

Review Scientific Paper/Pregledni naučni rad  
Paper Submitted/Rad primljen: 15. 10. 2020.  
Paper Accepted/Rad prihvaćen: 24. 6. 2021.  
DOI: 10.5937/SJEM2102081S

UDC/UDK: 005.322:316.75

## **Trocki kao proizvod specifičnog vremena - strategija, liderstvo i kulturalizacija**

Verica Savić<sup>1</sup> Filip Matic<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>American University of MiddleEast, verica.savic@aum.edu.kw

<sup>2</sup>Grinnel College, Iowa,

**Apstrakt:** Cilj rada je da se ispita reputacija Lava Trockog kao vođe strategije koja je nastala tokom turbulentnih godina ruske revolucije. Sa specifičnim rukovodstvom, bio je proizvod specifične epohe, vršio je uticaj na ključne istorijske i kulturne događaje i kao takav bio je predmet istraživanja više od pola veka. Bez njegovih odličnih strateških veština, boljševici možda nikada ne bi došli na vlast. Na kraju je Staljin pobedio Trockog, koji je, zarobljen sopstvenim principima, imao malo političkih veština. Do 1927. isključen iz Partije, do 1929. iz same Rusije, Trocki je izbledeo sa ruske scene. Prognan, konačno je našao podršku u Meksiku, radio je tamo, uticao na Kardenasa i nadrealističke umetnike, napisao mnoge odlične članke, dao ogroman doprinos umetnosti, ali nije mogao da izbegne Staljinovu represiju, završio je ubijen. Rad se prvenstveno zasniva na delima Trockog, njegovih bibliografa kao što su: Ernes, Dimitri, teorija trockizma i nadrealističke kritike. Mapiranjem najznačajnijih teorija pokušali smo da predstavimo ideologiju tog vremena i njen uticaj na politiku i umetnost, kao i na percepciju liderstva. Hipoteza ovog rada je da je Trocki zaista bio proizvod određenog vremena i pozadine, ali da su ga odneli događaji kojima je pomogao da se oslobodi, koji su imali ogroman uticaj na različita polja kulture, doprineli ogromnoj kulturalizaciji.

**Ključne reči:** Trocki, strategija, vođstvo, kultura, umetnost

## **Trotsky as a Product of Specific Time - Strategy, Leadership and Culturalization**

**Abstract:** The aim of the paper is to examine Leon Trotsky's reputation as a strategy leader forged during the turbulent years of the Russian Revolution. Having specific leadership, he was a product of specific era, exerted an influence on the key historic and cultural events, and as such, subject of research for more than half a century. Without his excellent strategic skills, the Bolsheviks might never have come to power. Eventually, Stalin defeated Trotsky, who, trapped by his own principles, had few political skills. By 1927 expelled from the Party, by 1929 from Russia itself, Trotsky faded from the Russian scene. Exiled, he found support finally in Mexico, worked there, influenced Cardenas and surrealist artists, wrote many excellent articles, made enormous contribution to art, but couldn't avoid Stalin repression, ended up murdered.

The paper is primarily based on Trotsky's own writings, his bibliographers like: Ernes, Dimitri, Trotskyism theory and surrealist critiques. By mapping the most significant theories, we tried to present the ideology of that time and its impact on politics and art, same as perception of leadership. The hypothesis of the paper is that Trotsky was indeed a product of specific time and background, but was swept away by events he helped unleash, having a huge impact on various cultural fields, contributed to huge culturalization.

**Key words:** Trotsky, strategy, leadership, culture, art

## 1. Trotsky's background, socialistic insights, and contributions to the Bolshevik Revolution

### Trotsky's background and socialistic insights

As Trotsky (1973) himself used to say "it is not possible to live outside of politics, without politics, any more than one can live without air" (p. 282), he entered politics in his youth, long before he established himself as an immortal leadership icon. Even though his family was decently well off, his extraordinary love for all human beings, and his particular socialistic insights brought him to Marxism. Furthermore, his unique and creative leadership was the last straw that made Bolsheviks prevail and take over the rotting Russian Empire.

