

*Trotsky's Theory of Permanent Revolution:
A Real Alternative to Socialism in One Country?*

by Eva Dragosits

Leon Trotsky is a controversial person--the spectrum of judgements on him ranges from "a brilliant leader" to "a deformed personality." There is no doubt that he was a highly intelligent man with great organizational talent, but, having a closer look at his career, one realizes that he did not fully use his abilities. Several times he failed to use political opportunities he had; and his greatest theoretical achievement, the theory of permanent revolution, which he had developed in 1905, finally led to his end as a political leader. I try to examine to what extent Trotsky's personality and his political career depended on each other, and why Stalin, skillfully exploiting Trotsky's weaknesses, could so easily outmaneuver his political opponent.

Leon Trotsky, who had been fascinated by revolutionary ideas already at an early age, joined the Mensheviks in 1903. He shared their idea that a coming revolution would be bourgeois and would eventually lead to a second, a socialist, revolution.¹ But by 1905, Trotsky had developed a new idea: the proletariat, having assumed the leadership in the approaching revolution, would also assume the power, and, therefore, the new government would not be bourgeois, but Social Democratic, proletarian. From this embryo he gave birth to the doctrine of "permanent revolution." Support would come from revolutions in Western Europe, which he expected "the Russian spark to ignite," and which would lead Russia directly through the process of ripening industrialization, making possible the proletarian revolution. With this theory, Trotsky was contradicting Lenin who did not believe that a minority could achieve socialism, but was convinced that much time and mass education were needed. Trotsky was convinced that enough strength could be mustered temporarily to take and to hold Russia until the workers of Europe would arise. But the Petersburg uprising in 1905 was not answered by revolutions in the West, contrary to Trotsky's expectations. Trotsky as leader of the St. Petersburg Soviet was sent to exile.²

All Russian Social democratic revolutionaries based their concepts of revolution on Marx and Engels, according to whom proletarian revolutions occur in societies which are already

¹Bertram D. Wolfe, *Three Who Made a Revolution* (New York: The Dial Press, 1940), 289.

²Thornton Anderson, *Masters of Russian Marxism* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963), 120-4.

industrialized and urbanized under capitalism and therefore are ready for very rapid reconstruction along radically new lines. This society on the morrow of the great workers' revolt was the "first phase" of communism and in the later development of the Marxist movement became known as "socialism". Socialism would be governed by a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and would be a transitional phase followed by the higher phase of communism. In communism the modern productive powers would be completely liberated, material plenty would be achieved, and the government in the old repressive sense would cease to exist.³

Applied to the economically backward Russia, Marx's theory required first the creation and experience of a capitalist stage of industrialization, before a socialist revolution could occur and the country finally could proceed to communism.

In 1905, there existed three distinctly different positions towards the coming revolution which, according to Marx, was necessary to achieve socialism.

The Mensheviks thought the coming revolution in Russia would be a bourgeois democratic revolution which would bring the bourgeoisie to power and lead to the political and economic development and the organization of the working class. This would prepare a second, a socialist revolution. The role of the workers was, for the time being, subordinate to that of the liberal bourgeoisie.⁴

Lenin and the Bolsheviks accepted that the revolution would be bourgeois because Russia was too backward for a socialist revolution:

The degree of economic development of Russia...and the degree of class consciousness and organization of the broad masses of the proletariat...make the immediate complete emancipation of the working class impossible.⁵

However, Lenin rejected the notion that the bourgeoisie would lead the revolution because it was too weak and cowardly; therefore, the leading role would likely fall to the proletariat.⁶

Under Russian circumstances, however, the revolution could only succeed through an alliance

³Robert C. Tucker, *Stalin as Revolutionary, 1879-1929* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1973), 368-9.

⁴Wolfe, *Three Who Made a Revolution*, 289.

⁵"Lenin on Revolutionary Tactics, 1905," in Anderson, *Masters of Russian Marxism*, 68.

⁶Wolfe, *Three Who Made a Revolution*, 209.

of the two great oppressed classes, the proletariat and the poor peasantry.⁷ The Social Democratic Party would strive to enter any provisional government that might arise in the course of the struggle and would determine the policy of that government. He advocated a two-class government, "the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry."⁸

The third position was that of Trotsky. He was in complete agreement with Lenin about the lack of revolutionary potential in the liberal bourgeoisie and, therefore, believed that the proletariat would have to do the job which the bourgeoisie was incapable of doing. The revolutionary government would be a government of the workers' democracy, so the "bourgeois revolution" made by the proletariat would tend to flow over into a proletarian revolution.

