Trotsky's critics: recycled rubbish
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In late 1998, Resistance Books published Trotsky's theory of Permanent Revolution, A Leninist critique. The book's author, Democratic Socialist Party veteran Doug Lorimer, claims to subject Trotsky's writing to a "sustained critique" and show that "Trotsky's theory is wrong on the fundamental questions" of revolution in colonial and semi colonial countries. In fact most of the arguments in this self proclaimed "pioneering essay" were pioneered by Stalin and his apologists in the 1920s, as they conducted their campaign against Trotsky's 'original sin', the theory of Permanent Revolution. The DSP has again recycled these Stalinist arguments, supplemented by a few of their own, to distort and discredit the views of Trotsky and Trotskyism.

It is worthwhile beginning, as the Australian Democratic Socialist Party's (DSP) pamphlet does, by reconsidering the history of Trotsky's and the Left Opposition's (LO's) critique of Stalinist policies in the 1920s.

The fight by Trotsky and the LO against the bureaucratisation of the Bolshevik Party, and the rightward shift in the Communist International, was centred upon Stalin's reactionary theory of socialism in one country, and his related resurrection of the Menshevik "two stage theory" of revolution.

Trotsky argued that in the epoch of imperialism the two stage theory of revolution whereby revolution in colonial and semi colonial countries is limited to a lengthy bourgeois democratic stage was a trap for the working class.

It was a trap because it subordinated the interests of the working class in semi colonial countries to the interests of the local bourgeoisie, by insisting that they limit their struggle to bourgeois democratic demands which did not threaten capitalist private property.

This two stage theory, Trotsky and the LO asserted, was not only repudiated by the events of the Russian revolution itself, but was responsible for the military and political disarmament, and eventually the massacre, of thousands of communists in the revolutionary events in China from 1925 to 1928.

Because the Chinese Communist Party, on the advise of the Stalinised Comintern, limited itself to a bourgeois democratic stage, it entered into an alliance with, and subordinated itself to, the bourgeois nationalist Koumintang. The CCP's alliance with the nationalists was the rationale for disarming its own cadre, who were subsequently slaughtered by Koumintang forces.

Against Stalin's reactionary two stage theory Trotsky counterpoised his own theory of permanent revolution. At its most fundamental this was the view that revolution in the colonies and semi colonies would have to be led by the working class supported by the peasantry.

Yet any working class government that came to power could not limit itself to bourgeois democratic tasks. As the working class came into conflict with the domestic bourgeoisie, as it inevitably would, a working
class government would have to side with the workers and hence make encroachments on capitalist private property, if it was not to be a government of counterrevolution. Hence unfulfilled tasks of the bourgeois revolution would have to grow over into tasks associated with socialist revolution. The revolution would have to become permanent.

The gains of such a revolutionary movement, however, could only be consolidated and built upon by revolutions occurring in other countries. Hence the revolution, far from being the beginnings of "socialism in one country", would also have to become permanent on the international front.

Stalin and his apologists presented Trotsky's criticisms and his theory of permanent revolution as heresies against Marxist Leninism. From 1924 onwards they conducted a campaign of vilification against Trotskyism and Trotsky, which culminated in his assassination in 1940, and the expulsion and murder of thousands of revolutionary communists from communists parties around the world.

The principle arguments that the Stalinists levelled against Trotskyism was that it was an "ultraleft" theory which led to ultraleft practices, and that it underestimated the role of the peasantry in revolutions in colonial and semi colonial countries as the Mensheviks had done.