Lev Bronstein<sup>3</sup> was born in a remote Jewish-majority village in modern-day Ukraine in 1879. Although coming from a Jewish background, his family spoke a mixture of Russian and Ukrainian language and were not devoted Jews. They were wealthy thus they could afford Lev's pursuit of good education. At an early age of eight, he was sent to Odessa, a major cosmopolitan city at the time. Due to strong influence of both houses of Hapsburg and of Saxe-Coburg, many of Odessa's best schools were taught wide general knowledge, where young Lev learnt French, English, and German. However, the most important part of his stay in Odessa was meeting numerous foreign sailors, merchants, and other labourers. They introduced him to more in-depth Marxism insights, which he opposed at first. By the year 1899, the revolutionary fire burned in him, resulting dropping his pursuit of mathematics degree and he joined the Worker's Union.

The following year the most prominent members of the Union, including him, were arrested. The popular narrative is that Bronstein adapted the surname Trotsky from a jailer that astonished him during his stay in Odessa prison. After having been moved to Moscow prison, his second important strategic stage started as he came into close contact with other revolutionaries and read almost all Lenin's books. Later in 1899, Trotsky was sentenced to exile in Siberia where he became aware how split the Communist party was; one side was just for improvement of workers' situation, other, his side, for *total revolution*<sup>4</sup> and overthrowing the Tsarist government.

After three years Trotsky escaped to Berlin, further developing his ideas about leadership there, then moved to London and joined *Iskra* editors (*Spark* in English) with Lenin and Plekhanov as the most important for his leadership skills development. After quickly demonstrating his immense writing skills, he shortly became one of the papers' leading writers. While Trotsky solely focused on supporting and spreading the revolution, Lenin wanted to utilize his competence in order to gain power over the old guard of *Iskra* and promote him to a full member of the board, an action which Plekhanov fiercely opposed. That moment foreshadows the future where Lenin will showcase better political knowledge and manipulation, while Trotsky is motivated solely by his revolution. The party's Second Congress convened in London in 1903, but shortly after, the pro-*Iskra* delegates split into two fractions: Lenin's Bolsheviks, highly strategically organized and disciplined and Martov's Mensheviks, less disciplined party. Initially Trotsky supported Martov and fell out with Lenin.

However, he quickly left Mensheviks and was non-aligned for many years since he had his own strategic vision and did not want to sacrifice it for any power. Lenin utilized the fact that Trotsky was of Jewish origin to ruin his popularity, calling him *Judas*. In 1905 Russian Empire's internal problems culminated, and the first revolution started. Emancipated peasants were in a poor situation, labour unions and strikes were banned; Russians knowing about freer life in the West wanted a change. Trotsky stated (1973) that he had become head of the Petrograd Soviet after secretly returned to Russia believing that "the power is one social relation between social forces" (p. 59). Using his excellent managing skills, he mobilized the whole middle class against the bourgeoisie. However, people were not ready for the regime change yet and the revolution failed, although it served as a rehearsal for the revolution of 1917.

---

<sup>3</sup>Lev Davidovich Bronstein (7 November 1879 – 21 August 1940) Originally Jewish family given name, later changed to Trotsky by himself.

<sup>4</sup>Jayaprakash Narayan (1902-1979), the great Gandhian socialist raised his famous slogan, *Sampoorn Kranti (Total Revolution)*, in a speech at a huge rally in Patna on June 5, 1974. Many theories and books followed his insight.

### **Trotsky' contributions to the Bolshevik Revolution and Trotsky as military genius**

As a consequence of a failed revolution, Trotsky and other Soviet leaders were trailed (Hutley, 1937) and sentenced again to exile in Siberia, but his military expertise helped him escape during the transportation. After that Trotsky became incredibly popular, showed his talent, well elaborated leadership, and became wildly renowned and read. From 1908 he was *Pravda* editor in chief (*Truth* in English). Lenin agreed to approve financing the paper if a Bolshevik could be added to the editorial board, as he recognized that Trotsky would be a valuable asset for a future revolution.

