

---

# War and Memory: Trotsky's War Correspondence from the Balkan Wars

Maria TODOROVA\*

## Abstract

*Based on a critical reading of Trotsky's celebrated *The War Correspondence*, this article addresses the complex links between war and memory. It offers a detailed analysis of the correspondence, arguing for its present relevance in several aspects, beyond its polemical brilliance: firstly, its detailed information and personal evaluation of the socialist movement in the Balkans; secondly, its testimonies of wounded officers, soldiers, and prisoners of war, reproduced in extenso, in combination with interviews with politicians, serve as a rarely preserved primary source. The article considers *The War Correspondence's* formative significance on Trotsky himself by juxtaposing it with his later autobiography and political activities, and follows his evolution from a passionate defender of liberalism to one of its most bitter opponents. It finally utilises the distinction between *lieux* and *milieu de mémoire* to comment on the present memory of wars and the centenary of the Balkan Wars.*

## Key Words

Trotsky, Balkan Wars, memory, war, socialism, liberalism.

## Introduction

In the fall of 1912, Trotsky was sent from Vienna to the Balkans as a military correspondent of *Kievskaya Mysl* to cover the events of the Balkan Wars under the pen name Antid Oto. Trotsky, born Lev Davidovich Bronstein, had escaped from his exile after the 1905 Russian Revolution and by 1907 had settled in Vienna. Most of his efforts were spent on reuniting the different Menshevik and Bolshevik factions in exile. From 1908 until 1912 he published the hugely popular *Pravda* (not to be confused with the later Leninist *Pravda*), which was smuggled into Russia.<sup>1</sup> He also contributed to the Bolshevik (*Proletary*) and the Menshevik (*Luch*) papers, as well as to German and Belgian socialist periodicals. However, he earned his living, supporting his family as well as *Pravda* (co-edited and co-financed by Adolph Joffe and Matvey Skobelev), almost exclusively from the articles that he contributed to *Kievskaya Mysl*. At the time, this was the paper with the largest circulation in Kiev, and the most popular

---

\* Professor of History at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

liberal and leftist paper in the south of Russia. Trotsky wrote on diverse topics, from Ibsen, Maupassant and Nietzsche to the plight of the Russian peasantry. He jestingly coined the pen name Antidoto, having stumbled across the Italian word ‘antidoto’, in order to ‘inject the Marxist antidote into legitimate [sic] newspapers’.<sup>2</sup>

From October 1912 until November 1913, Trotsky wrote several dozen articles published in *Kievskaya Mysl* as well as in *Luch* and *Den*. These correspondences, supplemented by some additional articles as well as a few unpublished items from his archive, appeared in book form in 1926 as the sixth of the twelve volumes of his uncompleted *Sochineniya* [Works], published between 1924 and 1927.<sup>3</sup> The original title of volume six was ‘The Balkans and the Balkan War’ [*Balkany i balkanskaia voina*] and it was part of the second sub-series ‘On the Historical Threshold’ [*Pered istoricheskim rubezhom*] of his collected works. The editorial introduction of the 1924 volume provided a brief historical background of the Eastern Question and grouped Trotsky’s writing in three parts: the first- ‘On the Threshold of War’ [*U poroga voiny*] - comprising articles written between 1908 and 1912; the second on the war itself [*Voina*]; the third dedicated to post-war Romania [*Poslevoennaia Rumynia*]. This volume

was translated into English only in 1980 under the slightly misleading title *The War Correspondence of Leon Trotsky. The Balkan Wars 1912-13*, highlighting the second (and, granted, the largest) part. It was reprinted in 1993 to great acclaim as a primary source on the Balkans, at the height of the Wars for the Yugoslav Succession, named the Third Balkan War.<sup>4</sup> *The War Correspondence* has been hailed as a masterpiece, and Isaac Deutscher compared Trotsky’s experience ‘as a conscientious military correspondent [that] would one day be of use to the founder of the Red Army’ to Edward Gibbon’s experience as a Captain of the Hampshire Grenadiers, which he utilised as a historian of the Roman Empire.<sup>5</sup>