These long dead Stalinist arguments have been raised from the grave, almost word for word, by Lorimer in his pamphlet: "Trotsky shared the Mensheviks' assessment of the peasantry, i.e. that is was too backward, dispersed and passive to play the role of a strategic ally (and be the major social force) in the bourgeois - democratic revolution." 1

This is because "the ultra left theory of permanent revolution that Trotsky counterpoised to the Bolsheviks' policy of a two stage, uninterrupted revolution was based on a mechanical fatalistic conception of the class struggle." 2

And again, Trotsky "rejected, as unrealisable, the Bolshevik policy of a transitional alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry as a whole. Instead, he believed that not only would the working class play the role of political vanguard in the anti Tsarist struggle, it would be the main social force in overthrowing and destroying the old order".3

Just in case the reader hasn't got the point: "by dismissing the possibility and necessity of an alliance between the working class and the peasantry as a whole, Trotsky tended toward the view that the democratic revolution in Russia would be carried out by the proletariat alone..." 4finally, to nail the thesis home:

"Trotsky's approach to the land question reflected his repudiation of the decisive role of the peasantry in the bourgeois revolution and of a revolutionary democratic alliance between the working class and the entire peasantry as the necessary bridge to the anticapitalist alliance of the workers and poor peasants".5

Through applying the device of repetition Lorimer seems to think that his argument will have more weight. He is wrong. Trotsky refuted this Stalinist caricature of his views more that 70 years ago.

Trotsky always insisted that the peasantry, in alliance with the revolutionary proletariat, would play a key role in any revolution in the colonial and semi colonial world. As far back as 1905 he could conclude that:

"The oppressed workers and [and!] peasant masses ... must take it upon themselves to create ... the necessary political and organisational preconditions for their triumph".6

Similarly. Trotsky's 1928 book The Permanent Revolution can be read as an extended response to the
charge that his theory ignores the peasantry. He cites a wealth of textual evidence to show that he does not ignore the peasantry, but merely shows their class limitations as a revolutionary force.

In keeping with all previous Marxist scholarship on the subject, he argues that while the peasantry is a necessary ally of the proletariat in revolutionary struggle in the semi colonies, it is the latter who must lead the struggle.

This was because the material conditions of the peasantry engendered a vacillating petit bourgeois worldview and practice preventing them from independently completing the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution, let alone a socialist revolution.

Trotsky was not alone in this view. It was one that Marx and Engels themselves had advanced on numerous occasions.

As Engels showed in The Peasant War in Germany, the agrarian struggle in the 16th century was always led by some urban faction rather than by the peasantry themselves.

This was even more the case in the 1789 French revolution, the most thorough going bourgeois revolution ever, where there is no question that the peasantry was led by the urban bourgeoisie.

By 1848, however, revolutionary events proved that the bourgeoisie was no longer fit to play a progressive role in revolutionary struggle. But did this mean that the peasantry, still the most numerous class in most of Europe, would now play the leading role? Not according to Marx and Engels. The task of leading progressive revolutionary struggle, and with it the peasantry, would fall to the newly emerging proletariat.

As Marx wrote in 1856, commenting about the possibility of further revolutionary situations in Germany:

"The whole thing in Germany will depend on backing the proletarian revolution with some second edition of the peasant war."7

The correctness of this position of Marx and Engels that the democratic revolution would have to be led by the proletariat, supported by the peasantry, was thrown into even sharper relief by the experience of the 1905 Russian revolution.

Lenin and the Bolsheviks rightly argued that:

"In the view of the Bolsheviks the proletariat has had laid upon it the active task of pursuing the bourgeoisie democratic revolution to its consummation and of being its leader. This is only possible if the proletariat is able to carry with it the masses of the democratic petit bourgeoisie, especially the peasantry, in the struggle against the autonomy and the treacherous liberal bourgeoisie."8

This more or less reflects Trotsky's own position. Even Lorimer agrees that:

"Trotsky was in basic agreement with the Bolsheviks on the question of what approach the working class should take toward the liberal bourgeoisie." and "that the working class, through its own party, had to play the role of political leader in the Russian revolution."9

But Lorimer then goes on to argue that: "Trotsky shared the Menshevik's assessment of the peasantry, i.e. that it was too backward, dispersed and passive to play the role of a strategic ally (and be the major force) in the bourgeois democratic revolution"

Lorimer here infers that the Trotskyist position ruled out an alliance between the working class and the
peasantry.