The Great War erupted suddenly in 1914 (assassinations in Sarajevo, attack on Serbia). No one expected such a massive conflict to become a reality, nor himself as a now world renown leader. For Lenin, Trotsky and all other socialists, the war meant a chance for united struggle. Due to furious anti-war speeches, Trotsky ended up being deported first to Spain, and then to the United States. Eventually he reached Russia again in May 1917 agreed with Bolshevik position and was elected chairman of the Petrograd Soviet in October 1917. In November he personally led the efforts of overthrowing the Provisional Government lead by Kerensky. Even Stalin (1937) noted that "all practical work of the uprising was done under Trotsky" (p. 34). Trotsky led the attack on the Winter Castle, utilizing extreme cruelty towards his enemy because he believed that "smashing, breaking up, and demoralizing enemy forces" (Dmitri, 1997:78) was the only way to ensure victory. Such successes undeniably brought him to be the second man in the party, just after Lenin. In his detailed study Ernest (1979) underlined that after overtaking the government, Trotsky became the chief negotiator in talks with the German Empire, trying to delay negotiations as much as possible, hoping that German and other western workers would rebel themselves. After signing the Peace Treaty, Trotsky resigned as the Commissar for Foreign Affairs and was appointed as the People's Commissar of the Army and Navy Affairs, effectively making him the Head of the Red Army. He identified that current Soviet Army lacked coordination, discipline, and subordination.

Hence, during the whole Civil War Trotsky was transforming the army from many small independent detachments into a larger, homogenous one. Having incredible military skills, previously elaborated, and studied, "Trotsky held discipline highly with compulsory obedience, introduced forced conscription and officers being chosen by the party leadership, not by rank" (Ernest, 1967: 73). The sheer size of Russia and enormous number of armies and combatants tested his organizational skills. He successfully mobilized close to a million men in May - October 1918 believing that death is not scary, especially when it is supported by the history and the base that held the army together was the belief in the revolution. Trotsky managed to overcome the difficulties and win the war through immense strategic military skills.

However, his political advisories, particularly Stalin, just waited for any misstep that came during the Soviet-Polish war. Even though the loss came partly because Stalin refused to obey and Trotsky himself was against the war, wide critique spread. Overall, the Bolsheviks won over in the Civil war because Trotsky introduced numerous new ideas and policies to the red army, such as suppressed political opponents, concentration and labour camps and managing the work of old Tsarist military specialists.

Resuming Trotsky life and career he is typical product of a specific man in one specific time. Immensely intelligent, educated, typically, was a loner, and was not a great team player. After Lenin death in 1924, Stalin utilized such weaknesses and successfully overtook the party and expelled him by 1929. Trotsky believed into ideas of worldwide socialism, while Stalin's ideas were more focused on *Socialism in one country*, an attitude of national self-sufficiency and self-centeredness. The two were not compatible and therefore one had to go. Firstly, Trotsky and his family were exiled to Turkey, soon lost Soviet citizenships, and were forbidden to enter the Soviet Union. Trotsky was dangerous and non-communist countries did not want to accept him out of fear of the revolution in their country. Eventually he managed to go to France and ended up in Mexico. On his journey, Trotsky (1939) observed that revolutions in most of the countries died out because money "transformed their leaders into political agents of the bourgeoisie and of its state" (p. 70).

Although unsurpassed as an academic and military strategic organizer, Trotsky had few political skills. Hence, when Lenin died, he failed to consolidate his power, he was Lenin's intended successor, but was also trapped by his own principles. As a Marxist-Leninist, he believed in the need for collective decision-making in the Party; did not see himself as Russia's paramount leader. Instead of destroying

Stalin when he had the chance, Trotsky debated him on matters of policy and ideology, and was defeated on every front. By 1927 he had been expelled from the Party and by 1929 from Russia itself. Trotsky now faded from the scene and played only a marginal role in the history of his country. Specific time, specific man, specific leadership skills, unique Soviet revolution, great possibility, and great loss. What a powerful Trotskyism thought, what a lack of united managed skills!

## 2. Leon Trotsky strategic thoughts about culture and art

### Trotsky's theory of culture

Leon Trotsky had exceptional range and diversity of the cultural and artistic interest. His contribution (1973) to the theory of culture is highly remarkable, stating that culture is the sum of all knowledge and skills amassed by mankind throughout all its preceding history. "Culture is everything that has been created, built, learned, conquered by man in the course of his entire history, in distinction from what nature has given" (p. 227).