He further anticipated that the Russian revolution would tend to spread to the West which was ripe for a socialist revolution. The proletariat, once in power, might hold onto it and keep the revolution going "in permanence": the bourgeois and proletarian revolutions would combine into a single, continuous process, dominated throughout by the proletariat.

Trotsky and Lenin both attributed the leading role in the revolution to the proletariat because they thought the bourgeoisie to be incapable of carrying through a revolution, and both wanted the Social Democratic Party to enter the provisional government. But Lenin rejected Trotsky's formula of a "socialist government" or a "dictatorship of the proletariat." He favored a "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry:"

The only force capable of gaining "a decisive victory over tsarism", is the people, i.e., the proletariat and the peasantry. And such a victory will be precisely a dictatorship,...⁹

In Trotsky's opinion Lenin overestimated the prospects of independent revolutionary representation of the peasantry.¹⁰ As I have already mentioned, he had developed his own theory of revolution, which I here want to explain in detail.

The basic idea of this theory was that Russia could and would achieve power before the working classes of Western Europe and without passing through a prolonged period of bourgeois democracy. Trotsky considered the peasantry, which plays an important role in Lenin's

⁷John Molyneux, *Leon Trotsky's Theory of Revolution* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981), 20.

⁸Wolfe, *Three Who Made a Revolution*, 291.

⁹"Lenin on Revolutionary Tactics, 1905," in Anderson, *Masters of Russian Marxism*, 68-9.

¹⁰Wolfe, *Three Who Made a Revolution*, 289-91.

conception, to be too differentiated and shapeless to form an independent party or policy of its own. The peasantry would be forced to side with the proletariat, but its role would be strictly subordinate. The coalition envisaged by Lenin was not realizable at a political, governmental level;¹¹

Our attitude towards the idea of a "dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" is now quite clear....In our opinion, it simply cannot be realized, at least in its direct meaning.¹²

Consequently the government would pass into the hands of the party and the class that had led the uprising, which could only be the Social Democrats and the proletariat. But, compelled by the logic of the continuing class struggle, the government would not be able to restrict itself to merely democratic measures, but would lead to the socialist revolution.¹³

This is the first aspect of Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution: the transition of the democratic revolution into the socialist; Trotsky denied that a long period of democracy would exist.¹⁴

The second aspect of the theory characterizes the socialist revolution:

For an indefinitely long time and in constant internal struggle, all social relations are transformed....Revolutions in economy, technique, science, the family, morals and usages develop in complicated reciprocal action and do not allow society to reach equilibrium.¹⁵

The third aspect of the theory concerns internationalism. Russia was an economically and politically backward country, and the material prerequisites for socialism did not yet exist. Trotsky saw the answer to this problem in "internationalization" of the Revolution: "...A Socialist revolution in the West would allow us to turn the temporary supremacy of the working class directly into a Socialist dictatorship."¹⁶ This help from the European proletariat would remove

¹¹Molyneux, *Leon Trotsky's Theory of Revolution*, 25-7.

¹²Leon Trotsky, "The Permanent Revolution," in Anderson, *Masters of Russian Marxism*, 136.

¹³Molyneux, *Leon Trotsky's Theory of Revolution*, 25-7.

¹⁴Trotsky, "The Permanent Revolution," in Anderson, *Masters of Russian Marxism*, 130.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 139-40.

¹⁶Trotsky, "Our Revolution," in Anderson, *Masters of Russian Marxism*, 138.

the threat of military restoration of capitalism, would relieve Russia from the pressure of international economic competition, and would make available resources which would allow a rapid development of Russia's productive forces.¹⁷ Therefore, for the Russian working class "nothing remains but to link the fate of its political supremacy and the fate of the Russian revolution with the fate of a Socialist revolution in Europe."¹⁸ Trotsky warned about Lenin's concept, which required a highly centralized Party control over the peasants who were not yet able to govern the state: "The organization of the Party will take the place of the Party itself; the Central Committee will take the place of the organization; and finally, the dictator will take the place of the Central Committee." This shows that Trotsky was aware that out of Lenin's concept a dictatorship would almost certainly be created under the conditions of actual revolution. For his part, Lenin warned about Trotsky: "Whoever wants to approach socialism by any other path than that of political democracy, will inevitably arrive at the most absurd and reactionary conclusions, political and economic."¹⁹