The evidence presented by Lorimer relies on one quote:

"Today based on the experience of the [1905] Russian revolution and of the reaction. we can expect the peasantry to play a less independent, not to mention a decisive, role in the development of revolutionary events than it did in 1905. To the extent that the peasantry has remained in the grip of "estate" and feudal slavery, it continues to suffer from economic and ideological disunity, political immaturity, cultural backwardness and helplessness. Despite its elemental opposition to the old regime, in every movement the peasantry's social energy is always paralysed by these weakness. They force it to halt where really revolutionary action begins."10

Lorimer slyly and falsely infers from the phrase "less independent, not to mention decisive" that Trotsky "rejected, as unrealisable, the Bolshevik policy of a transitional alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry as a whole".11

This is a gross misrepresentation of Trotsky's position. Trotsky was not arguing that the proletariat could not enter into an alliance with the peasantry, but that the latter would be unable to 'independently' achieve the overthrow of Tsarism, and that they would not and could not lead the revolutionary struggle in Russia.

When "revolutionary action begins", Trotsky insisted, the peasantry would either have to follow the bourgeoisie or the workers. In the epoch of imperialism a 'third way' was impossible. Hence Trotsky is not "dismissing the possibility and necessity of an alliance between the working class and the peasantry".

What he is saying is that when the class struggle erupts in the countryside the petit bourgeois peasantry "as a whole" will fragment. The richer land owning peasants will customarily follow the bourgeoisie and the poorer peasants the proletariat.

Therefore while it is possible to envisage "tactical" alliances with the "whole peasantry", longer-term "strategic" alliances on that basis are utopian.

Lorimer himself inadvertently admits this point later in his essay. He concedes that at a certain stage of development in the Russian revolution, the class differentiation of the peasantry was expressed when the rich peasants broke from the working class and joined the camp of counterrevolution.

Why did they break? Because the peasantry is not a homogenous social entity but is itself divided by class. This makes a nonsense of any long-term strategic working class alliance with the peasantry "as a whole", as is advocated by Stalin contra Trotsky and the DSP contra Trotskyism.

Lorimer goes on to accuse Trotsky and the theory of Permanent Revolution "of lacking any conception of the possibility and necessity of measures transitional to the socialist revolution". In the context of the Russian revolution the consequences would be that: "the bourgeoisie would be able to rally the Russian peasantry against the workers government, and easily overthrow it."12

The primary transitional measure that Lorimer is alluding to is at the heart of the peasants struggle - land reform.

Trotsky's views on the land question in 1905 were explicit:

"The first thing the proletarian regime must deal with on coming to power is the solution of the agrarian
question, with which the fate of vast masses of the population of Russia is bound up. In the solution of this question, as in all others, the proletariat will be guided by the fundamental aim of its economic policy, i.e., to command as large a possible a field in which to carry out the organisation of socialist economy. The form and tempo of the execution of this agrarian policy, however, must be determined by the material resources at the disposal of the proletariat, as well as by care to act so as not to throw possible allies into the ranks of the counterrevolution."13

Not only is Trotsky aware, some 12 years before the Russian revolution of 1917, of the importance of the agrarian question for the majority of the Russian people, he even pointed out the dangers for the proletariat if this question was not resolved: namely the possibility of "throwing allies into the ranks of the counterrevolution".

This is precisely why Trotsky never advocated the immediate collectivisation of all peasant lands and a "leap" into socialist agriculture as is sometimes attributed to him. Rather, he was for the immediate expropriation of the big landed estates and the introduction of economic incentives that could progressively shift the balance between private and collectivised agriculture in favour of the latter: hardly measures that would throw the entire peasantry into the hands of the bourgeoisie, as Lorimer suggests.

At this point Lorimer's argument gets even more fanciful. He says:

"Trotsky's mechanical fatalistic conception of the development of the class struggle led him to draw erroneous conclusions from the experience of the 1905 revolution, that is, to mechanically project them on to the future course of the development of a new revolution in Russia".14

This claim is based exclusively on some mistaken predictions that Trotsky made after 1905: namely that he expected a future revolutionary upsurge would drive the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks closer together and that the introduction by a revolutionary government of an 8 hour day would lead to a general capitalist lockout.