There are two aspects of culture according to Trotsky (1923): material culture and spiritual culture. The first comprises material achievements like tools, machinery, buildings, monuments, includes methods, skills, welcome acquired abilities. Thus, technology is a valuable part of material culture. Spiritual culture as inherited from the past comprises religion, philosophy, science, social sciences, and art. Both forms of culture have passed through a long process of evolution. Class structure of society has inevitably shaped its culture.

Concerning his political writings, the most belong to the period before 1929 and are not available in print now. The available ones belonging to the period 1929-1940 are remarkable for their depth and insight. Three of them (2005, 1965, 1981): *The Permanent Revolution*, *The Revolution Betrayed* and *In Defence of Marxism* constitute the proletarian revolutionaries' theory all over the world. *The History of the Russian Revolution* (2008) written in three volumes is an indispensable account of the event as well as an illustration of the communist method of writing history.

Trotsky (1973) stated that the road to Cultural Revolution was long and hard. "The cultural revolution must not be understood in a superficially idealistic way or something which is an affair for small study groups. It is a question of changing the conditions of life, the methods of work and the everyday habits of a great nation, of a whole family of nations" (p. 246). Cultural Revolution means development of higher morals, too. Therefore, the work of culturizing was a fundamental revolutionary task to him and one of his main strategic points in achieving his goal. He pointed out (Trotsky, 1973) that it was simply impossible to abstract the cultural work from the national and international politics. Proceeding from that stand, he took up: philosophy, library work, religion, social and individual psychology, literature, the role of cinema, the position and prospects of women and the purification of speech, as an instrument of mass initiative. He emphasized that "Socialism, after all, does not consist only in the abolition of the exploiters, but also demands a system of material prosperity, general security, and all-round cultured existence" (1973:85).

Trotsky (1973) noted that no book was useful for everyone arguing that "there must be a correlation between the reader's personal experience, general level of development, and abilities" (p. 295). He stressed that elementary steps in the education of the deprived classes are the eradication of illiteracy, alcoholism, and superstition. Besides, formal educational institutions, newspapers, libraries, worker's clubs and cinema could become the instruments of enlightenment. He (1973) viewed the newspaper not as an "organ telling us about this and that, but as the worker's instrument of education, as a weapon of knowledge, a direct, daily, practical expression of a political and economic activity" (p. 149). He expected the library worker to play the role of a social worker stressing "that library worker is not a library worker of a socialist country if he is simply in charge of a shelf of books" (p. 153). He suggested that the cinema can prove the most powerful and the most democratic instrument in this respect.

Trotsky thoughts (1973) about link of culture and alcoholism are more than unique and a part of an obvious strategic roles that are showing his specific leadership lessons. "For the working masses the struggle against alcoholism is a struggle for physical and spiritual. On daily life of the worker, alcohol snatches a large share of wage earnings and in this way undercuts the advance of culture" (p. 174).

To sum it up, due Trotsky, cultural progress begins with education continues with art and literature, or culture as a strategy. To promote them, it is desirable to permit them freedom as the remedy lies not in the negation but in giving the satisfaction of this desire a higher artistic reality, at the same time making amusement a weapon of collective education. "It can be supplanted by new forms of life, new amusements, new and more cultured theatres" (p. 35).

### **Mexico's leadership period: Trotsky, Rivera, and Surrealist artists**

Trotsky influenced Cardenas's Mexico and Cardenas himself, who was socialist president, highly sympathetic to Trotsky's ideas and under his influence nationalized all important oil industry. Hence Mexico, key nation in that time in American hemisphere, offered a chance for renewed Fourth International, efforts that aimed to rid of Stalinist elements to return it to its original Lenin path.

Ernest Mandel (1979) underlined it was clear that that Soviet Communist Party wanted to sell its own proletariat as to form alliances with the capitalist bureaucracies of Europe and it was him, Trotsky, who realized that reform was no longer possible and that entirely new organization needed to be built. Trotsky saw the key problem in the XX century as "the crisis of mankind is the crisis of the revolutionary leadership of the proletariat" (p.115).