When, seventeen years later, in 1929, Trotsky penned his autobiography in Istanbul, he reiterated the significance of his experience: ‘In many respects, this was an important preparation not only for 1914, but for 1917 as well.’<sup>6</sup> Yet he devoted barely a page and a half to this episode, and did not explain in any depth what it was that was so significant about it. He summarised his articles in one sentence as an ‘attack on the falsity of Slavophilism, on chauvinism in general, on the illusions of war, on the scientifically organised system for duping public opinion’, and on Bulgarian atrocities against wounded and captured

Turks, which put him at odds with the Russian liberal press. This, then, encapsulated Trotsky's memory of his Balkan experience. While he cautioned that 'memory is not an automatic reckoner' and 'never disinterested', he was somewhat disingenuous about the stated deficiencies in his memories of different types. He claimed that his topographical and musical memories were weak, his visual and linguistic memories fairly mediocre, but his memory for ideas considerably above average.<sup>7</sup> In fact, only some of his earlier ideas persisted, i.e., were remembered, only the ones that did not contradict the narrative persona that was constructed to make sense of his memory. His brilliant, biting and not always fair attacks on liberals, both in *The War Correspondence* and especially in *My Life*,<sup>8</sup> neatly omitted the liberal persona he himself inhabited in 1912.

*The War Correspondence* moves from analytical pieces to impressionistic dispatches, to what *de facto* amounts to interviews, and to political portraits. There are excellent surveys of the internal economic, social and political situation in each of the belligerent countries (Serbia, Bulgaria, the Ottoman Empire after the Young Turk Revolution, and Romania) as well as their mutual relations; a prescient section on the Armenian Question; colourful and well-informed portraits of

a whole array of politicians and literary figures (Nikola Pašić, Lazar Paču, Stojan Novaković, Constantin Dobrogeanu-Gherea, Christian Rakovsky, Andranik Ozanian); in-depth analyses of great power- especially Russian- diplomacy and its aims in the Balkans. Trotsky is especially informative on the state of social democracy in these countries, in particular Bulgaria, where the socialist parties were strong. His descriptions of and conversations with wounded soldiers and officers as well as with prisoners of war are heart-rending. He also writes powerfully on the larger framework of the War, describing in detail the feelings in the rear, the queues, the anticipation and the fear. Throughout, his prose shines with vitality, often with verbal brilliance, especially when his polemicist temperament is challenged.

---

Trotsky welcomed the 1908 revolution and the newly convened parliament, but in a succinct and prescient analysis clearly described the fault lines between centralisers and federalists.

---

And still, one wonders what is left of these articles today, one hundred years after they were written? While the analyses are interesting, do they have a

cognitive significance aside from their historical value of being written by such a major figure as Trotsky? Are they more informative than the dispatches of dozens of other war correspondents of major European papers? Were they revolutionary in their analysis even at the time? Apart from being a testimony to Trotsky's rhetorical and polemical brilliance, would we care to go back to them? Some people actually did go back to them in the 1990s, in order to find confirmation of their often completely opposing political preferences or prejudices.<sup>9</sup>

There are three aspects that make them interesting and relevant today. One is the very detailed information and personal evaluation that Trotsky gives of the socialist movement in the Balkans at the time. This, to my knowledge, has been little if at all utilised. Secondly, there are the several sections made from testimonies of wounded Bulgarian officers and soldiers, as well as witness accounts of Turkish prisoners of war, reproduced *in extenso* as quotes. There are also lengthy citations from the interviews with politicians. Lastly, there is the question of *The War Correspondence's* formative significance on Trotsky himself as well as the question of memory in general, which is the principal topic of this article. What is most striking (and unexpected) about the tenor of Trotsky's

war correspondence is the curious mix of conventional Marxist dogma, Russian revolutionary patriotism with notes of great power condescendence and, most surprisingly, classical liberal posturing reminiscent of this undying breed in praise of Western civilisation.

