, New York, 1970.
- Trotsky, L. The Trotsky Papers, Vol. 2, 1920-1922, Mouton & Co., The Hague, 1971.
- Trotsky, L. Chto takoe SSSR i kuda on idet ?, Fourth International, Paris, 1971.
- Trotsky, L. In Defence of the October Revolution, New Park Publications, London, 1971.
- Trotsky, L. 1905, Trans. Anya Bostock, Allen Lane, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1971.
- Trotsky, L. In Defence of Marxism, New Park Publications, London, 1971.
- Trotsky, L. Writings of Leon Trotsky, Twelve Vols., Pathfinder Press, New York, 1971-1978.
- Trotsky, L. Transitional Program for Socialist International, Pathfinder Press, New York, 1973.
- Trotsky, L. Problems of Everyday Life, Pathfinder Press, New York, 1973.
- Trotsky, L. The Challenge of the Left Opposition, 1928-1929, Pathfinder Press, New York, 1981.
- Trotsky, L. Stalin, Two Vols., Vermont, 1985.
- Trotsky, L. Dnevniki i pis'ma, Hermitage, New Jersey, 1986.
- Trotsky, L. Trotsky's Notebooks, 1933-1935, edited by P. Pomper, Columbia UP, New York, 1986.

- Trotsky, L. Portrety revolyutsionerov, Chalidze, Vermont, 1988.
- Trotsky, L. Excerpts from O Lenine: Materialy dlya biografii (Moscow, 1924); Iz vospominaniy o Lenine, (Tiflis, 1924); Moya zhizn', (Vol. 2, Berlin, 1930). Ogonek, No. 17, April 1989, pp 3-7.
- Trotsky, L. 'Iosif Stalin. Opyt kharakteristiki' (September, 1939), Gorizont, No. 5, 1989, pp 51-62.
- Trotsky, L. Excerpts from Stalinskaya shkola fal'sifikatsii (Berlin, 1932). Kommunist, No. 10, July 1989, pp 101-103.
- Trotsky, L. Excerpts from 'Novyi kurs' (January, 1924). Molodoi kommunist, No. 8, 1989, pp 51-68.
- Trotsky, L. Excerpts from Stalin. Argumenty i fakty, No. 34, 1989, pp 4-6.
- Trotsky, L. Excerpts from Stalin. Argumenty i fakty, No. 37, 1989, pp 5-6.
- Trotsky, L. Excerpts from 'Tuda i obratno' (1907), Sovershenno sekretno, No. 4, 1989, pp 14-16.
- Trotsky, L. 'Natsional'noe v Lenine' (Pravda, April 23, 1920). Rodina, No. 7, 1989, p 33.
- Trotsky, L. Excerpts from Stalinskaya shkola fal'sifikatsii (Berlin, 1932). Voprosy istorii, No. 7, 1989, pp 137-153; No. 8 (1989), pp 125-139; No. 9 (1989), pp 112-133; No. 10 (1989), pp 117-135; No. 12 (1989), pp 84-101.
- Trotsky, L. Excerpts from Literatura i revolyutsiya (Moscow, 1923). Voprosy literatury, No. 7, 1989, pp 189-228.

- Trotsky, L. Excerpts from Literatura i revolyutsiya (Moscow, 1923). Teatr, No. 8, 1989, pp 85-102.
- Trotsky, L. Excerpts from 'Nashi raznoglasiya' (30th November, 1924). Nedelya, No. 37, 11-17 September 1989, pp 14-15.
- Trotsky, L. 'Nasha politika v dele sozdaniya armii'. Speech to the VIII Party Congress, 20-21st March 1919. Izvestiya Ts.K KPSS, No. 9, 1989, pp 175-181.
- Trotsky, L. Excerpts from Chto takoe SSSR i kuda on idet ? (Paris, 1989). Voprosy ekonomiki, No. 12, 1989, pp 123-125.
- Trotsky, L. 'Iosif Stalin. Opyt kharakteristiki.' (September, 1939); 'Sverkh-bordzhia v kremle' (October, 1939). Osmyslit' Kult' Stalina, Progress, Moscow, 1989, pp 624-647.
- Trotsky, L. 'Nashi rasnoglasiya' (30 November 1924). Novaya i noveishaya istoriya, No. 2, 1990, pp 171-197.
- Trotsky, L. Excerpts from Istoriya russkoi revolyutsii (1931). Istoriya SSSR, No. 2, 1990, pp 164-173.
- Trotsky, L. 'Germano-Sovetskii Soyuz' (September 1939), Daugava, No. 3, 1990, pp 111-113.
- Trotsky, L. 'V sekretariat Ts.K' (24th October 1927), Rodina, No. 3, 1990, p 59.
- Trotsky, L. 'Yadro voprosa' (Summer 1927), Slovo, No. 4, 1990, pp 16-17.
- Trotsky, L. 'L. D. Trotskii V. I. Leniny' (5th June 1921), 'L. D. Trotskii V. M. Molotovy' (5th June 1921), 'L. D. Trotskii chlenam politbyuro Ts.K. RKP(b)' (15th May 1922), Izvestiya Ts.K. KPSS, No. 4, 1990, pp 178-179, 196-197.