The failure of either to eventuate is allegedly a symptom of Trotsky's "mechanical fatalism". Poor Trotsky! On this issue we can only point out the obvious to Lorimer: numerous perspectival formulations down through the history of the Marxist movement have been falsified by actual events. Marx, and Engels themselves predicted that the 1848 revolutions in Europe would turn out very differently than they did.

Did this make them "mechanical fatalists"? No. It only showed that historical contingency and subjective intervention, or lack of it, can falsify plausible predictions, and that Marxists are not witch doctors or crystal ball gazers.

We shouldn't be surprised then, that Lorimer does not even bother to show how Trotsky tried to project his perspectives in 1905 onto the October Revolution of 1917.

There is hardly any need to when you can show that he is a mechanical fatalist because he made wrong predictions.

The two stages of the Russian Revolution

A central feature of Lorimer's critique of Trotsky revolves around a different appreciation of the 1905 revolution, and the alleged applicability of Lenin's position in 1905 to the 1917 revolution. Hence it is useful to reconsider what is at stake.

Before 1905 Russian Marxists believed that the coming revolution would be a bourgeois democratic
revolution. However, when events required that this theoretical position be given a practical character, long lasting disputes arose.

Lenin, the Bolshevik Party and Trotsky all agreed that the Russian bourgeoisie would be incapable of leading the revolution.

Only the Mensheviks believed that because the immediate tasks of the revolution were bourgeois, then the bourgeoisie would have to lead the revolution, with the working class and peasantry in support.

This Menshevik stages theory held that after the bourgeois revolution there would be a period of capitalist development (stage 1). Once capitalism had developed then and only then could the working class fight for socialism (stage 2). Lenin and Trotsky viewed things differently.

Lenin believed that the revolution would see the coming to power, forcibly, of a government embodying the slogan "revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry". The tasks facing such a government were to complete the bourgeois democratic minimum programme. While this was a revolutionary advance over the ideas of the Mensheviks, Trotsky could see a flaw.

Trotsky argued that the slogan "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" left open which class would be hegemonic in the new government. Trotsky believed, for reasons already explained, that the working class would have to lead.

However, if the proletariat was to lead such a government it would be compelled to go beyond fulfilling the demands of bourgeois democracy. Why? Because such a government would be immediately confronted with problems that demanded solutions which went beyond capitalist private property.

For example, when faced with strikes, lockouts and sackings, the workers' government would have two options: either yield to the capitalists, repress workers' struggles and thus act as a government of counterrevolution; or defend the rights of workers.

This would mean expropriating the capitalists' factories and organising production on a socialised basis. From this Trotsky drew the bold conclusion:

"The very fact of the proletariat's representatives entering the government, not as powerless hostages, but as the leading force, destroys the line between maximum and minimum programme: that is to say. it places collectivism on the order of the day".15

Hence for Trotsky, in a semi-colonial country like Russia it is not so much that there are no stages in the revolutionary process, as that there is continuity between the different stages. Both the bourgeois and the socialist tasks would be intertwined and there could be no hard and fast separation between them.

Lorimer wants us to believe that Trotsky abandoned this position after he came over to the side of the Bolsheviks in 1917 and that he "abandoned his criticisms of the existing Bolshevik two stage theory".16

The opposite is in fact the case. The period of political instability and dual power between February and October 1917 confirmed Trotsky's view. A bourgeois democratic stage and a socialist stage of revolution could not be rigidly separated, but were organically connected by a period of sharpening social conflicts which could only be resolved progressively if the working class took political power and began eroding the economic basis of the old order.

The Bolsheviks for their part, after a fierce struggle between Lenin and conservatives in the party, were won to the Trotskyist view that the impending revolution would be proletarian in character. This change
was most famously embodied in Lenin's "April Theses".

After the February revolution in 1917, and in the absence of Lenin, the Bolshevik leaders trailed events and clung to the two-stage theory and the old slogan of "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry".

Stalin and Kamenev wrote in Pravda "what matters now is not the overthrow of capitalism, but the overthrow of autocracy and feudalism".