In 1905 Lenin failed to grasp the significance of Trotsky's new theory. He himself started to question some of the settled points of Russian Marxism, like the necessity of a period of capitalist rule, and suggested that workers and peasants "will not surrender" the democratic revolution to the bourgeoisie. He also admitted that "in history certain particular elements of both revolutions become interwoven," thus blurring the old distinction between the bourgeois revolution and the socialist revolution. Lenin came very close to Trotsky's position, but drew back from a sharp break with orthodox Marxism.²⁰

In the years between 1905 and 1917, Trotsky continued his independent line, disagreeing with both Bolsheviks and Mensheviks on many issues. Nevertheless he tried also to reconcile the two. However, in 1912 the split became final, when Lenin, at the Prague conference proclaimed the Bolshevik faction to be the party. The Mensheviks and a few Bolshevik splinter groups then coalesced against Lenin and formed the August Bloc under Trotsky; but it soon broke apart.²¹

¹⁷Molyneux, *Leon Trotsky's Theory of Revolution*, 28.

¹⁸Trotsky, "Our Revolution," in Anderson, *Masters of Russian Marxism*, 138.

¹⁹Wolfe, *Three Who Made a Revolution*, 293-4.

²⁰Anderson, *Masters of Russian Marxism*, 52.

²¹Issac Deutscher, *The Prophet Armed: Trotsky, 1879-1921* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963; reprint, New York: Oxford University Press, 1954), 181-200.

Trotsky, who then was in Vienna in exile, kept attacking Lenin in his journal *Borba* ("Struggle"). In 1914, when the war broke out, Trotsky left Vienna and subsequently stayed in Zurich, France, Spain and New York. After the liberal revolution that ousted the Tsar in February 1917, he returned to Petrograd to his position of leadership in the Petrograd Soviet, which was again in the control of the Mensheviks.²²

In April 1917, Lenin also returned to Petrograd and issued his famous "April Theses," his analysis of the revolutionary situation in Russia. He had changed his concept. In his "April Theses," Lenin believed that the Petrograd Soviet and others throughout the country were strong enough to take power. In a kind of amalgamation of his own and Trotsky's theories he proposed to carry the bourgeois revolution on into a proletarian and peasant revolution as soon as he could secure a Bolshevik majority in the Petrograd Soviet. He presents this in his April Theses:

The specific feature of the present situation in Russia is that it represents a transition from the first stage of the revolution--which, owing to the insufficient class consciousness and organization of the proletariat, placed the power in the hands of the bourgeoisie--to the second stage, which must place the power in the hands of the proletariat and the poorest strata of the peasantry.

Trotsky saw that Lenin, in his "April Theses," did not want to halt the revolution, even temporarily, at the bourgeois-democratic stage; and Lenin saw in the Russian and international situations an opportunity that convinced him that Trotsky's formula of "permanent revolution" could succeed. The differences between them had narrowed. They both now formed a sort of "pragmatic union" in a determined and concentrated struggle toward the same goal.²³

After the seizure of power in 1917, which was brilliantly arranged by Trotsky as the chairman of the Military Revolutionary Committee of the Petrograd Soviet,²⁴ Lenin wanted to minimize his past disagreements with Trotsky. He simplified the scheme of "permanent revolution" for his own use: he believed that a political or bourgeois revolution in backward Russia might "grow over" into a socialist revolution.²⁵

It was more difficult for Trotsky to justify his position. Being a leader in the party after 1917

²²*Ibid.*, 213-49.

²³Anderson, *Masters of Russian Marxism*, 124.

²⁴Tucker, *Stalin as Revolutionary, 1879-1929*, 216.

²⁵David S. Anin, "Lenin, Trotsky, and Parvus," *Survey* 24 (Winter 1979), 209.

meant that he had to suppress and deny parts of his past. In 1905 he had feared that the party might finally be replaced by a dictator--and in 1917 he himself had joined this party! This was a missing link in Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution: an authoritarian party had to step in order to force the revolution within a backward and incompletely prepared country. Trotsky realized that he had been too optimistic concerning a spontaneous inclination of the proletariat in both Russia and western Europe.