- Trotsky, L. 'Pis'mo L. D. Trotskogo chlenam Ts.K. i Ts.K.K. RKP(b) (8 October 1923), Izvestiya Ts.K. KPSS, No. 5, 1990, pp 165-175.
- Trotsky, L. 'L. D. Trotskii zashchishchaetsya', Voprosy istorii KPSS, No. 5, 1990, pp 32-43.
- Trotsky, L. 'Rech L. D. Trotskogo na mogile A. A. Ioffe na novodevich'em kladbishche v Moskve 19-go noyabrya 1927 goda' Novaya i noveishaya istoriya, No. 3, 1990, pp 108-109.
- Trotsky, L. 'Ya umry s nepokolebimoi veroi', Moskovskie novosti, No. 29, 22nd July 1990, p 16.
- Trotsky, L. 'Ssylka, vycylka, shitaniya, smert'', Znamaya, July, 1990, pp 173-190.
- Tsipko, A. 'Esli by pobedil Trotskii...', Daugava, No. 7, 1990, pp 83-98.
- Tucker, R. C. (ed) Stalinism: Essays in Historical Interpretation, W. W. Norton, New York, 1977.
- Twiss, T. 'Trotsky's Break with the Comintern', Soviet Studies, No. 39, January 1987, pp 131-137.
- Ulanov, V. 'Trotskii. K politicheskoi biografii', Leningradskaya pravda, 23rd July 1989, pp 2-3.
- Vasetskii, N. A. V konflikte s epokhoi. Trotskizm protiv real'nogo sotsializma, Moscow, 1985.
- Vasetskii, N. A. 'L. Trotskii: mifi i real'nost', Argumenty i fakty, 20-26 August 1988, pp 5-7.
- Vasetskii, N. A. O Trotskom i trotskizme, Moscow, 1989.
- Vasetskii, N. A. 'Likvidatsiya. Kto i pochemu ubil Trotskogo.', Literaturnaya gazeta,

- 4th January, 1989, p 13.
- Vasetskii, N. A. 'L. D. Trotskii: politicheskii portret', Novaya i noveishaya istoriya, No. 3, 1989, pp 136-165.
- Vasetskii, N. A. 'Shtrikhi k portretu Trotskogo', Komsomol'skaya pravda, 19th May 1989.
- Vasetskii, N. A. '<<Demon revolyutsii>> kak personazh istorii.', Kommunist belorussii, No. 11, 1989, pp 50-55; No. 12, 1989, pp 48-55; No. 1, 1990, pp 72-75; No. 2, 1990, pp 56-63; No. 3, 1990, pp 66-71.
- Vasetskii, N. A. & Ivanov, V. 'Bumerang usechennykh tsitat', Literaturnaya Rossiya, No. 50, 15th December 1989.
- Vasetskii, N. A. 'Lenin i Trotskii', Kommunist ukrainy, No. 1, 1990, pp 19-44.
- Vasetskii, N. A. 'Fragmenty iz knigi L. D. Trotskogo <<istoriya russkoi revolyutsii>>', Istoriya SSSR, No. 2, 1990, pp 156-164.
- Vasetskii, N. A. 'Posleslovie', Novaya i noveishaya istoriya, No. 2, 1990, pp 198-204.
- Vodolazov, G. 'Vybor istorii i istoriya al'ternativ: N. Bukharin protiv L. Trotskogo', Problemy mira i sotsializma, No. 10, 1988, pp 61-66.
- Volkogonov, D. 'Fenomen Stalina', Literaturnaya gazeta, 9th December 1987, p 13.
- Volkogonov, D. 'Demon revolyutsii', Pravda, 9th September 1988.
- Volkogonov, D. 'Demon revolyutsii', Sputnik, No. 5, 1989, pp 82-90.
- Volkogonov, D. 'Chelovek planety bez pasporta', Rodina, No. 7, 1989, pp 27-32.
- Volkogonov, D. '<<Trotskii davno smottrelysa v zerkalo istorii.>>', Kommunist

- vooruzhennykh sil, No. 19, 1989, pp 70-84.
- Volkogonov, D. 'Stalin mertv, no ne umer eshche stalinizm', Moskovskie novosti, 25th February 1990, pp 8-9.
- Volkogonov, D. 'Devyatyii val vandeii', Literaturnaya gazeta, 30th May 1990, p 13; 13th June 1990, p 12.
- Warth, J. D. 'Leon Trotsky: Writer and Historian', Journal of Modern History, Vol. 20, No. 1, March 1948, pp 27-41.
- Weber, N. S. 'Parvus, Luxemburg and Kautsky on the 1905 Revolution: The relationship with Trotsky', Australian Journal of Politics and History, No. 3, 1975, pp 39-53.
- Weinstein, F. 'Trotsky and the Sociological Dimension: An Analysis of Social Action', Social Forces, Vol. 40, No. 1, 1961, pp 8-14.
- Wistrich, R. S. 'Leon Trotsky's Theory of Fascism', Journal of Contemporary History, No. 11, October 1976, pp 157-184.
- Wistrich, R. S. Trotsky, Robson Books, London, 1979.
- Wolfe, B. D. 'Leon Trotsky as Historian', Slavic Review, Vol. 20, No. 3, 1961, pp 495-502.
- Zavorotnyi, S. 'Poshchechina Stalinu', Komsomol'skaya pravda, 6th July 1989, p 4.
- Zvyagin, V. 'Ya kochu idti poseredine', Moskovskie novosti, No. 45, 5th November 1989, p 16.