The first section of the volume provides the background to the Balkan Crisis of 1912 by collecting Trotsky's newspaper articles on the Young Turk Revolution of 1908, as well as on issues of Balkan social democracy (mostly on the Bulgarian but also partly on the Serbian case). The two articles on the Ottoman Empire ['The Turkish Revolution and the Tasks of the Proletariat' and 'The New Turkey'] came out in *Pravda* (# 2, 17/30 December 1908) and *Kievskaya Mysl* (#3, 3 January 1909). Turkey, this 'hornet's nest of the Near East' had been a tyrannical state 'from times immemorial';<sup>10</sup> it was unreformable, the epitome of backwardness, stagnation and despotism. Its industrial development was obstructed because of the Sultan's fear of the proletariat;<sup>11</sup> had they read his writing, the Young Turks would have been surprised to learn that their 1908 revolution was 'the most recent echo of the Russian Revolution' [of 1905], which caused a fiery surge of proletarian movements in Western Europe and woke up the peoples of Asia.<sup>12</sup>

Otherwise, Trotsky welcomed the 1908 revolution and the newly convened parliament, but in a succinct and prescient analysis clearly described the fault lines between centralisers and federalists. What to him was the only desirable solution for the Eastern Question – a democratic Turkey as the basis of a larger Balkan federation on the model of Switzerland or the United States of America- was passionately opposed by the Young Turks. Nevertheless, in these articles Trotsky primarily exposed the stance of the Russian government concerning the fate of the Serbs living under the Austrian occupation and annexed by Austria-Hungary in 1908. The tsarist government used liberal Slavophilism as a fig leaf to legitimise its imperial ambitions and Trotsky rightly pointed out that fellow Slavs, like the Poles, were faring far worse under Russian rule than the Serbs under Austrian rule.

Trotsky's writings on the Balkans and his war dispatches shed important light on the socialist tradition in the south-eastern margins of Europe during the period of the Second International. Trotsky was no stranger to the region, having been sent there on several occasions, among others on an unsuccessful mission of the Socialist International, alongside Krístiu (Christian) Rakovsky and Camille Huysmans, to mend the split within the socialists' ranks.<sup>13</sup> Trotsky

was particularly close to Bulgarian social democrats and lavished praise on their activities, especially their press and other publications. Most recently he had been the Russian delegate to the congress of the Bulgarian Social Democratic Workers' Party (the 'Narrows') in July 1910 in Sofia. He heaped praise on the Bulgarian socialists who used the occasion to invite delegates from several Slavic social democratic parties- Poles, Russians, Serbs, Czechs and Ruthenians- as a counterweight to the all-Slav congress, this 'all-Slav comedy',<sup>14</sup> that had been convened a couple of weeks earlier in Sofia. They not only demonstrated that there were two Bulgarias, two Serbias, two Russias – the one reactionary-dynastic, the other revolutionary-proletarian, but also showed that 'the only way out of the national state of chaos and the bloody confusion of Balkan life is a union of the peoples of the peninsula in a single economic and political entity, underpinned by national autonomy of the constituent parts'.<sup>15</sup> This was the only way to rebuff the 'shameless pretensions of tsarism and European imperialism' and enjoy the advantages of a common market of the Balkans.<sup>16</sup>

That a common market was the best solution came from the antipathy Trotsky shared with (or derived directly from) Marx and Engels towards *Kleinstaaterei*, especially the