In April 1917 Lenin returned from exile. He came out strongly against his old slogan and all those who used it as a cover for compromise and inaction. He argued that the Soviets should offer no support to the Provisional Government. The revolution was not over and that if the dual power situation that existed was to be resolved favourably in the interests of the working class and peasantry, all power should pass to the Soviets.

Initially the leaders of the Bolshevik Party were almost unanimous in their opposition to Lenin's plans. But Lenin appealed to the rank and file of the party and succeeded in changing the course, not only of the party, but also of history. He argued:

"Under such circumstances, whoever continued to cling to the formula of a 'democratic dictatorship' renounced, in effect, power and led the revolution into a blind alley.

The fundamental controversial question, around which everything else centred, was this whether or not we should struggle for power: whether or not we should assume power. This alone should be proof that VC were not dealing with a mere episodic divergence of opinions but with two tendencies of utmost principled significance. The first and principled was proletarian and led to the road of world revolution. The other was 'democratic'. i.e. petit bourgeois and led, in the last analysis, to the subordination of proletarian policies to the requirements of bourgeois society in the process of reform."17

In a word Lenin had consigned the old slogan of dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry to the dustbin of history, and embraced the Trotskyist position that working class power had to be fought for.

Lorimer suggests that Lenin came out against his old slogan because "the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry has already become a reality ... for this formulae envisages only a relation of classes, and not a concrete political institution implementing this relation; this cooperation".18

This is patently ridiculous. Can Lorimer really expect that a serious person will believe that a worker and peasant dictatorship was "already a reality" in April 1917? If it was a reality then why did not the worker/peasant dictatorship withdraw Russia from the war?

Why did it not expropriate the big landowners as it did after October? It did not do so because it was not a reality, and never could be while the bourgeoisie still controlled the levers of political power.

Like many political renegades before him Lorimer can play fast and loose with the slogan "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" because of its algebraic character.

Because the slogan does not spell out which class will be hegemonic in the dictatorship, various conciliators within the Bolshevik party were able to use it as a defence of their position. This happened not only in 1917, but also in the mid 1920s when Stalin appealed to the slogan in his defence of the "block of four classes" which led to the murder and the betrayal of the Chinese revolution.
Trotsky identified the dangers inherent in the political ambiguity of the slogan: “The formula of the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry bore in large measure an intentionally algebraic character. Lenin did not solve in advance what the political relationship would be between the two participants in the assumed democratic dictatorship. that is the proletariat and the peasantry. Yet I came out against the formula ‘democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry’, because I saw its shortcomings in the fact that it left open the question of which class would wield the real dictatorship.”

Trotsky, learning the lessons of 1917 and the Chinese revolution formulated a much more precise slogan. “With regard to countries with a belated bourgeois development, especially the colonial and semi colonial countries, the theory of the permanent revolution signifies that the complete and genuine solution to their tasks of achieving democracy and national emancipation is conceivable only through the dictatorship of the proletariat as the leader of the subjugated nation, above all the peasant masses.”

This is precisely what transpired as a consequence of the October 1917 Russian revolution. The Bolsheviks lead a revolution, which gave power to the Russian working class. What was decisive was not the role of the peasantry but the leadership of the proletariat.

While it is true that the appalling social conditions and revolutionary participation of the peasantry were necessary conditions for the success of revolution, it was only the decisive leadership of the working class that could utilise the social weight of the peasantry to achieve the revolutionary transformation of the entire social order.

In other words the working class was the leading force in the October revolution and the state that it established.

Lorimer does not see it in this way. In defending the two-stage theory he argues that the October insurrection represented the establishment of the first stage which lasted until July 1918: “The October Revolution began as a worker/peasant revolution and, then, eight months later, developed uninterruptedly into a proletarian socialist revolution. It was the continuity of proletarian political leadership that gave the transition from the bourgeois revolution to the socialist revolution its uninterrupted character, i.e., made them two stages of a single uninterrupted revolutionary process.”

