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ABSTRACT

Leon Trotsky was one of the most influential men in the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. Why was he a revolutionary? Furthermore, why, then, did he lose the succession struggle for leadership after Lenin's death? Psychoanalytic theory can help provide answers to these questions.
CHAPTER I
A PRELIMINARY GLIMPSE

November 7, 1917, marks one of the most important events in recent history -- the Bolshevik uprising in Russia. Exactly thirty-eight years before a baby was born who played a critical role in the insurrection, and without whom it would have been exceedingly more difficult. He was Lev Davidovich Bronstein, who later assumed the name that became synonymous with revolution -- Leon Trotsky.

Bronstein's story, from being the child of a wealthy landowner, to his holding a high position in the U.S.S.R., and to assassination in exile, is indeed a fascinating one. What caused him to forsake a life free from want in tsarist Russia and, instead, to fight against that system? What qualities made him a revolutionary; and, more interestingly, why did he lose the post for which he had fought so hard and to fall from the pinnacle of power to the depths of impotence? These are intriguing questions that find incomplete answers upon a general study of late nineteenth and early twentieth century Russia. Biographies are more elucidating in this respect but leave something to be desired. Although the reader learns what Trotsky did which created certain effects, the causes of his actions are not always clear.
Our goal will be to make some of the motivations for Trotsky's behavior more apparent. To this endeavor, the technique of psychoanalysis lends itself rather well. Not only does this method produce a systematic analysis of the case, but it is also compliant enough to study historical personalities. Hopefully, a synthesis of objectivity without rigidity can evolve.

Before turning to the psychobiographical data and in-depth analysis, it may be instructive to specify several significant traits and events in Trotsky's life. A brief listing follows.

One of the most outstanding characteristics Trotsky possessed was extreme self-confidence. The Soviet Commissar of Education, Anatole V. Lunacharsky, commented ... "That elegance of his, and especially a kind of careless high-and-mighty manner of talking with no-matter-who [sic], struck me very unpleasantly...."

Trotsky emphasized his individuality. Although this is not so remarkable for a man of his intellectual prowess, he frequently impressed those around him as being self-centered and vain.

Many felt the thrust of Trotsky's poison pen or tongue. He had a penchant for being aggressive, sharp, and criticizing, which often got him into difficulties. Lenin remarked that Trotsky had the tendency to "chop" at his opponents whereas
"lubrication" would have been more efficacious. Related to this, in part, was Trotsky's flair for drama. Indeed, his whole career was permeated with dramatic speeches and incidents.

Throughout his life Trotsky showed an aversion to "hard" and "dry" things. For example, he envisaged Marxism as something hard and almost inhuman before he fully embraced it.

Although he stressed logic as his guiding light, Trotsky was a rigid thinker and not at all pragmatic. At their first meeting his future wife Alexandra Sokolovskaya exclaimed with respect to Trotsky's affiliation with Populists, "I can't imagine how a person who thinks he is logical can be contented with a headful of vague, idealistic emotions!"

Trotsky was always excessively clean and neat, and very much a perfectionist. In fact, his preoccupation with cleanliness took on an almost obsessional quality sometimes. His aunt, Mrs. Spentzer, declared

"... The w-rst trouble I had was that he was so terribly neat. I remember once he had a new suit, and we went out walking, and all the way he kept picking imaginary lint off that suit... He had to have everything perfect." (4)
One of Trotsky's severest handicaps was his inability to organize. In his character sketch, Lunacharsky explained, "I will say here immediately that Trotsky succeeded very badly in organizing, not only a party, but even a little group..." Perhaps this was partly because of his inability to maintain lasting friendships.

Finally, Trotsky was one of those people who was appalled at injustice. He wished dignity for everyone.

Let us now list some of the events which had a profound effect on Trotsky's character.

First, as a child Bronstein was exhibited to his parents' friends. In particular, his talents of writing and reciting poetry were shown off.

Second, his older brother, Sasha, was an academic failure. He was not a good student and succumbed to his parents' constant drive. Consequently, the younger Lev was left to carry the burden of his father's hopes for a successful, educated son.

Third, perhaps the event most central to analyzing young Bronstein was his leaving home at the age of nine to live in Odessa with a relative and pursue an education. From this time he returned home only for brief, sporadic visits.
Fourth, the school at Odessa did not prepare one to enter the university immediately. Lev completed his last (seventh) year in the small town of Nikolaev. Here, he did not live with relatives thus forcing him to make an adjustment at a critical age. Here, too, he met Alexandra Lvovna Sokolovskaya, his future wife.

Fifth, many political exiles lived in Nikolaev. From his contact with them, Bronstein acquired radical ideas and began fighting to "liberate" the lower class. This political activity led to his first stay in prison. Incarcerated as he was, he was no longer an "outsider" working for others but was a member of the "oppressed" class himself.

Sixth, until the time of his first arrest, Bronstein had studied and written unsystematically. However, while in exile in Siberia, he perfected his literary style. When the young man escaped to London several years later, he emerged as a conscientious, ideological Marxist.

Finally, the revolutions of 1905 and 1917 gave strength to Trotsky's convictions. After the first he became surer of his theories, especially those dealing with his interpretation of history and economics. After the second he found himself in the new position of head of state, rather than being a revolutionist within the state.

During the lifetime of Lev Davidovich Trotsky, several general changes occurred in his character. When young he
was a quiet and sensitive farmer's son. After his ninth year, while at Odessa, he became noticeably more extroverted. His was the self-confidence of a scholar. The refinement of a big city was not disagreeable to the young man whose cosmopolitan, internationalist outlook grew rapidly.

It is a long jump from being an intellectual, a member of the intelligentsia, to a seat of power in the Kremlin. This was perhaps the greatest change Trotsky underwent. Yet, for reasons which become clearer later, he was unable to readapt himself completely to this new mode of living. His subsequent fall from leadership, deportation, and assassination were the result.

The task remains, then, to explain these changes as reflected in the traits previously cited. In order to do this we shall rely on the aforementioned significant events and on psychoanalytic theory to produce a schema of Trotsky's personality structure and development. Particularly we will see what the theories of Sigmund Freud, Erik Erikson and Robert White can tell us about the case of Leon Trotsky. In the following statement of methodology, major emphasis will be placed on the differences in approach of the three men rather than on a comprehensive discussion of their system.

Although Sigmund Freud was not the first psychoanalyst
(Breuer was), he is generally considered the father of psychoanalysis.

Freud believed his discoveries would not only give us a deeper understanding of men but also provide a technique by which people could overcome their subjective sentiments and achieve a form of super-human objectivity. (8)

For the sake of understanding and objectivity he endeavoured to formulate a mechanism for analyzing personality.

Freud became infatuated with primitive societies, especially with their taboos and forbidden impulses. Through his analysis of primordial kingship (Totem and Taboo), he concluded that there is a fundamental ambivalence in man. The ruler is worshipped as a god, yet he is bound by certain rites. He is regarded as capable of commanding the heavens, but, if flood or drought occurs, he pays the price for failure. He is omnipotent but accountable for error. The subjects are not bothered by the seeming contradiction in holding opposite opinions of their leader.

Similarly, Freud noticed how a child is also capable of an ambivalent attitude towards his "king" -- his father. The Master reasoned that since this relation precedes all others of like nature, it must therefore shape them. Hence, this conflict of early childhood which Freud called the oedipus complex is a central theme of psychoanalysis. More of the theory will be elaborated subsequently, but for now a cursory glance at it will be instructive.
The scientific discipline developed by Freud consists of a number of postulates concerning man's development and mental functioning. Of the various hypotheses, two of the most important are the principles of psychic determinism, that is, nothing happens by chance, and the concept that unconscious mental processes are responsible for most of one's actions. Although we cannot observe these unconscious processes directly, inferences about them can be made through various indirect methods. So we have a powerful tool for personality analysis.

Freud believed the mind was energized by what he called instinctual drives which produce a state of psychic excitation. This impells the sentient being to action which, in turn, may lead to the alleviation of tension, or gratification.

Psychic energy becomes cathexed, or attached, to the mental representative of an object or person. Freud proposed two drives, the sexual (libidinal) and the aggressive, each of which is invested with a quantum of energy. Most of the time they are combined together in various proportions. It is this energy and these drives that produce the desires and needs of infancy and adulthood.

Freud noticed that during the first year and a half of life an infant's desires and gratifications are basically
oral ones; that is, those associated with the mouth, lips, and tongue. A baby's first sexual activity is sucking at his mother's breast.

From about a year and a half to three years old, the anus is the focus of sexual attention and gratification. The child's sensations are aroused by the expulsion and retention of feces as well as by the feces themselves. Toilet training is an important process during this stage of development.

At the beginning of the fourth year the center of sexual attention becomes the penis (or, analogously, the clitoris in females). Hence, this phase is called the phallic one. The most important part of this stage is the oedipal complex. In fact, according to Freud, the critical determinant of personality is how one resolves this conflict of incestuous and parenticidal impulses.

A latency period follows from the beginning of the sixth year for the next five or six years. Then comes the last, or genital, phase, in which sexual maturity is achieved. Here the capacity for orgasm is acquired.

So the libidinal progression here has run the gamut from oral, anal, phallic, to genital in search of discharge. Gratification is not a random process, but rather seeks to relieve tension in a pleasurable way. Whether or not gratification of the aggressive drive brings pleasure is still
a matter of conjecture.

As Freud studied the mind further, he hit upon a structural explanation of how it works. He put into three groups processes that were functionally related and called these divisions the id, the ego, and the superego. Briefly, the id is made up of the psychic representatives of the drives, the ego of those functions allowing one to cope with his environment, and the superego of one's moral precepts and ideals.

Erik Erikson viewed the character traits of Freud's as general attitudes in his own theory. In extending the range of ego psychology Erikson postulates the existence of mutuality between parent and child. This leads to crises, the outcomes of which are needed for growth. Later, the conflicts broaden to incorporate crises with society.

Consequently, Erikson posits eight ages through which man must pass. Presented as dichotomies, they build upon one another in a hierarchical manner. Briefly, they are: Basic Trust vs. Basic Mistrust; Autonomy vs. Shame and Doubt; Initiative vs. Guilt; Industry vs. Inferiority; Identity vs. Role Confusion; Intimacy vs. Isolation; Generativity vs. Stagnation; and Ego Integrity vs. Despair.

Robert White claims that the notion of competence is sorely lacking from traditional psychosexual theory. By competence he means fitness or ability to carry on transactions
with the environment. The motivational principle which lies behind aspects of competence such as activity, manipulation, and exploration, he calls "effectance." The experience that goes with producing changes on the environment is called the "feeling of efficacy." Central to White's argument is the idea that effectance does not generally conflict with the drives but rather merges with them. Furthermore, he treats the subjective aspect of competence, sense of competence, as a function developing in its own right.