*Kleinstaaterei* of the southern Slavs. His derision of the ‘Lilliputians’, the ‘dwarf states’, the ‘broken fragments of Balkan Slavdom’, and the ‘broken pieces’ of the Balkan Peninsula, could be assuaged only if they unified in a federal republic in order to create a common Balkan market as a precondition for industrial development.<sup>17</sup> The Balkan countries that he depicted in detail- Serbia and Bulgaria -were backward, and the trope of backwardness was ubiquitous: there was a ‘lag in Bulgaria’s historical development’, they had a low level of social differentiation,<sup>18</sup> their literatures lacked tradition and were unable to develop their internal continuities, their cultures were ‘obliged to assimilate the ready-made products that European civilisation had developed’,<sup>19</sup> their bourgeoisie, like the bourgeoisie in backward countries in general, was not organic,<sup>20</sup> and, worse, ‘it had not yet managed to throw off its Asiatic features’.<sup>21</sup> Sitting on the train to Belgrade, Trotsky comments derisively on the ‘multilingual, motley, culturally and politically confused East, ...an Austro-Hungaro-Balkan International!’<sup>22</sup> The Bulgarian peasant democracy was primitive, because it was ‘rooted in elemental relations of everyday life, like our own Russian village community’.<sup>23</sup> Trotsky knew very little about the ‘peasant question’ in Bulgaria but

assumed it followed the Russian model.<sup>24</sup> It gave him, however, an opening to ridicule the Narodnik utopia of a direct way to socialism.

Though much of his portraits of Balkan politicians were witty, they were deeply marred by his contempt for their peasant origins. In his subtle evaluation of Nikola Pašić as a politician, Trotsky insisted that he was primitive, since he spoke German, Russian and French badly,<sup>25</sup> and Trotsky felt very much his superior. In his autobiography, as in many of his articles, Trotsky constantly fended off criticisms of his attitude towards the peasantry. In *Moja zhizn*, he emphatically denounced the allegation that in 1905 he had ignored the peasantry.<sup>26</sup> It is instructive, therefore, to read the unpublished memoirs of a Bulgarian activist of the agrarian party (BANU-Bulgarian Agrarian National Union), Khristo Stoianov, a lawyer and later minister of the interior in 1923 during the time of Alexander Stamboliiski’s agrarian regime, who found refuge in Yugoslavia after the regime’s fall. Back in Bulgaria, following World War I, he was active in the left agrarian movement, which, however, opposed the communists. In the period preceding the Balkan Wars, he had been in charge of closely observing the rival activities of the social democrats in the villages, and he was fairly well acquainted

with Krístiu (Christian) Rakovsky, Trotsky's close friend and collaborator. During the war, when Stoianov served as an officer, he spotted Trotsky, who had missed the train to Çorlu (present-day Turkey), at a provincial railway station. Stoianov invited Trotsky to his tent, and Trotsky stayed there for eight days. Trotsky gave lectures on the workers movement, on the Second International, on Jules Guedes, Jean Jaurès, August Bebel, Emile Vandervelde. Stoianov remarked: 'Trotsky could not bear to be contradicted. He did not like the peasant movements and did not recognise the peasantry as a class. We did not contradict him. We were buying, not selling.'<sup>27</sup>

---

Comparing the stories of wounded soldiers and prisoners, Trotsky remarked that their views were extremely subjective and prone to simplistic generalisations, since they had seen only a small patch of the battlefield and had no idea of the complex strategic operations.

---

The most astonishing thing about Trotsky's war correspondence was that he actually did not see the heat of war; journalists as a rule were not allowed on the front line. The value of his dispatches comes from the witness accounts he took

from officers and soldiers, but also from interviewing prisoners of war: 'We have to form our picture of the life and death of the army on the battlefields through interrogating participants, with the bias this inevitably implies'.<sup>28</sup> Some of his informers were casual acquaintances, but most often they came from his own social-democratic circles, 'men of high principle who had proved their personal courage and high character both in their political struggle and on the battlefield', and Trotsky gave their accounts greater credence.<sup>29</sup>

The evaluation of these texts as a rare primary source is somewhat delicate. That most are not attributed, given the restrictions of wartime, is understandable. We read about 'A Wounded Man's Story', 'An Officer's Story', 'Two Monologues' about the political parties and the war, 'Among Officers and Prisoners', direct quotes 'From the Stories of Participants', 'Conversation with a Bulgarian Statesman', 'Behind the Curtain's Edge', but all of these sources remain anonymous. It is unclear whether the large amount of direct quotes can be taken literally in a period when journalists did not go around with tape recorders and Trotsky explicitly states that he did not know stenography.<sup>30</sup> Some of the testimonies are suspiciously well crafted, almost philosophical. They display an educated authorship, either

Trotsky's own or of some of his Bulgarian comrades. In any case, although they are a rare glimpse into the genuine voices of the time, they should be used with a proper dose of scepticism.