What Lorimer fails to point out is that his first stage would be impossible without the proletariat taking power and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Furthermore, it went way beyond anything in the bourgeois minimum democratic programme. This included the abolition of private property in land, the creation of a single centralised bank, the abolition of the army and police and their replacement with Soviets and workers’ control of production.

What is more, his view that the period from October 1917 to July 1918 represented the first, bourgeois democratic stage of the revolution flatly contradicts his contention, identified above, that Lenin dropped the slogan of dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry in April 1917 because it was "already a reality''.

Was it a reality or was it not? The confusions are compounded when it comes to commenting on the significance of the October revolution. Contrary to Lenin, Trotsky and the vast weight of socialist scholarship on the subject. Lorimer is at pains to deny that the revolution brought about the dictatorship of
the proletariat.

Over and over he maintains it was a "democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants' (which apparently had existed since at least April).

He maintains that if Trotsky acknowledged the existence of "the Bolshevik/Left SR. coalition government..." would have "forced him to admit that a 'democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants' had been constituted in Russia, during the first democratic stage of the October Revolution."22

The existence of such a government was not a problem for Trotsky:

"In the event of a decisive victory of the revolution, power will pass into the hands of that class which plays a leading role in the struggle in other words, into the hands of the proletariat. Let us say at once that this by no means precludes revolutionary representatives of non-proletarian social groups entering the government. They can and should be in the government: sound policy will compel the proletariat to call to power influential leaders of the urban petit bourgeoisie, of the intellectuals and of the peasantry. The whole problem consists in this: who will determine the content of the government's policy, who will form within it a solid majority."23

Contrary to what Lorimer suggests then, Trotsky could conceive of a government with representatives from classes other than the proletariat. The existence of such a government did not constitute a "transitional stage of worker peasant state power in a proletarian revolution, in a predominately peasant country." What defines the class nature of a government is not the personnel who compose it, but which class is hegemonic in the government as expressed by the class interests that it defends. The Soviet government was a government of and for the working class.

It was a dictatorship of the proletariat.

The DSP claims to maintain a "Leninist theory and policy of a two stage uninterrupted revolution". While Lenin never formally renounced the two-stage theory of revolution nor expressed his support for permanent revolution on paper, his practice in 1917 showed that he accepted its conclusions.

When it came to the crunch he pushed for the workers to play the leading role in the revolution and to seize power, thus dominating the revolutionary government.

Lorimer has failed in his effort to subject Trotsky's writing on Permanent Revolution to a "sustained critique". He has also failed to show when and where, in 1917, the practice and policy of Lenin differed in any way from that of Trotsky, summed up in the theory of Permanent Revolution.

Trotsky was not only able to see the weaknesses in Lenin's two stage theory and the slogan of democratic dictatorship, he was also able to distil the lessons of 1917 and the failed Chinese revolution into a more rigorous theory of Permanent Revolution.

What Lorimer's pamphlet shows is that the DSP, like the original Mensheviks and Stalinists, use the orthodoxy of a two stage theory and the old Bolshevik slogan of a democratic dictatorship, as a cover for inaction, vacillation and betrayal.

The DSP solution to the questions raised in the democratic and national struggles in semi colonial countries has at its fundamental base the idea that a mass movement, in and of itself, will be enough. What puts them at odds with the real practice of Leninism is that Lenin recognised, as did Trotsky, that only a proletarian revolution could solve the problems in backward countries like Russia.
In countries like Indonesia today, working class revolution, supported by the peasant masses, is ultimately the only way to achieve the democratic and social objectives that can relieve the miseries inflicted upon millions of workers and peasants by capitalism. The DSP not only refuse to raise the spectre of working class power and socialism in countries like Indonesia, but they actively tail groups like the PRD who peddle illusions in bourgeois politicians like Megawati Sukarnoputri.

Like the Mensheviks during the Russian revolution, the DSP continually stress that there can and has to be a bourgeois democratic solution before a socialist solution can ever be raised. The DSP have more in common with Menshevism and Stalinism than they do with Leninist Bolshevism.

Marxists have a name for groups like the DSP who embrace revolution in words and renounce it in deeds. We call it centrism.
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