Let us apply these theories to the case of Leon Trotsky. We will concentrate on his early life from childhood through the Bolshevik uprising.
CHAPTER II
CHILDHOOD

Lev Davidovich Bronstein's childhood was not insignificant. No one seems to have realized this more than he, for he devoted over a hundred pages of his autobiography to his early years. In fact, he attributed much of his character formation to his youth. Let us now shed some light on what sort of a world Lev Davidovich was born into and how his family fit into that world.

About 1800 a large number of Jews were annexed from eastern Poland and Lithuania. By the ukaz of 1804, Alexander I placed the state lands in the Ukrainian provinces of Kherson and Ekaterinoslav open to them for agricultural colonization. The ukaz of 1872, however, was much harsher. Alexander II took back much of the land his grandfather had given. Ten years later, Jews were forbidden from increasing their land holdings.

In 1879 a Jew, David Leontievich Bronstein, his wife, Anna, and two children, Sasha and Liza, moved to an old estate of one Colonel Yanovsky. Anna was pregnant with Lev. Yanovka, as the place was called, was on the southern steppes --
one of the few places Jews were allowed outside of the towns. The same year, the terrorist Narodnaya Volya passed the death sentence on tsar Alexander II. On November 7, 1879, Anna Bronstein bore her fifth child (two had died in infancy as did two of the subsequent three more children). Within a matter of weeks after Lev's birth, another Russian radical would be born named Josif Vissarionovich Djugashvili -- Joseph Stalin! Shortly, the 1860's period of "enlightenment" drew to a close. After the assassination of the tsar in 1881, a black reaction gripped the land. Until the 1890's, when worker strikes began, popular will was suppressed. Lev (or Leon) was cast into the midst of this political turmoil.

David Leontievich was of peasant vintage but had no memory of real serfdom. Although he spoke Russian heavily flavored with Ukrainian, he could read neither; but his parsimony, ambition, and unremitting toil enabled him to build up a substantial farming business despite his illiteracy. Although the ukaz prevented his expanding Yanovka, he owned 250 acres outright, leased 400 more, and continued to enlarge underhandedly by preying on his neighbors' misfortunes.

Anna was of an entirely different ilk from her husband. She came from a conservative city family. At first, her parents looked down on the crude, rough country bumpkin their
daughter wished to marry. However, Anna and her parents suppressed their condescending airs, and the marriage was a fairly successful one. She was one for orderliness and personal cleanliness, which complemented David Leontievich's industriousness, initiative, fierce price, and unbending will.

As his wealth increased, David's "Jewishness" decreased. Anna's background was more orthodox, however, and she clung to her religion, at least superficially, more than her husband. Isaac Deutscher says implicitly that Anna was more educated than David Bronstein. Max Eastman recalls Lev's fascination with his mother's lip movements as she read in the winter time when not working in the fields. However, in his autobiography, Trotsky declared, "My father was undoubtedly superior to my mother, in both intellect and character. He was deeper, more reserved, and more tactful." Although David Bronstein was illiterate (he did not learn to read until many years later and then only so that he could understand some of his son's books), he was regarded as an intelligent but rude person, and, most of all, his son respected him. "Trotsky is proud of his father, proud of the fact that he died working and understanding. He loves to talk about him."

David Bronstein owned the only mill in the area. He rented it to his neighbors for the fee of ten percent in kind. Despite the family's wealth, they lived in a five room dry mud hut with wooden plank flooring in only the
the sitting dining rooms. This was part of the elder
Bronstein's "penal code." By the time Lev was but a few
years old, his father was already then a kulak -- a wealthy
farmer. Trotsky's use of this word later in his career
is important to a full understanding of his personality.

Other than the peasant traffic to the mill, Lev felt Yanovka
25 was a lonely place. He felt that his parents did not give
26 him enough affection or attention. But contrary to his
feelings of loneliness on the farm, there were nursemaids,
brothers and sisters, a mechanic, a cook, a steward, a
fireman, a shepherd and many hired hands to break the
isolation. Max Eastman says Lev's home life was warm, tender,
friendly and unworried. He lived with an aunt to study for
a while, but was home much of the time, because "he is so
sweet-tempered and has such merry dimples that his parents
27 cannot get along without him." It seems that Eastman
overstates the case a bit although it is more likely that
young Bronstein did receive attention and affection,
contrary to his claims that he did not. One must realize
that the Bronsteins were a wealthy Jewish family of the late
nineteenth century in Russia. The Jews of this time were
an oppressed people and took good care of their young.
While conceivable, it is hardly likely that Mr. and Mrs.
Bronstein failed to show some emotion towards their offspring.
His "loneliness" was really a "fear of not being indulged"
by his parents. The fact is that, despite the
affection received from his nurse
and older brother and sister, Lev felt neglected.

Trotsky's autobiography, *My Life*, begins with accounts of his earliest remembrances. One must realize that he wrote this book nearly 50 years after the fact, and the validity of these incidents is subject to criticism. On the other hand, one must also recognize the fact that Trotsky thought they happened, which makes them significant in some sense; that is, these "islands of memory" may be a function of primary processes in his unconscious. They are comparable to something from a free-association session. Consequently, whether the events occurred or not matters little.

The first memory Trotsky had was one of suckling at his mother's breast when he was about a year or two old. One can remark at Trotsky's memory, if this testimony is taken at face value. Perhaps, in all verity, he did recall breast feedings from his mother, but let us see how psychoanalysis explains this in relation to other "recollections" of his. We should keep in mind that the young Bronstein was very close to his mother in these early days.

At other times, he recalled encounters with snakes. Evidently, his fear of them was not terribly great, because they nested in the cracks of the family's mudhouse. When he was two or three, he and his nanny spied a bright object in the grass while walking in the garden. At first they thought
it was a snuff-box, but upon closer inspection it "turned into a snake." Rather than expressing fear, little Lev was tremendously excited by this discovery and related the story with great glee to his parents.

One of the more remarkable snake stories as follows:

Storks would nest every year on the roof of the "big" barn. They would raise their red bills to heaven as they swallowed adders and frogs -- a terrible sight. Their bodies would wriggle from their bills downward, and it looked as if the snake were eating the stork from the inside.

Perhaps such instances did occur. If so, the fact that Trotsky was so fascinated by them or even bothered to mention them in his autobiography is meaningful.

Once more Trotsky related occurrences in which he conjured up images of snakes. He was accustomed to falling asleep in a corner of the living room at night after dinner. As his parents carried him to bed, he dreamed in a semi-awake state that he was being attacked by "dogs, snakes, and robbers."

Ostensibly, there is some mental process going on in Trotsky's unconscious which can account for these experiences. Of course, a snake may really be a snake, but it is also known in psychoanalytic theory to be the universal symbol for a phallus. With the recurrence of the male symbol and
remembering that Lev was particularly intimate with his mother when very young and "none too cordial" with his father, we can make some interesting speculations. From Freudian tenets we may conclude that Lev Davidovich regarded himself as aimant to his mother at a tender age. The adders were perhaps symbolic of David Bronstein, especially where Lyova (a diminutive of Lev) imagined he was being attacked when carried to bed. That is, as his mother's lover, he feared retribution from his father. This, of course, is what Freud calls the oedipal complex. Although Trotsky wrote his autobiography some fifty years after these scenes supposedly happened, the mechanism was still working within him. We will develop this point more fully later, but for now let us examine other islands in his early memory.

As was previously mentioned, David and Anna Bronstein worked long, hard hours in the fields. Erikson claims that "the infant's first social achievement...is his willingness to let the mother out of sight without undue anxiety or rage, because she has become an inner certainty as well as an outer predictability." It is quite conceivable that the job of caring for little Lyova was divided between his mother and his nurse Mashka. He could not rely on the:

sameness and continuity of outside providers....

................................................

[T]he amount of trust derived from earliest
infantile experience does not seem to depend on absolute quantities of food or demonstrations of love, but rather on the quality of the maternal relationship. Mothers create a sense of trust in their children by that kind of administration which in its quality combines sensitive care of the baby's individual needs and a firm sense of personal trustworthiness within the framework of their culture's life style. (35)

While Mrs. Bronstein may have shown affection for her child, it seems to have been inadequate for his needs.

Trotsky's recollections of the next few years reflect the basic mistrust he acquired in this first important crisis of life, leaving him, for a time, in a search for meaning. Once, he listened to his parents discussing how they came to live at Yanovka and how old each child had been at the time. His mother said, "We brought Lyova here from the farm all ready-made." The incomprehending boy inquired, "Then I was born on the farm?" "No," came the reply. "Then why did Mother say that you brought me here ready-made?" he asked. His parents tried to pass it off as a joke:

But I am not satisfied, and I think it is a queer joke. I hold my peace, however, for I notice that particular smile that I never can bear on the faces of the older initiates. (36)

Of course, his parents were referring to the fact that Anna Bronstein was pregnant with Lev Davidovich when the
family moved to Yanovka in the summer of 1879. Only afterwards did Lev realize this sequence of events and their significance. Once again Lev expressed anxiety about his "not being around" - his "loneliness." Consequently, he later felt compelled to leave his mark in the world and to be remembered.

The aura of deceit of the "older initiates" extended to other relatives and friends as they broke their promises to bring Lev presents from the city. At another time, he became curious as to where telegrams came from. When his Uncle Abram confronted him with the concept of electricity, he became totally confused. In disgust, the uncle lost his patience and left the question unanswered.

Lev and his younger sister Olya were close and often played together. At the dinner table, words would often crop up that had some secretive meaning to these two. Generally, they brought fits of laughter to the children and grunts of dissatisfaction from their parents.

The grown-ups would look at the children with a question in their eyes that was sometimes friendly but more often full of irritation. The two circles of life, upper and lower, would touch for a moment. (38)

Lev Davidovich generalized his mistrustfulness to nearly all adults. Wolfenstein claims Bronstein was endowed with a basic sense of trust when young which primarily accounted for his frequent arrests because he was not wary enough. I find this difficult to accept, by the evidence cited, and will posit different reasons for his incarcerations later.
Furthermore, Erikson claims that

the parental faith which supports the trust emerging in the newborn has throughout history sought its institutional safeguard (and, on occasion, found its greatest enemy) in organized religion. (40)

Those who are mistrustful may vary from this surrender to a Provider. That is, in fact, what Trotsky did in his rejection of religion. Bolshevism eventually became his "religion," but the comparison is odious. Let us now turn to another aspect of Trotsky's early development.