The subsequent two world wars have produced such an enormous amount of literature (both documentary and fictional), which illuminates all aspects of war at the front and in the rear that Trotsky's dispatches, while extraordinarily moving, can add little in terms of knowledge about war trauma, atrocities, the psychology of the soldiers and so on. Yet when they appeared at the time, the detailed first-hand accounts must have been a rarity. Being Russian, Trotsky had no difficulty understanding Bulgarian and Serbian but, more importantly, he constantly had with him some socialist friend who would be his interpreter, and often his informer. In fact, a few of the articles in the volume are not dispatches, but fragments from *Sketches of Bulgarian Political Life* by Trotsky and Khristo Kabakchiev,<sup>31</sup> a book to a great extent authored by Kabakchiev, which was published in 1923.<sup>32</sup>

Comparing the stories of wounded soldiers and prisoners, Trotsky remarked that their views were extremely subjective and prone to simplistic generalisations, since they had seen only a small patch of the battlefield and had no idea of

the complex strategic operations. There was, however, one significant difference. While the Turkish prisoners of war were already demoralised from the outset of the war, 'the Bulgarian soldier regarded this war as necessary and just, as his own war... The terrible burden of militarism is accepted by every Bulgarian, right down to the most ignorant peasant, as a burden that has been placed on Bulgaria's shoulders *by Turkey*... For the ordinary man in Bulgaria, therefore, the concept of Turkey combines the Turkish tyrant, official and landlord of yesterday, with today's oppressor of his Macedonian brethren, and, finally, with the primary cause of the burden of taxation in Bulgaria itself'.<sup>33</sup>

Heartbreaking are the accounts given by Christian soldiers (Greeks, Bulgarians and Armenians) in the Ottoman army. On the one hand, they complained of constant abuse by their Muslim superiors.<sup>34</sup> On the other hand, their inclusion in the army 'inevitably destroyed the belief that Islam is the one and only moral bond between the state and the army, thereby introducing the gravest spiritual uncertainty into the mind of the Muslim soldier'.<sup>35</sup>

Standing out among the articles is 'An Officer's Story' which came from Trotsky's archive and was first published in this volume. The six printed pages are

extremely well written and are presented as a single quote. This could be the diary of a highly educated Bulgarian officer, who may have given it to Trotsky. It gives an account of the Bulgarian army's advance to Lüle Burgas, and the discrepancy between military theory and practice. It gives a disturbing depiction of being wounded and expecting death, and is full of incisive psychological reflections on fear:

Fear? You feel no fear while you are fighting- that is, when you are actually under fire. Before and after, though, you are extremely frightened- it's the same sort of fear that you feel, even if not so badly, when you have to sit for an examination, or make a speech in public. [...] Fear vanished completely, and its place is taken after a certain time by indifference. Cowards and high-strung men sometimes have sudden moments when they seem quite heroic...

Fear, as an acute response to mortal danger, disappears, but through the whole organism, through all your muscles and bones, there spreads a languor of fatigue. You are dreadfully, unbearably, infernally tired... As every day draws to its close you think: this is the end, things can't go on like this any more. But then another day passes, and another. You find yourself longing for the sight of the enemy.<sup>36</sup>

Trotsky exposed the horrors of war and the atrocities committed by the allied forces of Serbs and Bulgarians.<sup>37</sup> While he did not doubt that the Greeks and the Turks committed comparable massacres (and he did give appropriate accounts),

he protested that the Russian Slavophile press ignored the reports of Bulgarian and Serbian acts of violence and wrote only of the rest.<sup>38</sup> His indignation was strongly argued, especially when he defended himself against accusations of not having checked the smallest of details:

But however little and insufficient my knowledge, am I not obliged to raise my voice in protest to the Russian press? Is a journalist a prosecutor drawing up an indictment on the basis of investigation of all the conditions and circumstances of the crime committed? Is a journalist an historian who calmly waits for materials to accumulate so as to be able, in due course, to put them in order? Is a journalist only a belated bookkeeper of events? Doesn't his very description come from the word journal, meaning a diary? Doesn't he take upon himself obligations towards the very next day?<sup>39</sup>

This was a passionate and eloquent manifesto on the duties of moral journalism. And yet there was some truth in the allegation by Ivan Kirillovich, a Kadet, scientist and journalist, when he exclaimed listening to Trotsky: 'For you, it seems history exists for one purpose only, in order to demonstrate the illusoriness, reactionariness and harmfulness of Slavophilism.'<sup>40</sup>

Trotsky was especially livid about the Bulgarian military censorship, which wanted to 'keep from the eyes of Europe's reading public all facts and comments which [...] might show the seamy side of

any department of Bulgarian social life whatsoever, whether connected to the war or not.<sup>741</sup> Several times he successfully challenged the censors, explaining that he was reporting on issues removed from purely military matters. He wrote several fiery articles against the stupidity of the censorship and the compliant press which 'is tuned to make a cheerful sound', while the 'opponents of the war have been reduced to complete silence.'<sup>742</sup> Trotsky's particular vitriol was directed towards the chief military censor Simeon Radev, whom he described as a 'former anarchist' greedy for power, 'a thoroughly demoralised creature', 'a vulgar careerist', who did everything 'his uncouth nature is capable of to poison the existence of the European journalists who were obliged to have dealings with him.'<sup>743</sup> He wrote also against his erstwhile acquaintance Petko Todorov,<sup>744</sup> a romantic poet who only two years earlier had stood next to Trotsky protesting the Pan-Slav Congress in Sofia and now participated alongside other intellectuals in imposing the military censorship.

Trotsky's blanket pontification on the war censorship, in a rhetoric almost as if lifted from present-day liberal think-tanks, provoked the wrath of Petko Todorov, who sent him a letter that Trotsky published in *Kievskaya Mysl* on 30 November 1912 alongside his own response. Todorov

protested that 'all reproaches that you level against Bulgarian democrats, and me in particular, are due to the misunderstanding that constantly arises between us and the Russians who come to Bulgaria, and which results from the facts that all of you, to employ a splendid Russian saying, try to apply your own rule in someone else's monastery.'<sup>745</sup> In a style paralleling Trotsky's own liberal pathos, he further extolled Bulgaria's democratic traditions, its constitutionalism, rule of law and civic discipline. In a war that had been viewed widely as a patriotic enterprise, even by the anti-war parties and individuals,<sup>746</sup> foremost among them the socialists and the agrarians, Todorov saw his participation as the fulfilment of his duty as a citizen: 'Just as hundreds of thousands of my fellow countrymen have been sent, some to fight at Çatalca, others to besiege Odrin, so I have been placed in a position where I am entrusted with the safeguarding of our task of liberation from all those conscienceless spies and marauders with whom the press organs of Europe's usurers have now inundated our country.'<sup>747</sup> He further accused Trotsky of irresponsibility and intransigence and contrasted this to a sense of proportion, which was the most valuable legacy bestowed by the Ancient World: 'You see how far we Bulgarians are from your Russian flight from responsibility. We, unlike you, see in this

the very foundation of our civic spirit, and it is with this sentiment that we, like European democracy, seek to secure our rights as men and citizens. Similarly alien to us is your uncompromising attitude, which we are inclined to see as an anomaly that has been fortified in you by the regime under which you are obliged to live without rights; though also, it seems to me, behind this intransigence of yours, you hide from yourself your social impotence and lack of any practical sense.<sup>48</sup>