In his essay *Nationalized Industry and Workers' Management* Trotsky (1939) warned that although the Mexican government had made certain concessions toward the proletariat, it was by no means a workers' state free of the heavy pressures of private foreign capital. He argued it remained tied to capitalism, thus, the danger, if any government - union collaboration lay in tendency of union leaders to be swayed by the "apparatus of state capitalism against the interests of their own constituency, transforming those leaders into political agents of the bourgeoisie and of its state" (p.70). In that text he focuses intently on the nature of the Mexican proletariat in relation with Cardenas' government and examines various strategies for creating and maintaining a revolutionary vanguard leadership that would link the Mexican struggle to their international proletarian movements. Offering day to day political strategies, he criticizes Mexico having been stymied in the bourgeoisie phase of its revolution. But the most crucial areas of interest and late critiques are those about culture and agrarian strategies. Trotsky (1939) recognizes that agrarian reform is "the main question in Mexico" (p.76) although he ignored the fact that the Mexican peasantry, not the proletariat, was the historically revolutionary class. He fell into trap for which Gramsci (1971) criticized him of disregarding national differences in the revolutionary potential of various oppressed groups and of homogenizing the international working class. This is the point at which the issue of culture arises. They are not only political and economic specificities that determine differences, but cultural factors as well!

Helena Lewis (1988) underlined that Andre Breton was introduced to the great revolutionary by Diego Rivera, the flamboyant communist leader of Mexican Mural Movement. They drafted together the famous manifest *For an Independent Revolutionary Art* (1938), forming the cultural milieu in which Surrealism and Trotskyism came together. Focus was internationalist under particular scrutiny on both political and cultural levels. It raised questions about subsequent surrealist attitudes toward other cultures. Despite their effort to find a common platform, one that would combine theory and practice, surged fundamental differences in their basic conceptions of imperialistic capitalism and how to combat it to set up a socialistic state. What the manifesto purports to offer, therefore, is in means of judging social freedom by thinking about conditions of artistic production. On the surface, this produced a landmark collaboration between two of the most powerful and innovate interwar schools of thought on social revolution.

For surrealist, the most important thing was that Trotsky was anti-Stalinist and that his 1924 published book *Literature and revolution* (Trotsky, 2008) advocated freedom of cultural expression as necessary to any true proletarian state. Andre Breton restated Trotsky famous dictum "art, must, above all, be judged by its own laws, that is to say the laws of art" when he wrote in 1937. *The Declaration on the Second Moscow Trial*, Breton clearly came around supporting Trotsky against Stalin (Hutley, 1937). He recapitulates Trotsky's analysis of Moscow as a Bonapartist political regime, one that promises to represent the revolutionary energy of the proletariat but in the end concentrates power in a state bureaucracy "determined at all costs to prevent a new revolutionary wave from breaking on the world" (Hutley, 1937: 318-25).

Nevertheless Trotsky (1973) persistently opinions that culture is ultimately a subsidiary issue, while Breton and surrealist conceptualized it as central. Trotsky (1938) argued in *Manifesto for An Independent Revolutionary Art* for centralized socialism in the realm of “productive material forces”, but for anarchism as a theory of cultural production. “No authority, no dictation, not the least trace of orders from above” (p. 185). This sedition marks it clearly that Trotsky could not reconcile Marxism’s commitment to collectivity whit that he thought to be artistic production’s individualist nature. Trotsky focused almost exclusively on the purportedly objective problem of economic exploration, giving little thought exactly how culture or individual agency might actively be incorporated into Marxist’s theory. Trotsky’s Marxism was and remained very orthodox. On the other hand, Breton and Surrealism formed part of a western Marxist tradition that saw true revolution as occurring on the level of culture as much as any other.

Still working closely and influencing mutually, Trotsky organized and managed *IV International* in Mexico, congress took place in Paris, just after Breton returned there and elaborated his essay *Souvenir du Mexico* (1939) with a help of Trotsky. Visibly under his influence Breton wrote “there is at least one country in the world where the wind of liberation has not fallen” (p. 31).<sup>5</sup> Even they edited together manifesto *For an Independent Revolutionary Art* it is obvious that it was elaborated by Breton and edited by Trotsky (Gramsci, 1971).