When Lev Davidovich was about two or three years of age, he travelled to the nearby town of Bobrinetz with his mother. There he met a little girl his own age:

I am the bridegroom, the little girl is the bride. The children are playing on the painted floor of the parlor; the little girl fades away; the little boy is standing dazed and petrified beside a chest of drawers. His mother and hostess come in. His mother looks at the boy then at the puddle beside him, and then at the boy again, shakes her head reproachfully and says, "Aren't you ashamed of yourself!"

...................................................

...The little boy feels neither shame nor repentance. (41)

There are several interesting features of this account.

First, the mock wedding ceremony lends credence to Bronstein's capability of being his mother's lover. Ostensibly, the young gallant saw himself quite able to play an amorous role. Second, this time he is with a contemporary. Possibly,
he had already realized the futility of his attempts on his mother and feared subsequent punishment from the elder Bronstein. Third, once again we see the symbolic nature of Trotsky's recollections in the chest of drawers which replaces the girl who has faded away. Bureaus and the like are generally recognized in Freudian theory to be female images. Thus, the early infancy memories take on more and more aspects of unconscious fantasies and probably should be considered as such. Fourth, we run across the notion of shame. In this particular case, it was connected with a romantic adventure with a little girl, which maybe influenced his later relationships with women. At any rate, although he declared he was not ashamed, his behavior was observable to others and must have left him with some sense of shame. Perhaps to hide his shame, he used the third person instead of the first person in describing the "little boy." It seems that he wanted to say, "The little boy is not ashamed, b—but I am."

At about the same age, Lev tried to emulate his older brother Alexander by walking on stilts. He fell, however, and cried until Alexander coddled and kissed him. A year later, he fell off a horse on one of his first attempts at riding. He professed puzzlement but not hurt.

Once he was playing with the thresher and related:
it slips out of my hands and falls with its
whole weight on my finger. The pain is so
intense that my head swims. I slip to one
side so that the men shall not see my crying,
and then run home. My mother pours cold
water on my hand and bandages my finger...(42)

Here, as in the previous cases, we see Lyova sensing shame. 43
That is, as Robert White describes it, Lev cannot do
something he or someone else thinks he should be able to
do, which leads to a loss of respect.

One other theme is hinted at in Trotsky's early memoirs.
We have said that he played with his brother and sisters.
Evidently, conflicts arose which laid the basis for adult
relationships with peers. We have already noted his attempt
to compete with his brother by walking on stilts. Once,
the mechanic made a little railroad car for Lev out of
cardboard. His older brother declared he could make one too,
and proceeded to dissemble the toy to find out how it was
made; but after several hours there was no duplicate rail-
road car nor even the original one.

When young Bronstein was about five or six, he remembered
his mother having fits of temper:

My mother would often lose her temper with us,
sometimes without reason, and would vent on us
her fatigue or her chagrin over some domestic
failure. We always found it more remunerative
to ask our father for favors rather than our mother. (45)
Lev did love his mother, however. Indeed, it was at this age when he wanted to be her "little lover" most. But he blamed his father for forcing her into the fields and denying her to him. His mother's outbursts of rage made the situation more enigmatic and left him with a fundamental ambivalence.

Physically, Lev was no match for his skilled father. He felt that he must either learn from his father or do something else to surpass him in vying for Anna Bronstein's love. Psychoanalysis tells us that the child at this stage of development may have fear of retaliation (i.e., castration) by his father. In addition, the theory states that during the phallic phase the young boy is not only afraid of the loss of his father's love, but also afraid of destroying his father. Hence, a great conflict is presented to the five year old. To resolve the conflict a strategy called identification, or unconscious internalization of an external threat, is developed. In young Bronstein's case, he only partially identified with his father as will be explained shortly.

Possibly because of the anxiety he felt at home and because he attained that age where one begins to explore the environment, Lev acquired new relationships with people
outside of his immediate family. The most important person he grew closer to was the mechanic Ivan Vasilyevich Gryeben. Lev was infatuated with the man and the shop. He often performed simple tasks himself.

I was sometimes allowed to cut the threads of nuts and screws in the machine-shop. I liked this work because I could see the direct result in my hands. (46)

Lev Davidovich's break from the womb of his family led him more and more to the machine-shop, the kitchen, and the backyard. His presence often went unnoticed as he eavesdropped on the peasants' and his parent's conversations. By his own admission, Lev began seeing his relatives in a new light.

But at the workshop the boy now and then also came up against an outburst of puzzling ill temper on the part of other laborers. Time and again he would overhear harsh words about his parents, words which shocked him, set him thinking, and sank into his mind. (47)

We know David Bronstein was a hard-driving man. We also can realize the jealousy aroused in the workers because of his wealth. It would not be difficult, therefore, to imagine the impact the harsh words had on Lev, who up until this time, had regarded his father as nearly omnipotent.
Nevertheless, it was mainly because of his father's affluence and spreading influence that Lev came into contact with so many lower class elements. He witnessed the plight of neighbors in Kherson who had been hit hard by the agricultural crisis of the 1880's. In these Polish and Russian gentry he saw a social class in decay and all the bitterness that accompanied its downfall. In the meantime, while his family had risen from these very ranks, the Bronstein's had adopted a somewhat contemptuous air towards the impoverished. By way of illustration I shall mention a particular case that left a vivid impression on young Bronstein.

Neighbors' horses frequently broke into David Bronstein's fields. Often, he would be terribly harsh in meting out punishment. In one instance Lev saw a peasant come crying after the elder Bronstein pleading with him to give back his horse. Lev Davidovich ran into his mother's bedroom and cried for the unhappy peasant, perhaps with egotistical and jealous pains of his own. The elder Bronstein, realizing what the problem was, let the man have his horse and then told his son of it, thus putting Lev in the uncomfortable position of having wept for no reason at all.

David Leontievich was imbued with a sense of competence by comparison with his neighbors and began alienating himself from them. It became all too apparent in his incessant
arguments with them that he regarded himself and family superior. In fact, he often kept Lev inside the cottage, so that he would not intermingle with the workmen. This is what Erikson calls a negative identity fragment, whereby the family tried to live down its past and suppressed it in the children.

Lev Davidovich bore the brunt of the peasant children's jealousy. They would taunt him with, "Come on, Lyova, and have dinner with us!" Or, "Why don't you ask your mother for a bit of chicken for us, Lyova?" At Easter a worker's child stole some colored eggs from Lev:

I watched him go in astonishment, and felt very much like crying, but there was nothing to be done about it. (50)

So at first Lev resented the working class and peasantry although later he was their champion. The situation was further aggravated because he partially identified with them and sometimes supported their arguments against his father. His associations with the lower class were recalled by subsequent stronger influences.

Education was important to Mr. and Mrs. Bronstein. When Alexander (Sasha) turned out to be an academic failure, they placed their last hope for excellence on Lev Davidovich. When he was six a private tutor was hired for his
edification. The lessons lasted only a few months but
left him able to read and write. The world of the machine
shop became less and less important to him as his reading
and writing skills improved. Immediately, he took a liking
to poetry and even tried his hand at composing. His verse
was neat as were his drawings but showed little artistic
value or emotion.

Lev Davidovich's pen had a "will of its own." He
turned to books because they were gentle and beautiful in
comparison to the hardness and ugliness he saw around him.
"In my inner life -- he wrote later --throughout my youth,
nature and individuals occupied a lesser place than books
and ideas ...The very word 'author' sounded to me as if it
was uttered from some unattainable height..."

But his abilities were also a source of anguish. Once,
he made a list of obscenities he had overheard. Its discovery
by his mother and sister brought tears to his eyes. Some-
times he read "forbidden" books -- forbidden because of
the political or sexual nature of their content.

With his pen Lev meticulously hand wrote a little
magazine. His father's showing it to guests embarrassed Lev
terribly. Occasionally, he would be called upon to recite
his poetry for visitors. This, he absolutely abhorred.
In fact, he rebelled violently against these exhibitions, dug his fingers in his eyes, crawled around behind the furniture, and on one occasion when a little girl from the neighboring farm had been called in to hear him, he just burst out yelling in the middle of a poem and ran away and hid in the barn. (53)

While Lev Davidovich was rapidly devouring books and spewing forth his own creative efforts, it seems that he was not yet ready to let anyone else share his work. He appeared to have a certain amount of residual shame; that is, he was afraid of writing or reciting poorly; he felt incompetent at this stage in his development.

He soon added addition and subtraction to his repertoire of skills. He was facile enough with numbers to replace Sasha and Liza as his father's "accountant." In this capacity, Lev went to the trouble of computing the average peasant's pay and expenses and concluded that they must run short of money frequently. When his father was confronted with this fact, he was furious and told Lyova, in no uncertain terms, to keep quiet.

Lev unconsciously realized he had the means to get ahead in the world by employing his intelligence. He partly identified with his father in valuing education, but from then on his intellectual and literary abilities were to be his weapons against his father and all other authority figures.
CHAPTER III
A MODEL

Before continuing Trotsky's development, let us pause briefly to reiterate the main currents till now. Information is lacking for an exact description of the oral, anal, and phallic stages, so we will primarily use the Eriksonian and White models.

During the first age of man the infant learns to differentiate between inside and outside which leads to the defense mechanisms of projection and introjection. Projection implies externalizing an inner harm in us. Introjection signifies internalizing an outer goodness. It is noteworthy in Trotsky's descriptions of his parents and early homelife that he blames his parents for lack of affection. He did not consider the fault to be his own. Quite possibly he projected an inner harm as an outer one; that is, the evil of lack of affection was within him, not in his parents. These two mechanisms appear in subsequent crises of love, faith, and trust in adulthood. It is characteristic that Leon Trotsky often attributed what was bad in himself to significant people in his life, making intimate relationships difficult.
Trotsky left the first stage of development with a sense of basic mistrust. Owing to this he always stressed his "individualism" and rejected religion because of the inability to trust a supreme being.

In the second stage, Trotsky was frequently humiliated by lack of self-control. Witness the pants-wetting episode. He passed through this phase with a residual sense of shame, which left him susceptible to humiliation in later years. His defense against this was the attempt to humiliate others instead. Furthermore, he was left with the profound sense that things were unjust merely because they existed.

Robert White contends that during this stage the child's first attempt to measure his efficacy vis-a-vis other people may leave a mark on his confidence and sense of social competence. Trotsky's encounter with the intrinsic crisis in the growth of social competence left him with a feeling of incompetence for which he felt forced to compensate later. In addition, the competence model suggests that orderliness and neatness emerge spontaneously during the second year. Here, Trotsky may have acquired the obsessional quality of his drive for perfection in action and dress by fixation.