Trotsky dismissed this as 'a very primitive level of political culture.'<sup>49</sup> He confronted Todorov with the crimes committed by the Bulgarian army 'that must evoke shudders and nausea in every cultured person, in everyone capable of feeling and thinking.'<sup>50</sup> He further detailed the atrocities: the destruction by artillery fire of a Pomak village with its entire population; the killing of prisoners and of the peaceful Turkish inhabitants of Dimotika; the particularly heinous deeds of the Macedonian Legion; the corpses lying on the roads of the victorious army; the stabbing to death of wounded Turkish soldiers in the fields with the knowledge and under the orders of Bulgarian commanders. All of this he had learned from the returning Bulgarian officers and soldiers who had told him these stories with 'complete frankness [...] turning their eyes away'.<sup>51</sup>

Some told the stories of stabbing to death wounded men and shooting prisoners 'with instinctive disgust, others "in passing" and indifferently, yet others with conscious moral indignation'.<sup>52</sup> Trotsky's indictment was as harsh as it was just:

You, the radical, the poet, the humanist, not only did not yourself remind your army that, besides sharp bayonets and well-aimed bullets, there exist also the human conscience and that doctrine of Christ in whose name you are alleged to be waging your war – no, you also tied the hands of us European journalists behind our backs, and placed your military censor's jackboot on our chest! Light-heartedly you put on your poet's head a uniform cap with a censor's cockade in it you assumed responsibility to and for your general staff, to and for your diplomacy, to and for your monarchy. Whether your red pencil contributed much to the extension of Bulgaria's frontiers, I don't know. But that the Bulgarian intelligentsia was a fellow traveller, and therefore an accomplice in all those fearful deeds with which this war will for a long time yet, perhaps decades, poison the soul of your people - that will remain an indelible fact that you will be helpless to alter or to delete from the history of your country. Your public life is still only in its cradle. Elementary political and moral concepts have as yet not been established among you. All the more obligatory is it for the advanced elements of your people to watch intransigently over the principles of democracy, the politics and morality of democracy.<sup>53</sup>

Was this one of the important lessons Trotsky carried over into preparations for

1914 and for 1917? He clearly shared this state of mind at the beginning of the Great War in 1914. Immediately after the end of the Balkan War, he commented that civilisation inspires the false confidence that 'the main thing in human progress has already been achieved- and then war comes, and reveals that we have not yet crept out on all fours from the barbaric period in our history'.<sup>54</sup> This was the viewpoint of the peacetime liberal habitus Trotsky inhabited at the time in Vienna, and it came in a period when he was enamoured by a modernising and civilising pathos. Deutscher describes this stage as the mission of all Marxists to 'Europeanise' Russian socialism, but each fighting faction followed its own way. This cry to Europeanisation came most naturally from Trotsky, as the most 'European' of the Russian émigrés, according to Deutscher.<sup>55</sup> To the surprise of Deutscher, his close ties were not to Luxemburg, Liebknecht or Mehring, 'but to the men of the centre group'.<sup>56</sup> He continued his internationalist stance as one of the leaders of the Zimmerwald movement. As legend has it, Karl Kraus, when told that Trotsky organised the Red Army and saved the revolution, exclaimed: 'Who would have expected that of Herr Bronstein from Café Central!'<sup>57</sup>

This state of mind was in apparent contrast to another celebrated war

correspondent of the Balkan Wars, Filippo Tommaso Marinetti (1876-1944). The author of the 1909 'Futurist Manifesto' was the war correspondent of the Parisian daily *L'Intransigeant*. Before that he had covered the Italo-Turkish War in Libya (1911). Arriving in Sofia, he seems to have had much better luck than Trotsky, because not only was he allowed on the front, but he was flown in an aeroplane during the siege of Adrianople (November 1912 - March 1913). He had already been aware of the new role of aerial war during the bombing of Ain Zara in Libya in 1911, the first use of aeroplanes in war. The following year, the Bulgarian army experimented with air-dropped bombs and conducted the first night bombing on 7 November 1912. As a result, Marinetti started looking at 'objects from a new point of view, no longer head on or from behind, but straight down, foreshortened; that is, I was able to break apart the old shackles of logic and the plumb lines of the ancient way of thinking'.<sup>58</sup> In 1912 he published his 'Technical Manifesto of Futurist Literature' in which he promoted *parole in libertà* (words-in-freedom), foregrounding sound and sensation over meaning. He himself said that words-in-freedom were born in the battlefields of Tripoli and Adrianople. Marinetti's experience in Adrianople inspired him to start working on a visual