At the end, collaborative failure between Mexicans and Surrealist was deeply formed not because Surrealism did not conform to a Trotskyist program, but more because surrealism despite its adamant anti-colonialist stance, slid close to a Eurocentric attitude toward culture and social change with respect to Mexico. It soon became clear that Breton’s agenda in addressing Mexican culture and society is quite different than Trotsky’s. Over the time Breton dropped into poetic prose that conceptualized historical time. He privileged Mexican culture over European. On almost all levels, Trotsky’s tactics and approaches differ considerably from Breton’s. Trotsky’s materialism opposes Breton’s reformulated Hegelian dialectics. The insights differ substantially between the two. Trotsky’s rationalism of matter of facts, almost scientific political discourses, insistent focus on the immediate present were getting away from international surrealist and local Mexican artists point of view.

### **Trotsky - Tragic hero**

Trotsky was classical tragic hero as his biography and work show. His primary tragic insights are visible in his theory about *Permanent revolution* (2005) as well during his journeys thru Europe, like tragic figure Odyssey, wandering around, forced to live that way, escaping from danger. In his earlier mentioned here texts, evidently, consistent struggle one should embrace, inner and strategic, is seen on a greatest scale. Already tragic figure, Trotsky produced in 1923 two renowned books: *The problems of Everyday life and The Literature and the Revolution* (1973, 2008). Critical analysis shows that he was big reader and writer, reading and writing in libraries and prison. Sentence “No better product than one well written book on a whole civilization” (p. 48) is evoking his main attitude. *My life* (1973), is written in Turkey while exiled, as well as *History of the Russian Revolution*.

Evidently Trotsky is one of the most valuable historical figures of XX century, but very tragic hero, the typical one representative as it used to say old saying” The Revolutions eat their own children.” Trotsky himself did not believe on predestination, although he faced historic drama without precedents. Hence being such a tragic figure and one of the most eminent XX century erudite, he influenced many artistic works, essays, articles, predominated tragedy genre. His contribution is visible in surrealist work of Breton and Mexican poet Octavio Paz<sup>6</sup>, in which work tragedy insight can be noted in depth. Guillermo Cabrera Infante<sup>7</sup> (1981) said in *Tres Tristes Tigres* that he was “prophet of one heretic religion: messiah and heretic in one unique entity” (p. 77). He lived in the midnight of XX century, during dark time as Hannah Arendt (1951) called 1930’s of XX century. Another important contribution is made by modern Cuban writer Leonardo Padura Fuentes (2013) who wrote a novel named *The man who loved the dogs*, based on Trotsky life, translated over the world.

---

<sup>5</sup>Betrayed revolutions: Soviet Union, Germany, China, and Spain.

<sup>6</sup>Octavio Paz (1914-1998) was a Mexican poet and diplomat. For his body of work, he was awarded the 1981 Miguel de Cervantes Prize, the 1982 Neustadt International Prize for Literature, and the 1990 Nobel Prize in Literature.

<sup>7</sup>Guillermo Cabrera Infante (1929- 2005) was a Cuban exiled erudite novelist, essayist, translator, screenwriter, and critic.

Even so tragic, Trotsky's texts shed light, offering one optimistic attitude toward the future, in terms of history, although only one small part of the world intellectuals assumed it. Today, from every corner of the world they admire him, exiled tragic Jewish erudite, as he wrote dozens of books and hundreds of articles offering the most valuable clues to comprehend that present history. Trotsky was speaking more than 5 languages. His international vision, his cosmopolitan culture, analysis of coming fascism in Germany, tragedy of Spanish revolution involved in Civil war, decadency of British imperialism, bureaucratization of Soviet Union in *Where does Russia go?* (Trotsky, 1927), Chinese communism, and many more, made him eternal figure.

## Conclusion

Trotsky was undoubtedly the foremost brilliant intellect propelled to prominence by the Russian Revolution, outdistancing Lenin, and other theoreticians both within his leadership style, the range of his interests and within the imaginativeness of his perceptions. He was an indefatigable worker, a rousing orator, and a decisive administrator. On the opposite hand, Trotsky was not successful as a pacesetter of men, partly because he allowed his brilliance and arrogance to antagonize the lesser lights within the communist movement. Maybe he lethally undermined himself when he turned into a Bolshevik in 1917, subjecting himself to Lenin's authority and tolerating the strategies for fascism that he had subsequently denounced. Had Trotsky won the battle to succeed Lenin, the character of the Soviet system would more likely be different, especially in strategy, social arrangement, and consequently in the degree of terroristic suppression. Trotsky's failure, however, seemed to be almost predictable, considering his own qualities and therefore the conditions of authoritarian rule by the Communist Party organization.