The third stage brought to Trotsky the conflict of maternal neglect. We have seen that Trotsky managed to
survive this crisis not unscathed. But at the same time he fought a less unequal battle than the one with his father; that is, he built a sense of competence by asserting his manhood on intellectual grounds.

Trotsky was capable of a more than adequate solution to the crisis of the fourth stage. He developed a strong sense of industry from it.

Let us now resume the course of Trotsky's development and see how these early stages affected his later actions.
CHAPTER IV
ODESSA

Moissei Filippovich Spentzer, Mrs. Bronstein's nephew was highly respected by David and Anna Bronstein because of his citified, scholarly attributes. When Lyova was nine years old, Mr. Spentzer took him to Odessa to attend school. Here, Lev realized there was more to life than the crudeness of Yanovka. He disciplined himself according to the example set by Moissei Spentzer, rather than by any of the latter's prescriptions or proscriptions. This order and the divorce from concrete things were agreeable to young Bronstein, who began to feel repulsed by his birth place.

At Odessa, Lev entered the St. Paul Realschule. Progressive and practical studies rather than classical ones were stressed by the administration. Mr. Spentzer chose it because it was easier for a rural boy to gain admission and to adjust to it.

Lev Davidovich did adjust to school life. In fact, in a short time, he became the top student in his class. He excelled particularly in mathematics and Russian class. His father wanted him to become an engineer, but in those few first years at St. Paul's Lev dreamed of becoming a mathematician or an author. This latter desire was augmented by contact with Moissei Spentzer's printing press,
which now held Lev's fascination as Gryeben's machine shop had previously.

Moissei Spentzer often told Lev stories. In one of these, "Faust," Lev noticed Moissei Filippovich became uneasy in telling the part about an unmarried mother. Bronstein read *Oliver Twist* on his own and particularly remembered the descriptions of the unwed mother in that book. On still another occasion he found a court report about a sex crime. Thus, from the beginning Bronstein associated reading and writing with illegality.

In Odessa, not only at the Spentzers' but also in school, Lev accrued the attention and affection he felt he had previously missed. His Russian teacher would often read his compositions aloud to the class. Another instructor there was in the habit of never giving the mark of five:

"Only God gets five!" he used to say. But he gave Leon five -- he simply had to. Another boy tried his best to get that mark, but the teacher told him again, "I don't give fives."

"You gave Bronstein five!" the boy said,

"That's Bronstein!" the teacher answered.

Lev Davidovich's self-confidence soared.

Often Lev worked hard for high marks rather than for knowledge. He felt superior and liked to excel everybody. The Russians called this *samoliubiy* -- the eagerness to excel, the sensitivity to a challenge. These years at
Odessa instilled in him a permanent sense of rivalry suited to his intellectual abilities.

Moissei Spentzer had quite an impressive collection of books in his home library. Here Lev filled himself with extraneous facts and bits of information. Frequently, he asked difficult questions which embarrassed his teachers as they groped for an answer. Lev would then calmly set forth his prethoughtout answer much to the chagrin of his instructors. Young Bronstein employed his knowledge aggressively. He never outgrew the need to humiliate others with his superior intellect.

Scenes of social protest abounded in Odessa as well as at Yanovka. As Max Eastman remarks:

His first arrival in the school was signalized by an event very little suggesting the future commander of an army. He was all dressed up in a brand-new uniform -- and Trotsky loves to be dressed up; he loves gloves and shapely costumes -- all those things are supposed to be incompatible with revolution. (43)

And of this adventure, Trotsky himself said:

...and in general it seemed to me that upon my shoulders, or at least in my knapsack, rested the dignity of the whole school upon whose threshold I was about to cross for the first time. (44)

On his way to school he was met by a street-boy worker who spat on him. Lev Davidovich could not imagine how anyone could have done this to his magnificent being. Yet
the worker's son held nothing sacred; his spit was a form of protestation.

We notice several other important features in the above quotations. First, Eastman's description makes young Bronstein seem almost dandyish. An obsession of this sort might be due to an anal or phallic fixation. In the first stage, Bronstein may have felt shame at the dirtiness of his faces and compensated by being overly clean and neat. In the phallic stage, a child begins to masturbate. A similar overcompensation may have been developed by Bronstein to hide his guilt associated with this act. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, his obsession with cleanliness was a function of identification with his mother and a reaction to the filth and crudeness of the peasantry he saw at Yanovka. Also, he desired the attention he felt he had missed in his childhood. This was generalized into his fancy mode of dress. Interestingly, it was through Trotsky "the person" that he later played the role of revolutionary; that is, he always emphasized his own correctness rather than stressing the inevitability of his policies as Lenin did.

Second, while Bronstein wanted personal dignity, he also wanted dignity for the masses. Notice how he identified himself with the whole of St. Paul's. Later, this same mechanism was still alive in him.
After having seen many such protests, Lev Davidovich organized some of his own protests. One of these occurred when he was in the second grade. There was a French teacher, Burnande, whom no one in the class liked. Burnande was a particularly stern taskmaster and did not tolerate disobedience or stupidity. One of his favorite victims was a poor, ignorant student named Vakker. On a day when he was especially cruel to Vakker, the students, Bronstein at the forefront, decided to treat him to a "concert" -- a closed-mouthed howl as he left the room.

Immediately, an inquiry was begun to ascertain who the instigators were. Some of those who were held after school for interrogation (the prize pupil Bronstein was not) forsook their schoolboy honor and named Lev the prime culprit.

There were the groups that resulted from that episode: the tale-bearers and the envious at one pole, the frank, courageous boys at the other, and the neutral vacillating mass in the middle. These three groups never quite disappeared even during the years that followed....(45)

St. Paul's headmaster accused Lev of having the whole school under his power. He was a "Moral Monster" for organizing this protest. That was his crime -- he organized.
Consequently, Lev was expelled from the Realschule for the remainder of the year to be readmitted to the third grade upon successful completion of the examinations the following fall. He stayed on in Odessa, however, until summer vacation, as if nothing had happened. After his father found out about his expulsion, he was hurt but found it amusing that his star student son had the courage to howl at high officials. That David Bronstein almost condoned his son's rebellious nature was one of the most important results of this incident. The other was that Lev's subsequent personal relationships were formed more than ever with those who acknowledged his superiority without harboring jealousy.

Again in the sixth grade Bronstein showed his rebellious personality. One of his teachers was accustomed to assigning compositions indiscriminately and never grading them. One student objected but was soon silenced by the teacher. Lev could restrain no longer: "He is entirely right. You will have to correct our first papers before you ask us to write a second!" His self-confidence and aggressivity were so great by this time that one notices the voice of command; he insisted that it was only judicious for the man to correct one paper before assigning another.

In both of these events we notice Bronstein's indignation at injustice. Earlier scenes of the peasants at Yanovka and a residual sense of shame nourished this concept.
Furthermore, we see Lev Davidovich protesting on the behalf of another, much as he had done for the workers when he was his father's accountant.

Because he left home at nine, Bronstein's conflicts with his parents remained unresolved. Ordinarily, during this period one outgrows the idea of parental omnipotence. But Lev returned home only in the summertime, so that he saw his father at his best working in the fields. On these vacations he felt his estrangement from Yanovka more and more because of a lack of common base of interest. At this stage Lev was not sure what his career would be, but he knew he did not want anyone to choose it for him. His completion of school in Nikolaev helped to settle that uncertainty.
CHAPTER V
THE ROAD TO MARXISM

The summer of 1896 Lev Davidovich spent at home. Books had fed his vanity at school but failed to impress anyone on the farm. David Bronstein sensed his son's estrangement and put him in school in nearby Nikolaev to keep an eye on him during his last year. (St. Paul's had only six grades, and seven were needed to enter university study). What David Leontievich did not realize was that, as a small town, Nikolaev was one of the few places old radical exiles were allowed to resettle. Hence, it was a highly political town.

Elder Bronstein picked a boarding house for his son's living accommodations. The mistress's sons who were older than Lev Davidovich had already assimilated socialist inclinations. So at the critical age of seventeen, when one samples life roles and assumes an identity, Lev was thrust into a house of strangers with radical politico-economic ideas.

At first, Lev argued against them because of his self-confidence that he was nearly always correct and to express "independent" judgement. Soon he began to realize how little he really knew of what they debated. He neglected his schoolwork and began to consider their views.
He lost his "puritan complex." That is, he ceased to spend all his time studying and began to ask "why" in regard to the political and philosophical questions of the day. Away from the sheltered environment of his youth he suddenly grasped their socialist opinions and made them his own. He shocked his former adversaries by his ability to postulate new theories and ideas. A mechanism evolved which was repeated often. As Deutscher puts it:

He is confronted with a new idea... he resists at first...his resistance grows with the attraction...Then his inner defences crumble, his self-confidence begins to vanish; but he is still too proud...There is no outward indication yet of the struggle that goes on in his mind. Then, suddenly, the new conviction hardens in him, and, as if in a single moment, overcomes his spirit of contradiction and his vanity. (47)

That is, his self-confidence made him believe in the correctness of his ideas. His sense of competence had been built upon his own and other people's acknowledgement that he was superior. He was able to deal effectively with the world merely because of his presence and intellectual ability. But, here, as in other cases, he sensed shame for fear of discovery of his ignorance. Hence, his self-confidence dwindled. But when he had fully embraced an idea internally, he lashed out at opponents in an effort to compensate for his feelings of shame.
Socialism, then, was for Bronstein an "effort to rationalize life, i.e. transform it according to the dictates of reason...It is only socialism that has set itself the task of embracing reason and subjecting all the activities of man to it." Whether lack of emotionality was an intrinsic quality of his he projected onto his early childhood or was a trait acquired at Yanovka, socialism filled this need in him. At this juncture Bronstein became affiliated with the Populists (Narodniki) -- a group mainly concerned with motivating the peasantry to revolution. He was to be drawn deeper into this sect before bolting and joining the Marxists.

Through one of his school-mates, Lev Davidovich met Franz Shvigovsky, a gardener, and Galatsky, a bookseller. From these two he obtained many radical pamphlets and books which he devoured voraciously. The message they transmitted was to "have things right." Bronstein found in them a common bond and grasped them firmly.

In the meantime, David Bronstein learned of Lev's shirking his studies and went to Nikolaev to straighten him out. The father traced his son to Shvigovsky's garden where a small circle of radicals met to debate. But Lev liked the garden activities more than his university work.
His father; in a fiery burst of temper in front of several of Lev's peers, demanded that he resume his studies and threatened withdrawal of funds. The pangs of humiliation were too great, and Lev Davidovich shot back that he wanted to be left alone. Thus, his fight against his father and the social system became united. Shortly afterwards, he moved to the garden to live. He believed himself to be a Populist although he knew nearly nothing about it.