Trotsky's shift in 1917 is a serious repudiation of his previous concept of the party, but an unavoidable step for his theory of permanent revolution. It is certainly a paradox that in 1917 Trotsky's prophecy of 1905 applied not only to Lenin, but to Trotsky himself, as an authoritarian leader of the party.²⁶

Trotsky explained his long resistance to Lenin (1903-1917) by saying that "only a man who has struggled with doubts can emerge a firm and principled believer."²⁷ He criticized the dependence of the Bolsheviks upon Lenin:

"One could write an instructive chapter on the leadership of the Leninists without Lenin. The latter towered so high above his nearest disciples that in his presence they felt that there was no need of their solving theoretical and tactical problems independently. When they happened to be separated from Lenin at a critical moment, they amazed one by their utter helplessness."²⁸

He thus justified his former opposition. But also, he produced the unintentional effect that Lenin himself became the heart of the party, the "one and only leader," without whom the Party would likely have blundered badly.²⁹ With this he unknowingly played in the hands of Stalin who, in a very few years, would very skillfully claim Leninist legitimacy--and use it devastatingly against Trotsky.

Trotsky, appointed War Commissar in March 1918, was a brilliant military leader; his army defeated the Isarist generals in the civil war and repelled invasions by the British, French, Poles,

²⁶Robert McNeil, "Trotsky's Trotskyism," *Survey* 24 (Winter 1979), 174-7.

²⁷Leon Trotsky, *My Life: An Attempt at an Autobiography*. (New York: Pathfinder Press, Inc., 1970), 164.

²⁸Trotsky, *My Life*, 170.

²⁹Gary Kern, "Trotsky's Autobiography," *The Russian Review* 36 (July 1977), 297-319.

Czechs, Japanese and Americans.³⁰ Since internationalism played an important role in his theory, Trotsky placed high hopes in both his military activity and in the Communist International (Comintern), which was founded in 1919. He hoped that the revolution, with the help of the Comintern, would gain footholds in central Europe. The Hungarian, Bavarian, and Spartacist revolutions failed, but Trotsky never gave up his belief in the International.³¹

In the sphere of economics, Lenin and Trotsky were following the policy of War Communism between 1917 and 1921, with the abolition of the free market, centralized planning, and militarization of labor.³² But by the end of 1919 and the beginning of 1920, they had to realize that this program was failing. Soviet Russia was war-ravaged; the peasants were destructively opposing policies of requisitions and rationing; and signs of popular unrest were growing.³³

Lenin at that time planned the retreat into the New Economic Policy (NEP). This would be a tactical retreat from War Communism, during which capitalism would temporarily be restored and the forces of socialism in Russia would "retrench, recuperate, and then resume their march."³⁴ Trotsky now joined forces with the party ideologist Nikolai Bukharin, wanting to continue War Communism. They demanded the retention of central planning and administration and tighter discipline, a subordination of democracy to efficiency. At the Tenth Congress in 1921 these two positions were discussed: Lenin's retreat from War Communism and independence for the trade unions versus Trotsky's and Bukharin's idea of strengthening discipline, centralized planning, and incorporation of the unions into the state administration with allowing for a limited free market.³⁵ The Congress endorsed Lenin's position by an overwhelming majority. Trotsky came out as a loser in the trade union controversy; the Tenth Congress was an important political setback for him. NEP explicitly repudiated the line he had been publicly taking in economic policy.³⁶

³⁰Anderson, *Masters of Russian Marxism*, 126.

³¹Deutscher, *The Prophet Armed*, 452-6.

³²Anderson, *Masters of Russian Marxism*, 126.

³³Tucker, *Stalin as Revolutionary, 1879-1929*, 216.

³⁴Cohen, "Bolshevism and Stalinism," in Robert C. Tucker, ed., *Stalinism, Essays in Historical Interpretation* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1977), 19.

³⁵Anderson, *Masters of Russian Marxism*, 126-31.

³⁶Tucker, *Stalin as Revolutionary, 1879-1929*, 217-9.