Resuming Trotsky figure could be stated that being politically defeated by Stalin is the clue to the Socialistic tragedy of the XX century. It was not typical political dispute, discussion, it was chasing and torturing him, and their direct, strategic and academic fight, was the key role of antagonism in terms of understanding the socialistic process. Trotsky murdered by worse but stronger character, and Russia became isolated, is something even previously seen in Marxist theory, as per Isaac Deutscher (2015). Although, in return, his personality, figure, and brilliant mind are still alive. His books now are even more read, reedited, and translated as he became the epic political reference for a new generation of leaders and political science. His global vision of capitalism, his cosmopolitan conception of culture, his diverse dialogues with distinguished avant-garde schools in Soviet Union around 20's XX century (Russian formalism, constructivism, futurism), with psychoanalysis, surrealist, made him eternal key role of leader and writer (Dmitri, 1997).

It was the biggest clash of the theory and real life. After Trotsky's life, *norm* and *reality* even turned out more drastically. Continuation of XX century did not look like even at the smallest scale as Trotsky could imagine: final solution, atomic bomb, new world order made in Yalta... IV International failed, with the new, not envisioned, reality after Second World War. We hardly can imagine what Trotsky could contribute with his erudite insight and unique leadership skills.

## References

1. Arendt, H. (1951). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Amazon. Kindle Edition.
2. Breton, A. (1939). Souvenir du Mexique, *Minotaure REVUE*, n 12-13.
3. Breton, A., Rivera, D. (1938). Manifesto for an Independent Revolutionary Art. *International Federation of Independent Revolutionary Art*. Mexico. FIARI.
4. Deutscher, I. (2015). *The Prophet: The Life of Leon Trotsky*. Madrd: Verso.
5. Fuentes, L. P. (2013). *El hombre que amaba a los perros*. Madrid: Tusquets Editores.
6. Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebook*. New York: Nowel Smith.
7. Hutley, F., C. (1937). The Moscow Trials, *The Australian Quarterly* Vol. 9, No. 2 , pp. 77-86. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20629435>. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20629435>
8. Infante, G. C. (1981). *Tres tristes Tigres*. Barcelona: Seix Barral.
9. Lewis, H. (1988). *The Politics of Surrealism*. New York: Paragon House.
10. Mandel, E. (1979). *Trotsky: A study in the Dynamic of His Thought*. London: New Left Book.
11. Stalin, J. (1937). The road to power. *PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements*.392. <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/prism/392>
12. Trotsky, L. (1927). Where does Russia go? *The Collected Writings of Leon Trotsky: Trotsky Internet Archive*. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/works/index.htm>

13. Trotsky, L. (1939). Nationalized Industry and Workers' Management. *The Collected Writings of Leon Trotsky: Trotsky Internet Archive*.  
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/works/index.htm>
14. Trotsky, L. (1965). *The Revolution Betrayed*. New York: Merit Publishers.
15. Trotsky, L. (1973). *Problems of Everyday Life*. New York: Monad Press.
16. Trotsky, L. (1974). The Bonapartist Philosophy of The State. *Writings of Leon Trotsky, 1938-39* (pp. 318-250). New York: Pathfinder Press.
17. Trotsky, L. (1981). *In Defense of Marxism*. New York: Pathfinder.
18. Trotsky, L. (2005). *The Permanent Revolution, Results and Prospects*. New Delhi: Aaker Books.
19. Trotsky, L. (2008). *Literature and Revolution*. First Kindle Edition. Amazon.
20. Trotsky, L. (2008). *History of the Russian Revolution*. London: Haymarket Books, Max Eastman (Translator), Ahmed Shawki (Introduction).  
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/works/index.htm#a1901>
21. Trotsky, L. & Paul, N., S. (1972). *Art and Revolution: Writings on Literature, Politics, and Culture*. New York: Pathfinder Press.
22. Volkogonov, D. (1997). *Trotsky: The Eternal Revolutionary*. London: Harper Collins.