Eastman remarks:

It is not quite true that he "had no interest in girls." He was very shy in his relations with girls and disposed when he was particularly interested in one to cover it up or express it by treating her with special rudeness and brutality -- a method which did not get him along very fast. (50)

Notice a similar mechanism to Deutscher's. Only now shame played a bigger part in his sexual relations. Bronstein did not mention his relationships with females often. Probably, this is because of his unresolved oedipal complex. That is, he still was "in love" with his mother which rendered him incompetent with women. Hence, he overcompensated by attacking them to hide his shame. There was one girl who frequented Shvigovsky's orchard to whom Bronstein was attracted -- Alexandra Lvovna Sokolovskaya. She was several years (about six) older than Lev and was a mother-figure to the visitors to the garden. Being a mother-surrogate,
she was not so much of a threat to Lev; yet, he was rude to her because she was a Marxist. On their first meeting he exclaimed, "You still think you're a Marxist? I can't imagine how a young girl so full of life can stand that dry, narrow, impractical stuff!" And she in rebuttal said, "I can't imagine how a person who thinks he is logical can be contented with a headful of vague, idealistic emotions!"

Bronstein was rebelling against Marxism's materialistic interpretation of history; but more important was the reason he was repulsed by this. His use of the adjectives "dry" and "hard," I think, can give us a clue. These were the same words he used to describe his parents and homelife. In this sense, his rejection of Marxism can be viewed as a reaction against his parents' labor and lack of affection.

The Marxists were like technicians. At 17, Bronstein did not accept the hard discipline of Alexandra Sokolovskaya or her beliefs. Thus, for him she was a threat not only because she was female, but also because she represented a system he hated. Bronstein dropped out of school for a while in spring because of illness and lack of interest in his studies. When his father came to try and convince him he should return to school, he was confronted with a dilemma. On the one hand was Alexandra Sokolovskaya and on the other was David Bronstein. His childhood experience inclined
him away from the latter yet he was uncertain. Consequently, his self-confidence suffered and he appeared gloomy to all.

After the school year, he made a brief visit home as a guest and then to an uncle who was a factory owner in Odessa. In debates with this uncle, Bronstein was supporting Marxian views -- the value of goods was created by the workers -- without realizing it. In fact, he began organizing worker circles in his uncle's factory. That is, he concentrated on the proletariat rather than on the peasantry -- a Marxist not Narodnik tenet. Ostensibly, he was a Narodnik in theory but a Marxist in practical intuitions.

In Odessa, he participated in revolutionary discussions. Here, as always, he was intolerant of opposition and needed to be the center of attention. Since he had hardly read enough radical books to know what he was debating about, he was not infrequently humiliated.

He soon returned to Nikolaev, even after friends had warned him of danger from the police. Wolfenstein argues that Bronstein's flaunting of danger is a product of his sense of basic trust and the desire to be punished. I have already argued against the first reason; however, the second seems more believable. Freudian theory states that everything is psychically determined. We have "accidents" most of the time because we want them to happen. Being caught
at something is generally attributable to desiring to be punished. The previously mentioned incident of Lev's hurting himself in the thresher can be viewed as expressing a wish for punishment for trying to rival his father's physical prowess. Certainly now there is an even stronger guilt feeling and need for retribution. In this light, I feel Bronstein's insouciance vis-a-vis the police is merely part of the same mechanism.

On arriving in Nikolaev the first thing Lev Davidovich did was to organize a "practical joke" against Alexandra. After having his followers spread word that he had been converted to Marxism, he invited Alexandra to a New Year's Eve party to welcome in 1897. But at midnight Bronstein toasted:

A curse upon all Marxists, and upon those who want to bring dryness and hardness into all the relations of life. (53)

Two features of this toast are interesting. First, once again Bronstein has expressed his hatred of Marxism in the same tone as his dislike of his early childhood. Second, this joke seemed to be devised to prevent himself from realizing the truth of his internal conversion. Marxism was systematic, and for that reason it disagreed with Lev Davidovich at first because he was jealous. He had yet to
see that this system was the best way to maximize his struggle against his father and authority.

Shortly after New Year's Day Bronstein organized a series of lectures to inculcate more people with Narodnik theory. He himself decided to give the first lecture on a topic about which he knew absolutely nothing. Until this time he had only been involved in debating and was completely unfamiliar with lecturing. After rambling on incoherently at length he:

...walked across the room and threw himself face down in the pillow on the divan. He was soaking with sweat, and his shoulders heaved with shame, and everybody loved him. That was very important moment in his life. He was born with too much self-confidence, not with too little. (54)

His desire to be the center of attention and utter confidence prompted the program. His humiliation over people knowing what he did not caused his contumelious behavior. But he did learn how to begin in front of an audience. Only to fortify himself with facts and how to stop at the proper time was left.

Bronstein next took up the case of the public library where books were not bought for the general readers but were chosen instead by a board of directors. The importance of this minor incident was his realization that he needed organization and maturity to make his plan work. For this
he turned to Alexandra Sokolovskaya who agreed to the rapprochement. In so doing, he also brought himself one step closer to embracing Marxism. Similarly, his need of these two qualities reappeared in his later relations with Lenin.

The years 1896 and 1897 saw a wave of unionization and workers' strikes in Russia. Bronstein and his associates intended to organize the workmen of Nikolaev. Gregory Sokolovskaya -- Alexandra's brother -- knew a worker through whom they made many contacts. They met Ivan Andreyevich Mukhin, a mechanic, who had already been inciting the proletarians. Several discussion circles were organized. At first, Lev Davidovich was reluctant to speak in these groups. He soon overcame his reticence; and, as the newness of the affair wore off, the workmen urged him to set forth his views and take command. Once again, we see Bronstein's sense of competence being buttressed by others acknowledging his intellectual gifts. His confidence restored, he wrote a constitution for the group and gave it a characteristically dramatic name -- the South Russian Workers' Union.

On January 1, 1898, Lev Davidovich addressed the workers in a New Year's resolution. His demeanor was not the same as it had been one year before. Everyone noticed a change
in him. He appeared more humble but nonetheless stabler than at the party when he had had his fun with Alexandra Sokolovskaya. The indecision gone for a time, Bronstein was drawing nearer to that system he used to combat authority and win. He had by now identified himself with the workers and no longer contemplated "returning to society" and becoming an engineer as his father had wished.

Lev was so preoccupied with his radical activities that he traveled to neighboring villages for contacts at night so that he could sleep en route and not waste any time. He published a newspaper "Our Cause" for the Union which he printed himself:

...I printed the letters with the utmost care, considering it a point of honor to make them clear enough so that even the less literate could read our proclamations without any trouble. It took me about two hours to a page. Sometimes I didn't even unbend my back for a week, cutting my work short only for meetings and study in the groups. (56)

Notice the meticulousness of a Chinese artist-saint.
Ostensibly, the same mechanism was working which compelled him to be neat and clean. He never had much difficulty with the written word and it always gave him a feeling of power. But, once again, exhibiting his talents and delivering his message via public speaking was another matter. He felt like bolting and running as he had done when a child. It was as if somebody would find in him some fault:
...My knowledge was inadequate, and I didn't know how to present it effectively. We made no real speeches in the full sense of the word. Only once, in the woods on May-day, did I have to make one, and it embarrassed me greatly. (57)

It took time for him to outgrow this sense of shame and feel comfortable at the lectern.

The little group that called itself the South Russian Workers' Union was a thorn in the side of the police. Law enforcement agents had infiltrated the organization and knew its affairs for some time. They refused to believe that the handful of youths -- Bronstein, Sokolovskaya, Ziv -- were responsible for unifying over 200 workers in Nikolaev factories. But their disbelieving days were numbered and they began arresting members of the Union. Bronstein himself was taken into custody in January, 1898, thus beginning another important phase of his career.
CHAPTER VI
THE EDUCATION OF A REVOLUTIONARY

Bronstein's arrest began a four year hibernation. But he was far from asleep during this period. On the contrary, this was the time of his most tremendous growth. During prison and exile he studied and wrote diligently. Not only did he arm himself with knowledge, but also he perfected his literary style. Perhaps even more important was his adoption of Marxism soon after his arrest.

The prison records of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Russia read like a "who's who" in politics:

Trotsky belonged to this noble order, and his years in jail were but a part of the appropriate experience. They made him a member of the oppressed classes whose cause he had championed. (58)

The first three weeks of incarceration were spent in the Nikolaev jail. Lev Davidovich was then transferred to the Kherson jail to await trial. For two and one-half months he endured solitary confinement and miserable living conditions. The acknowledgement of his conversion to Marxism occurred during this time but had really been part of his unconscious for quite a while. It was so much
part of him by now that, when he told Franz Shvigovsky
that he was no longer a Populist, he was indignant because
the latter had not converted, too. Bronstein's mettle
was more than a match for the hardships of prison. Confinement
only meant increased revolutionary zeal and hatred for
the tsar.

About May 1, he was taken to a prison in Odessa. Here
there were accommodations for political prisoners and
Bronstein was permitted to read and write. He learned
German, French, English and Italian from reading a book
printed in Russian and those four languages. He mastered
Antonio Labriola's *Essays on Historical Materialism* and
tested his knowledge by compiling an essay on the social
meaning of the history of Free-Masonry, hence, helping to
shape his ideological identity.

Nearly seven more months passed until the trial for the
organizers of the South Russian Workers' Union reached the
court. With poise and drama Bronstein elected to defend
himself and tried to shoulder the blame for everyone.
Perhaps he was trying to take all the credit rather than the
blame for the Union's actions. Notice his sense of will-
fulness. Nevertheless, Lev Davidovich's brilliant critique
was to no avail, and in the autumn of 1899 he was sentenced
to four years in Siberia.

Before the journey he spent the winter in a transfer
prison in Moscow. In Kherson and Odessa he had tried
to marry Alexandra Sokolovskaya. Since he was not yet twenty-one he needed his father's permission, which was not forthcoming because David Bronstein thought Alexandra was solely responsible for his son's behavior. But in Moscow, in 1900, Lev was able to convince the officials to let him marry, and his father was too far away to exert any influence. Some have said that the marriage was entirely for the convenience of spending their time in exile together. It is rather more plausible that the young couple really did love each other—as much as they were capable of love—and that their emotional attachment was buttressed by a common revolutionary ideology. Later, two daughters were born to the Bronsteins.