On March 26, 1922, Lenin suffered the first in a series of strokes that would lead ultimately to his death, and the struggle for succession began. This struggle was fought between Trotsky and the so-called "Troika", Zinoviev, Kamenev, and Stalin. In April 1922, Lenin proposed that Trotsky be appointed vice chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, the governing body of the Soviet Union. If Trotsky had accepted, he would have become Lenin's deputy and potential successor in the Soviet premiership. But when Lenin's condition worsened, Trotsky said to Kamenev:

"Remember, and tell others that the last thing I want is to start a fight at the congress for any changes in organization. I am for preserving the status quo. ... I am against removing Stalin and expelling Ordzhonikidze and displaying Dzerzhinsky..."³⁷

Trotsky obviously underestimated Stalin and failed to use his chance for political leadership and the surge of pro-Trotsky feeling that arose in 1922 and 1923 in reaction to the NEP, which was unpopular within the ranks of the Party.

This passivity of Trotsky was probably caused by apathy or depression in the wake of the failure of the Permanent Revolution to transpire. Trotsky, instead of fighting, started to operate with slogans like "the Party is always right", thus justifying his own attitude. It was Stalin who mockingly reminded him that "the Party has sometimes been wrong."³⁸

Lenin died on January 21, 1924, and shortly after Stalin was able to drive Trotsky out of the Party and eventually emerge on top.

In autumn 1924, Stalin for the first time presented an independent theory, that of socialism in one country. In April 1924, he had the same opinion on the Russian Revolution as Lenin and Trotsky: it was a stage in the world struggle against capitalism. He asserted that the Soviet Union was not "an end in itself...[but] a link needed to strengthen the chain of revolutionary movement in the countries of the West and the East."³⁹ By the end of 1924, however, he had reversed his position and spoke of building socialism in an isolated Soviet Russia. His idea was that Russia would be able, with or without help from outside, to accomplish the second historic feat of con-

³⁷Kem, "Trotsky's Autobiography," 315.

³⁸Anin, "Lenin, Trotsky, and Parvus," 211.

³⁹Basil Dmytryshyn, *USSR: A Concise History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons: 1978), 141.

structing a full socialist society.⁴⁰ He rooted his theory firmly in Leninism:

...The victory of Socialism in one country, even if this country is less developed in the capitalist sense, while capitalism is preserved in other countries, even if these countries are more highly developed in the capitalist sense, while capitalism is preserved in other countries, even if these countries are more highly developed in the capitalist sense—is quite possible and probable. Such, briefly, are the foundations of Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution.⁴¹

So he denied any originality of his own in the matter and claimed Leninist legitimacy by maintaining that it was Lenin who discovered the truth that the victory of socialism in one country is possible.⁴²

Stalin emphasized that only in the further progress of world revolution lay final security for the Soviet Revolution. His innovation was that he made the construction of a socialist society at home independent of the international revolution, as is shown in the following: "After consolidating its power and taking the peasantry in tow, the proletariat of the victorious country can and must build up a socialist society."⁴³ Both conceptions, Stalin's and Trotsky's, therefore envisaged the same end product, an international socialist society, but they differed in timing, temperament, and their means to achieve this. Stalin called for the establishment of socialism in Russia first to be the leading example for an international revolution, Trotsky had the order reversed.⁴⁴ His argument was that the temporary rule of the Russian workers might only be converted into a lasting socialist dictatorship, if the European proletariat, by the Russian example, would be inspired to a successful revolution.⁴⁵

In 1924, Trotsky wrote the essay "Lessons of October," which questioned the policy of Stalin and the 'Right' and branded it as counter-revolutionary. This essay set the entire propaganda machine against Trotsky and helped Stalin to emerge as undisputed party leader as well as its

⁴⁰Tucker, *Stalin as Revolutionary, 1879-1929*, 377-8.

⁴¹Stalin, "The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists, 1924," in Anderson, *Masters of Russian Marxism*, 228-9.

⁴²Tucker, *Stalin as Revolutionary, 1879-1929*, 378.

⁴³Stalin, "The Foundations of Leninism, 1924," in Anderson, *Masters of Russian Marxism*, 227.

⁴⁴Dmytryshyn, *USSR*, 141.