One incident occurred in the Moscow prison which deserves mention. The warden was accustomed to having his prisoners doff their caps when he walked by. Seeing that Lev Davidovich had no intention of doing so, the warden asked him threateningly the reason why. Lev retorted, "And you, why don't you take off yours?" For this he was beaten and dragged out to another tower to live. His friends also refused to remove their hats and followed him. Thus, the episode resulted in a mass change of residence to better living accommodations and a relaxation of the hat removal rule.

The most noteworthy quality of Bronstein's action was that in his defiance he exhibited how much importance he
placed on dignity -- both his own and others'. His sense of dignity was a manifestation of the desire for recognition which was a function of his willfulness. Also, we see the sense of competence he derived by merely speaking out. He had been able for a long time to manipulate the environment with his tongue. Now, more than ever, did he realize the impact he made on other people by his speech.

In the spring he was moved to Siberia. On the way he wrote his Weltanschauung on the problems of life in the light of Marxist theory: love, death, friendship, optimism, and pessimism. First, he lived in Ust-Kut, then Nizhnie-Ilinsk, and then Verkholensk. It was here that he read diligently, perfected his literary style, showing a genuine vocation for being a writer, and identified with the social democratic trend. He managed to create the Social Democratic Siberian Union and to have some articles published in the newspaper "Eastern Review," for which he drew a salary that made life in Siberia tolerable. His style was over-elaborate, over-rhetorical, over-witty, and adolescent, but nonetheless showed mature judgement. After a time, however, the censor refused to allow his column to be published because of the inciting content and style of the articles.

Meanwhile, in the West, the Social Democrats were focusing on two main issues: that the revolution should be economic and political; and that centralization was needed to effect this. To the first, Bronstein had always agreed;
and to the second, after the Nikolaev days, he realized that a central committee of some sort was required. Consequently, when he received the first issues of "Iskra," Lenin's newspaper, and What's to be Done, Lenin's book, he knew he had to escape and join forces with that man.

The Bronsteins and their two daughters, Nina and Zina, lived in a small house in Verkholensk. Lev and his wife slept on the second floor, which was accessible only through a trap door in the middle of the floor. A police inspector poked his head through the entrance nightly at 10:00 to insure everything was all right. After one such surveillance on a summer night in 1902, Bronstein jumped on the door and menacingly told the policeman never to come again. The inspector was not a little frightened by the fiery young man and did not show his face above the floor anymore. Five days later, Lev Davidovich escaped. Both he and his wife knew that they might never meet again.

His friends had helped him plan his flight and had supplied him with a blank passport on which he hurriedly scribbled a name. Ironically, this was the name by which the world came to know him -- Leon Trotsky. Besides the fact that the name was noncommittal as to race, it merits attention because he borrowed it from one of his former jailers. Knowing more about this man might enable us to find out why Lev chose it. Wolfenstein argues that the choice of name expressed a fundamental ambivalence whereby he did not
know whether to fight or to submit. Perhaps, though, it indicates a further identification with his father, and hence father-surrogate, and consequent resolution of the oedipal complex. In other words, by now Bronstein felt not only that he had the system he needed to fight his father, but also that he was facile enough to work in that system effectively; hence, he identified with the aggressor.

On his journey westward, Bronstein often paid those who rendered him assistance a good deal more than was customary. Most likely he was reacting to David Bronstein's parsimony. Upon arriving in Austria:

Trotsky was hungry when he arrived in Vienna, but he was not worried. His arrival was that of a Russian revolutionary leader escaping from Siberia, and his only problem was to make this momentous fact known to the leaders of the Austrian Social Democracy -- to Victor Adler, for instance. That was the state of his feelings. You will, never
know Trotsky if you do not know what it is to feel important and absolutely self-confident. (61)

It took two months for Trotsky to get from Paris to London partly because of the merely adventurous nature of his journey and because of a young lady he met in Paris. The Parisian Social Democrats had an unofficial welcoming committee for emigres like Trotsky. The head of this group was Natalia Ivanovna Sedova, a quiet, strong rebel of a woman. Later, in 1903, he married her, without divorcing Alexandra. He may have had some guilt feelings about this despite his condonement of polygamy, because he barely mentioned either wife in his autobiography.

At any rate, Trotsky arrived in London in October, 1902. He immediately went to Lenin's house and aroused him in the very early morning. Krupskaya, Lenin's wife, preceded her husband to the door and called back to him that the "pen" (one of Trotsky's pseudonyms) had arrived. Trotsky
had finished his revolutionary education in eastern Siberia. He had indeed "arrived."
CHAPTER VII

THE MODEL FOR A YOUNG ADULT

The events of Trotsky's life became exceedingly complicated after 1902. At this juncture let us see how Erikson's model can explain his past experiences and subsequent political activities.

We have said that Lev Davidovich acquired a sense of industry in the fourth stage of development; that is, he adjusted to the laws of the tool world. He was given an education for a great number of possible careers. School became his whole world, and he felt alien to his birthplace. His goals in the classroom superseded his goals at home. Being the prize pupil made him feel adequate and even superior. His manipulation of facts and his eagerness to excel aided his facility in the tool world. As mentioned, his high marks were not always a function of the will to learn, but often merely for the sake of high marks. This, plus his family background and the scenes of social protest he remembered in his youth, had profound effects on his sense of identity.

The fifth crisis, identity vs. role confusion, begins with the onset of puberty. During this stage, one
questions earlier ideas, faces the adult tasks ahead, and endeavors to find his place in the world. Many earlier conflicts are re-enacted and innocent people are often chosen as adversaries. Some adolescents encounter role confusion, the most disturbing element of which is the inability to establish an occupational identity.

Trotsky underwent a particularly stormy period of identity crisis. Because he left home at nine there was no one set of events on which he could focus. Consequently, his conflicts were diffuse. Erikson compares the processes of the mind at this stage to a moratorium during which an ideology is sought. Trotsky was thrown into close contact with political activists at this critical age. His ideological and vocational choices were fused together. Furthermore, the arguments between Trotsky and his father at Shvigovsky's garden created what Erikson calls a negative identity; that is, he was warned not to assume the identity of a radical, yet he felt compelled to do it. David Bronstein did want him to be an engineer, however. In a sense, Lev, in eventually "engineering" a revolution, adopted this identity fragment positively. The conflict with his father was generalized to one with the establishment and joined with a collective trend. In his effort to identify with Populists, Trotsky felt he had to that much more repudiate
the Marxists. Not until he transcended his sense of shame did he convert to Marxism; and he never did fully resolve his oedipal complex.

The next stage, intimacy vs. isolation, entails the capacity to commit oneself to concrete affiliations, even though sacrifices may be necessary. Trotsky was incapable of doing this. His sense of shame did not allow him to compromise himself for fear of ego loss. His only companions were those who acknowledged his superiority. Even his marriage to Alexandra Sokolovskaya did not embody complete genital love. The lack of intimate relationships caused him to experience a sense of isolation and a feeling of self-importance. He felt compelled to attack and destroy anything or anyone who seemed dangerous to his being. The inability to work with peers proved to be Trotsky's undoing, as we shall see.

The complexity of Trotsky's life after his meeting with Lenin is too great to include in this study. Instead, I will only try to cite some of the most outstanding points that relate to his personality structure.
CHAPTER VIII
TROTSKY AND THE BOLSHEVIKS

Lenin and Trotsky were mutually admiring at their first meeting. When Lenin suggested that Trotsky work as a lecturer, the latter did not object. More than ever, he felt sure of himself. His education in Siberia had buttressed his self-confidence with knowledge. On his first assignment, a lecture at Whitechapel, he was astonished that the eminent emigrants Chaikovsky and Cherkasov were so easily overcome by his words. Lenin, too, was impressed and sent him to deliver his speech in Brussels, Liege and Paris. Gone was the shame Trotsky felt when he had previously tried to speak to a crowd. Public speaking not only satisfied his need to be the center of attention but also was one of his most efficient ways of affecting the environment.

Lenin's groups published two papers - "Iskra" and "Zarya." The first was a popular organ while the second was theoretical in nature. Lenin suggested Trotsky write his speech for publication in "Zarya," but Trotsky did not have the courage to appear beside Plekhanov and the others with a strictly theoretical essay. He did manage to write a lesser article for the other paper, although he
said, "I actually fell in love with the Iskra, and was so ashamed of my ignorance that I strained every nerve in my effort to overcome it." Trotsky was the sort of person who, ashamed of his insufficient knowledge must always be learning something.

On one of his speaking tours to Paris Trotsky took his second wife, Natalia Ivanovna Sedova. Both her love and Alexandra Sokolovskaya's were completely undemanding.

By now he had been contributing to "Iskra" for some time and was rapidly establishing himself in the world of radical oratory. He had risen so fast that Lenin selected him to play a large part in the 2nd Russian Social Democratic Party Congress in July, 1903.

The congress was convened for the purpose of unifying the Party and adopting a constitution. The six "Iskra" editors -- Lenin, Plekhanov, Martov, Zasulich, Axelrod, Potresov -- were to provide the main leadership for the meeting, but heavy opposition was expected from the Jewish Bund and the Economists. Trotsky strongly criticized the first group, which wanted special privileges for Jews. He denounced the idea of an autonomous Jewish committee. This was the only time he spoke of himself being Jewish. He took an assimilationist view, declaring that there was no future for Jews as a separate community. Some of the
stormiest sessions of the Congress were over this issue.

The next conflict of the congress was between the "Iskraites" and the Economists. The latter objected to a strong central committee under which they would be powerless. They were interested in a struggle for economic rather than political gains and reforms.

Amid the turmoil, Lenin sowed more seeds of discontent which compounded the problems and led to the dissolution of the congress. He proposed a reduction in the number of editors from six to three to include Martov, Plekhanov and himself. In undermining the solidarity of the "Iskra" family, he incurred, among others, Trotsky's wrath. Trotsky, in his infatuation with the paper, had not realized the internecine strife which had existed behind the scenes for some time. One of the problems was that votes on issues were often split between the younger and older members thus rendering the committee impotent. Lenin's first proposal, to incorporate Trotsky as an editor, met stiff opposition from Plekhanov, one of the old generation. Hence, on the grounds of greater efficiency, Lenin proposed to weed out Axelrod, Zasulich, and Potresov, who did not contribute much anyhow. This shocked Trotsky's sensibilities, because
not only did he live in the same house with Zasulich but also he viewed Lenin's "attack" on "Iskra" as sacrilegious.