⁴⁵Tucker, *Stalin as Revolutionary, 1879-1929*, 380.

theoretical spokesman.⁴⁶

Stalin's strategy in attacking Trotsky was to draw a fundamental contrast between "Leninism" and "Trotskyism" and an equally fundamental identification between 'Leninism' and 'Stalinism.' He presented his theory of socialism in one country as Lenin's theory and criticized Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution as semi-Menshevik and anti-Leninist. He accused Trotsky of the following: ...Lack of faith in the strength and capabilities of our revolution, lack of faith in the strength and capabilities of the Russian proletariat—that is what lies at the root of "permanent revolution."⁴⁷ Stalin cited this as proof of Trotsky's continuing underestimation of the potentialities of the peasant, his early opposition to Lenin's notion of an alliance between workers and laboring peasants as the proletarian dictatorship.⁴⁸

This public attack on "Trotskyism" in 1924 and 1925 marked the beginning of the end for Trotsky and his political cause.⁴⁹ Trotsky did not fight back. He was feverish, nervous, racked by influenza, and he kept silent to all the accusations that were made against him in the papers. On January 15, 1925, Trotsky asked to be relieved of the duties of the Revolutionary War Council, and his resignation was accepted.⁵⁰

In 1926, in a last futile effort to resist Stalin's relentless march to dictatorship, Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev were briefly aligned against Stalin in the so-called "United Opposition." Zinoviev declared that "only through the NEP could the party lead the country to socialism," but the country could not proceed to socialism through the NEP smoothly, that means without class struggle, and it could not proceed to socialism alone. Stalin argued that Trotskyism "denies the possibility of the victory of socialism in our country through the internal forces of our Revolution."⁵¹

By August, 1927, Trotsky and Zinoviev were expelled from the Central Committee and by November 14, 1927, they were expelled from the party. In January, 1928, Trotsky and his family

⁴⁶Dmytryshyn, *USSR*, 140.

⁴⁷Stalin, "The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists, 1924," in Anderson, *Masters of Russian Marxism*, 228-9.

⁴⁸Tucker, *Stalin as Revolutionary, 1879-1929*, 349-50.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, 300-1.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, 354.

⁵¹*Ibid.*, 384-5.

left for Alma Ata, from where they went to exile in Mexico. There Trotsky was murdered by an assassin sent by Stalin in 1940.⁵² With his departure the Left opposition as a political force was crushed.

Historians agree that Trotsky was a genius as an orator, organizer, and military leader, but failed in appreciating the personal element in Party relations. Anthony D'Augustino puts it as follows: "he fails not in the realm of thought, but where thought translated into practical politics."⁵³

Trotsky several times did not see and use the chances that the political situations gave him. Waiting for the revolutions in other countries to occur, he failed to use his real chances. In 1923/24, in the contest with the Triumvirs, Trotsky had aimed his politics only at Zinoviev and Brandler of the German Communist Party, but not at Stalin; and he even later admitted this to be only a "mistake of secondary importance."⁵⁴ But this mistake gave Stalin the chance to come to power and subsequently to get rid of Trotsky. Stalin was much more skillful in using Marxism-Leninism as a legitimacy for his theory and politics than Trotsky, who even remained silent under Stalin's attacks.

Trotsky also failed to face reality regarding his theory. He had stressed the international element and the hope that Western revolutions would support the Russian revolutions, but the Western revolutions did not happen. Also the Russian Revolution had rather been carried by soldiers and sailors--peasants--than by the proletariat, contrary to his theory.⁵⁵ But Trotsky still did not adapt his theory to reality, but tried to explain reality according to his theory. Trotsky "sometimes was the prisoner of abstract nouns," whereas Stalin "used the words to serve his interests."⁵⁶

Trotsky, despite all his talents and brilliance, was not a politician. Furthermore, he was unable to judge about people with whom he dealt directly and frequently, like notably Stalin.

Stalin's advantage over Trotsky was his strength as a leader. He very pragmatically pushed his ideas through, whereas Trotsky was unable to defend himself and his ideas. Stalin faced reality,

⁵²Dmytrivsyn, *USSR*, 142.

⁵³Anthony D'Augustino, "Ambiguities of Trotsky's Leninism," *Survey* 24 (Winter 1979), 178.

⁵⁴*Ibid.*, 187.

⁵⁵Anin, "Lenin, Trotsky, and Parvus," 209.

⁵⁶McNeil, "Trotsky's Trotskyism," 176.

carried through his ideas through his contrast of the Leninist party organization, and legitimized them by carefully picked quotes from Marx and Lenin.

Trotsky did not know what to do when his complicated model of permanent revolution did not work. I think that only Stalin, with his strong will to carry out his ideas, no matter what cost, was able to lead the country. He saw the necessity of strong, pragmatic leadership. This pragmatism is what Trotsky lacked.