At subsequent congress meetings, two groups tended to develop - the "hards" headed by Lenin and the "softs" led by Martov. Trotsky sided with the latter, because he thought Lenin was picayune in criticizing Martov's proposal and generally saw Lenin as the aggressor in precipitating the split. Trotsky thought Lenin was conspiring and was offended by the injustice of it. Once again, Trotsky showed his stiff pride and let personal grievances get in the way of politics.

By this time the Bund and the Economists were thoroughly disgruntled and seceded from the congress. Lenin immediately brought to a vote his scheme of the "Iskra" reorganization and the election of candidates to the Central Committee. He won by a bare majority of two votes and, hence, designated his faction "Bolshevik" - the men of the majority. The others were named "Menshevik" - the men of the minority. The psychological impact of this name served Lenin well even when, in later years, he was in the minority. Trotsky did not realize the significance of the split until 1917 and spent the next 14 years working for the reconciliation of the diverging groups. His personal hatred of Lenin blinded
him to the political realities - for he too desired a well disciplined party - and he was to vacillate among different factions until the October revolution.

Plekhanov, who sided with the Mensheviks, managed to gain control of "Iskra" for his faction. Since their first meeting he and Trotsky had been enemies. He saw too much of himself in young Leon and disliked his arrogant manner. Trotsky was not one to retreat from a conflict and aggravated the animosity between the two. Consequently, Plekhanov opted for dispensing with Trotsky's "Iskra" activities. Since Plekhanov was mainly responsible for wresting the paper from the hands of the Bolsheviks and thereby disgracing Lenin, the Mensheviks responded to his call to remove Trotsky. Thus, in April 1904, Trotsky began shifting away from the Mensheviks.

Because of his biting attacks on Lenin and his expulsion from "Iskra," Trotsky was at odds with everyone. He moved to Munich and lived there with A. L. Helfand, a Russian Jew who made his home in Germany. Trotsky liked his "virile, muscular style" indicating perhaps that he was trying to express his own masculinity. In the year that these two lived together Trotsky learned a great deal. Helfand claimed that the nation-state was an inadequate
institution (a common Marxist tenet) and that its days were numbered. He foresaw capitalist development leading to a political upheaval in Russia which in turn would lead to a world revolution. Trotsky, however, was the first to interject that the revolution would not be merely bourgeois in character. Rather, a socialist revolution would follow the political one and create a proletarian dictatorship in Russia before the world-wide upheaval. Thus, in 1904, Trotsky had already postulated the essentials of the theory of "permanent revolution," to which Lenin objected at first but the validity of which he many years later came to realize.

In September, 1904, Trotsky renounced his affiliation with the Mensheviks in an open letter. Shortly, thereafter, the Russo-Japanese war took a turn for the worse for Russia; and new polemics erupted between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. The latter were in a liberalizing mood, whereas the former remained hardcore socialists. Trotsky sided with the Bolsheviks, thus placing himself in a more ambiguous position. At the same time, he formulated a "plan of action" for revolution embodying a general strike of workers and soldiers. There was no precedent for his platform, which proved to be what actually did happen, consequently further isolating
his position.

Trotsky did not have long to wait for the validity of his theories to be confirmed. On January 23, 1905, Russia was caught up in the throes of revolution. By February, he had returned to Kiev to make speeches and write articles. On the 13th of October, there was a mass strike of workers. Tsarist Russia virtually grinded to a halt. In Petersburg the First Soviet of Workers' Deputies was formed and rivaled both the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks as leader of the masses. It even published its own newspaper "Izvestya." It was from this body and from the University where meetings were held that Trotsky's voice was heard loudest. He was first heard in Petersburg on October 17 in a speech that pointed out most of the weaknesses of the revolutionary movement. He realized that the tsar's powerful machine of Cossacks, Guards and army would frustrate any rebellion that would arise. The blind obedience of the men in the armed forces must be destroyed.

Thus the revolution was doomed to failure for several reasons, but primarily because it happened too soon. When the tsar recovered from the initial shock, it was not at all difficult to restore order. On December 3, 1905 he had the entire Petersburg Soviet arrested.
Trotsky and 14 others were charged with "fomenting an armed insurrection." He elected to present his own defense, which turned out to be an exposition of social democracy and an indictment of the tsar. His mother and father were in the courtroom for his trial and were proud of his eloquence. Despite his brilliant oratory, Trotsky was sentenced to life deportation to Siberia.

While in prison for fifteen months, waiting to be transferred, Trotsky read a great deal and drew several conclusions from the revolution. First, he saw how Bolsheviks, Mensheviks, and Social Revolutionaries had been drawn together by the excitement of 1905. This led him to believe that reconciliation was possible, even inevitable, for the next revolution. He endeavored to play the role of conciliator in an uncompromisable split, thus, further alienating himself from both camps.

Second, he recognized the need for an armed and organized proletariat. The haphazard manner in which the revolution had taken shape could not topple the tsar of the Russias. Furthermore, the power of the regime must be broken. The seeds of rebellion must be sown in the armed services.

Third, he envisaged a close connection between the
Russo-Japanese War and the revolution. War as a precipitating agent might prove to be the downfall of capitalism. Similarly, he thought that a rising economy, as was in existence before 1905, was a precondition to revolution.

As the first practical application of Trotsky's political education, the revolution of 1905 strengthened his convictions. He himself said:

...I organically felt that my years of apprenticeship were over, although not in the sense that I stopped learning. No - the urge and willingness to learn I have carried through my whole life in their first intensity. But in the years that followed I have been learning as a master learns, and not as a pupil. (83)

In early 1907 he began the trip to Obdorsk, Siberia, but escaped enroute. He had confided to his wife Natalia (who had had a baby boy while he was in prison) that he missed civilization. The only pleasant thing about jail this time was that it was nice to work in quiet "without any danger of being arrested." On the westward bound train:

For the first few minutes the almost empty car seemed too crowded and stuffy, and I went onto the front platform, where the wind was blowing, and it was dark. A loud cry burst from me spontaneously - a cry of joy and freedom. (84)

The meaning of this passage is unclear. What does seem certain was that anxiety had built up in Trotsky. His incarceration
may have made him feel out of touch - out of the limelight - and consequently elicited the cry of freedom. An almost empty compartment seeming too crowded to him is more difficult to analyze. Perhaps, this merely meant that he felt constrained by the regime. To say much else would appear contrived. At any rate, Trotsky fled to Stockholm and then met his wife and son in Vienna in October. Thus began his second period of exile. He did not return to Russia until 1917.
CHAPTER IX

THE TRANSITION TO POWER

The year 1907 brought tsarist repressions to Russia and many disheartened radicals emigrated once again to western Europe. Trotsky's spirit appeared less deflated than that of other emigres, but he was uninfluential during this period. Later, Stalin said that Trotsky's strength was greatest at the advance of revolution but receded when the revolution did. Stalin's remark was correct, for from 1907-1917 Trotsky's most fatal weakness was exposed. While Lenin was busy purging and forming a party, others like Stalin were consolidating strong support for themselves. Trotsky's attempt at playing the conciliator and his habit of insulting many people left him with little organizational backing. He felt superior to both the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks; and his criticisms of them only incurred their wrath. His character was revealed as that of a revolutionary rather than a politician and leader of men.

Trotsky's love of the freshly printed page led him to begin a newspaper, "Pravda," as he called it, insisted on
unity and radicalism and expostulated his theory of permanent revolution. He felt that divergences must necessarily exist but could be glossed over to create a unified party. His program was unrealistic, however, as he ignored many of the important issues over which the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks were quarreling. His chief editorial aid was Adolphe A. Joffe, who happened to be under the psychiatric care of Alfred Adler. The latter was often a house guest of the Trotskys and interested Leon in psychoanalytic theory. Trotsky said that the revolution "healed Joffe better than psychoanalysis of all his complexes." This was even truer of the author.

The widening of the Bolshevik-Menshevik rift and Trotsky's estrangement from both led him to form his own coalition in August 1912. The "August Bloc," as it was known, was Trotsky's last real attempt to form a "non-factional" faction. He did not abandon the view that the next wave of revolution would reunify the party until that next wave occurred in 1917.

During the doldrums of the second exile, Trotsky's attention was directed to primarily theoretical questions instead of to organizing pragmatic structures to aid a
future revolution. He studied the relationship of economic crises to political upheavals and particularly the theories of Marx and Engels. Of these latter men he remarked, in a self-revealing description:

Their attitude to men and ideas was mine.... Marx and Engels were revolutionaries through and through. But they did not have the slightest trace of asceticism or sectarianism. Both of them, and especially Engels, could say of themselves that nothing human was alien to them. But their revolutionary outlook lifted them always above the hazards of fate and the works of men....What philistines and vulgarious considered aristocratic in them was really only their revolutionary superiority.... (86)

Notice that Trotsky called himself a revolutionary. Witness, also, that Trotsky chose to compare himself to the Marx and Engels of 1848, who went to the people. He wanted contact with the masses so that he could be the focus of attention and excel. Compare this with the Marx of 1851 in a letter to Engels: "I am much pleased with the public and authentic isolation in which we now find ourselves, you and I." Lenin preferred this aspect of Marx during his exile. He was busy working behind the scenes to establish a body capable of governing. Trotsky had to make himself known publicly and called for a new revolution. Finally, notice how Trotsky defended the attacks on himself by claiming his revolutionary superiority.
World War I sent invigorating blood once again flowing through Trotsky's veins. He felt certain that trench warfare would go on indefinitely until both sides were worn out and capitalism was severely weakened. This would set the stage for the progression of events in his theory of permanent revolution, culminating in a socialist uprising and worldwide revolt. Lenin, too, foresaw the possibility of a new revolution in Russia because of the effects the war was having on the tsar's grip on the country. Whereas in 1905 he had objected to the idea of permanent revolution he now realized its merits. On the other hand, Trotsky was beginning to see how irreconcilable the split in the Social Democratic party was. He began drawing closer to the Bolsheviks.

At the outbreak of the war, Trotsky left Vienna for Switzerland and then on to Paris to work for a newspaper. He attended the 2nd International from September 5 to 8, 1915, at Zimmerwald, Switzerland, and submitted the drafts for the manifesto which was agreed upon by the conference.

His stay in Paris was curtailed when the government expelled him. France, as Russia's ally, needed her soldiers for the homeland defense. A political enemy of the tsar
such as Trotsky was an undesirable. Consequently, he was led to the border and put on a train to Spain. The Spanish did not care for him either and shortly sent him packing to New York. He arrived there on January 13, 1917.

In New York he joined the editorial board of "Novy Mir" (New World); but his involvement with American socialism soon drew to a close. In February, the first jumbled cables announcing the overthrow of the tsar came. In Petersburg and Guchkov-Miliukoff ministry was set up. Before he had time to acquaint himself with the new world, Trotsky and his family sailed for Russia on the 27th March, 1917. After being detained by the British in Canada, he reached Petersburg on May 4.

Trotsky immediately went to the Smolny Institute where the Soviet was meeting. The Bolsheviks suggested that he be given a seat on the Executive Committee. The Mensheviks were not certain where he stood politically and moved to have him accepted only as an associate without the right to vote. What mattered to Trotsky was only that he have the right to speak.

The provisional government of Prince Lvov, established after the fall of tsar Nicholas II, was ruling from a position of insecurity. The real power lay in the hands of
the Soviet, which had supported but not yet joined the government. A conflict arose, since Prince Lvov wanted to retain the monarchy and reestablish discipline, whereas the Soviets wanted to further the revolution.

In April Guchkov had resigned his post as Minister of War after failing to restore military order. Miluikov had had to abandon the Ministry of Foreign Affairs because of the popular dissent he aroused in declaring a continuation of the tsarist war policy. The first provisional government was dissolved.

Thus Trotsky arrived just after the second government had been formed. He castigated the members of the Soviet for permitting the existence of two centers of power - the coalition government and the Soviets. Furthermore, he declared that the work of the revolution was not yet completed and must be consummated soon or there would be danger. He stressed the need to shift the whole power to one organization. This is just what Lenin and the Bolsheviks were saying at this time; and on May 10 Trotsky and Lenin met to discuss a merger. By this time Trotsky had formally renounced the possibility of Bolshevik-Menshevik unity, and Lenin had just endured a month long debate to convince his faction to accept the essentials of permanent revolution.
Lenin was the leader of a solid organization to which those against the provisional government looked for guidance. Trotsky, whose glowing words had the power to incite the masses, was like a "brilliant general without an army." Each needed the other. Trotsky's pride, however, did not let him surrender his individuality to Bolshevism so easily. Not until July did he officially join the Bolshevik party.

In the meantime, Trotsky made numerous speeches to agitate the masses. One of his favorite places for addresses was the naval base at Kronstadt, the support of which was crucial during the next few months. Trotsky's task was to keep the sailors from wrecking their revenge on the Ministry while maintaining their revolutionary esprit de corps. After he succeeded in gaining their confidence, they remained loyal to his commands. Another podium he enjoyed was in the Cirque Moderne where he addressed multitudes almost nightly. His excitement and identification with the masses at these gatherings was evident to everyone present.

Lenin was forced into hiding by a writ put out for his arrest as an alleged German agent. Trotsky had not passed through Germany on his return to Russia, so the coalition government did not yet issue his warrant. Everywhere he defended Lenin and the Bolsheviks with:
"Lenin has fought for the revolution thirty years. I have fought against the oppression of the popular masses twenty years. We cannot but hate German militarism." (88)

In this he revealed again his wish for human dignity.

Kerensky, Premier of the 2nd coalition government, appointed General Kornilov Commander-in-Chief. Kornilov's attitude towards Kerensky became hostile, however, and in August Kornilov marched his troops into Petersburg. Kerensky's only hope for rescue laid in the Bolshevik agitators. The latter were proficient in their art and persuaded the General's troops to desert. This affair put Trotsky and the Bolsheviks in an advantageous position. This succession of events led directly to the Bolshevik uprising.

Petersburg had been ready for insurrection for some time. Now the Bolsheviks were gaining majorities in the Soviets of all the industrial centers. September 23, the Petersburg Soviet elected Trotsky as its President. He and Lenin agreed that the need for revolution was near. But Trotsky felt that it should be conducted by the Soviets, whereas Lenin thought the Bolsheviks should undertake the task. Trotsky's plan, even though it required waiting at a critical period when time was important, had the potential for more mass appeal and was adopted.
By October the economic crisis was compounded by the rumor that Germany was pressing for invasion of Russia. In "behalf of the defense of Petersburg," the Military Revolutionary Committee was formed on October 9. Trotsky's power over the army and navy garrisons was greater than Kerensky's. By the 24th (November 6 on the new calendar), the Red Guards held every important position in the city. On the next day they captured the Winter Palace - the seat of the coalition government - without having fired a shot. Thus, with the promise of peace, land, and bread, the Bolsheviks became the rulers of that old canaille, the Russian Empire.

The main problem left unsolved immediately after the revolution was that of forming a government. Trotsky suggested naming the organization "The Soviet of People's Commissars" because it sounded revolutionary and would serve as a constant reminder to the people that Bolshevism had "liberated" them. At the first meeting of the party Central Committee, Lenin unexpectedly nominated Trotsky for the post of chairman of the Soviet. The latter vehemently refused out of deference to the former's seniority. Lenin's reasons for proposing this were twofold: first, Trotsky had been President of the Petrograd Soviet;
and second, Lenin preferred to channel his influence through the party. At the insistence of many prominent Bolsheviks, Lenin agreed to lead the new government as well as the party.

Trotsky did agree to become the government's Foreign Secretary. From this post he "confronted Europe" for six months undergoing the dramatic negotiations at Brest-Litovsk. In March 1918, Trotsky was appointed Commissar of War and President of the Supreme War Council because of his ability to manipulate soldiers. In the short space of two and a half years he transformed the meager 3000 strong Red Guard into the Red Army of about five million men. His success in this task attested to the persuasive powers of his oratory. The main difficulty was that, before the revolution, Bolshevik agitators had broken down the discipline of the armed services in order to promote the insurrection. Now the soldiers had to be reconvincing to obey orders, and a centralized administration had to be reinstated. The army did become, in fact, polarized around Trotsky himself as he traveled around the country in his armored train, haranguing the soldiers from the platform of his car.

Towards the end of 1919, with the issue of the civil war no longer in doubt, Trotsky turned his attention away from military matters to concentrate on the problems of
economic reconstruction. To revitalise Russia's faltering economy he had little choice but to act against his own principle. For many years he had fought for the proletariat and peasantry. But now the only way to save Russia from complete economic disorder was to deny political self-determination to those two social classes. He concluded that reinstating some freedom to the peasant was necessary to boost the crop output. Although the Central Committee rejected his plan at that time, it accepted a year later a nearly identical one submitted by Lenin, who finally realized that it was the only way to combat economic decay.

Because of Lenin's policy, the New Economic Policy (N.E.P.), the Bolsheviks deemed it necessary to make all other parties illegal. A liberal economic plan might very well have created new political organizations expressing grievances of individual peasants. Hence, in liberalizing the economy, the Party established its own political monopoly. Furthermore, laws were passed forbidding opposition within the Party.

Trotsky's preliminary version of the N.E.P. was to be one of the main arguments against "Trotskyism." The polemics of the 1920's maintained by Stalin during the succession struggle were basically slanderous and untrue.
But Stalin had the party organization firmly within his grip. The pattern that Trotsky himself had predicted was emerging:

The party organization would then substitute itself for the party as a whole; then the Central Committee would substitute itself for the organization; and finally, a single dictator would substitute himself for the Central Committee. (89)
CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION

Let us recommence our model with Erikson's seventh stage of development. Generativity implies "the evolutionary development which has made man the teaching and instituting as well as the learning animal." It includes the notions of productivity and creativity in guiding succeeding generations. Leon Trotsky was a man of ideas and theories. In this respect he rates high as a generator of humanity. He wished for dignity for future ages of civilization.

In the eighth stage, ego integrity can be attained only by one who has adapted to the vicissitudes of life. It is doubtful that Trotsky could have reached this plateau, even though when he died at the hands of a Stalinist assassin in 1940 he showed no particular signs of desperation.

Our analysis has been concerned with primarily two main questions. The first is why Trotsky chose the vocation of revolutionary instead of some other occupation within the established regime. Not to belabor the point, I stressed his partially unresolved oedipal complex as the major psychological factor in his propensity to revolt. Hence,
his biting castigation of kulaks in the Ukrainian uprising of 1919. Remember, David Bronstein was a kulak:

The well-fed kulak who has his rifle hidden regards the Red Army man, barefoot and hungry, with contempt; the latter feels uncertain of himself and humiliated. We must apply a hot iron to the spine of the Ukrainian kulak class, and then the right conditions for getting work done will be established. (91)

Max Eastman remarks with respect to Trotsky's relationship with Lenin:

That was why he [Lenin] concentrated such a wealth of fatherly-spoken counsel upon him in the convention. And that was why, when Trotsky went for some months into the camp of the Mensheviks, Lenin never lost confidence in him, never broke with him, as he did with everyone who he believed had really gone over, consciously or unconsciously, to the side of the enemy. (92)

Eastman, a Trotskyphile, overemphasizes the trust Lenin had in Trotsky. He does point out that the need Trotsky had for a father-surrogate. Trotsky had sublimated his childhood conflicts into a fight against authority. But the diffuseness of those conflicts left him with residual guilt that he never alleviated. His feud with Lenin after the 1903 Party Congress was a manifestation of this hostility.

This broaches the second major question of this study; that is, why Trotsky fell from the height of power,
to the depths of deportation. Wolfenstein submits that there are three plateaus to be reached by a revolutionary in his transition to power. They are: first, the adequacy of his preparation for the period of insurrectionary activity; second, the adjustment to power; and third, the question of succession. Trotsky was maximal in the first stage. He was the undisputed popular leader in the Soviets in 1905 and 1917.

In the second step Trotsky was an utter failure. In his autobiography he claimed that he had never given any thought to the idea of his holding power. This seems unlikely, but it is more probable that he was incapable of holding the supreme position that Lenin did. He was unable to do away with a leader mediating between the followers and his ideals. Furthermore, he did not firmly identify with parental authority himself - a requisite for leadership - because of the poor model his father presented.

Trotsky's inability to work with peers severely handicapped his leadership capabilities. He had a deep sense of shame which made him overly sensitive to criticism. He took disapproval of his policies as a personal affront and felt humiliated. Lashing back at opponents was his means of compensation.

Trotsky's great self-confidence often blinded him to political reality. His logic and swift thinking made him
intolerant of the confusion of others. He held firm in his precepts and followed through his ideas until he had either won an argument or had aroused a wave of protest against himself. When asked what he thought of Stalin as a potential rival, Trotsky answered, "Stalin is the outstanding mediocrity in the party." Trotsky's self-assurance did not allow him to acknowledge that anyone was superior to himself.

Trotsky never had to worry about the succession problem. He was purged and deported by Stalin and assassinated in 1940 in Mexico.

In conclusion, Trotsky realized something of his own nature while writing for the "Eastern Review," when he chose one of his many pseudonyms. It was Antid Oto - the spirit of opposition.
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