and verbal account, a combination of letters, pictures and sound, whose very title – *Zang Tumb Tumb: Adrianople 1912: Words in Freedom* – evoked the sounds of bombs, artillery shells and explosions. He finished his work in 1913 and performed it in London, Paris, Berlin, Moscow and St. Petersburg, before publishing it in 1914.<sup>59</sup>

For Marinetti, neither the Balkan Wars, nor the ensuing First World War were a rupture. Already in the 'Futurist Manifesto' Marinetti had proclaimed that 'We want to glorify war- the only cure of the world- militarism, patriotism, the destructive gesture of the anarchists, the beautiful ideas which kill, and contempt for woman. We want to demolish museums, libraries, fight morality, feminism and all opportunism and utilitarian cowardice'.<sup>60</sup> He might have wanted (and succeeded) to shock, but he was also serious not only in his aesthetics but also in his politics. In many ways, some disagreements with the specific policies of Mussolini's regime aside, he remained consistent in his views and support for fascism to the end, although his individual radicalism was blunted.

Similarly, for Trotsky, and despite his own verdict, neither 1912 nor 1914 served as a breakthrough. As we saw above, he remained loyal to his liberal

democratic ideas until his final return to Russia in May 1917. However, he was a very different person only half a decade after the Balkan War. At Brest-Litovsk, as the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, and during his whole career as the leader of the Red Army, he was the one framed as the barbarian. Trotsky had 'forgotten' some of his own ideas that he espoused in 1912: he refused to allow the Red Cross to move across the fighting lines, despite Lenin's permission, so as not to let them witness the devastation from the bombardment of Kazan.<sup>61</sup>

---

**'Making sense' of memory comes at a moment of rest, some time after the event, usually during peacetime, or as Trotsky himself called it a moment of 'pause [in the author's active political life]'.**

---

Trotsky's most strident attack on the illusions of liberal democracy came in 1920, at the height of the Civil War in Russia, when he published his *Terrorism and Communism* as a polemical response to Karl Kautsky's book of the same title.<sup>62</sup> Kautsky had made the prophetic statement that, while bolshevism had triumphed in Russia, socialism had suffered a defeat.<sup>63</sup> He lamented the violence of the 'Tatar socialism' and wrote that 'when communists assert that

democracy is the method of bourgeois rule... the alternative to democracy, namely dictatorship, leads to nothing else but the method of the pre-bourgeois law of the jungle'.<sup>64</sup> His conclusion about the world revolution asserted that it would be fulfilled not through dictatorship, canons and guns, and the destruction of political and social adversaries, but through democracy and humanity. 'Only thus can we reach this higher form of life, whose creation is the historical task of the proletariat.'<sup>65</sup>

Trotsky's response was devastating. This is not the place to evaluate this most controversial of Trotsky's works, but suffice it to say that it was a passionate defence of the ruthlessness ('*besposhchadnost'*) of the revolutionary methods. In chapter 4, 'Terrorism', Trotsky confronted the accusation that his tactics differed little from the tsarist ones. His response was that the terror of Tsarism was directed against the proletariat, while the revolutionary terror shot landlords, capitalists and generals who strived to restore the capitalist order. 'Do you grasp this distinction? Yes? For us communists it is quite sufficient.' No mention about 'human conscience' and 'the principles of democracy, the politics and morality of democracy', which he had addressed to Petko Todorov seven years earlier.

All of this is not intended to establish and expose Trotsky's alleged 'inconsistencies', let alone his bloodthirstiness. The latter is based on the naïve belief in the immutability of some basic core identity. Nor is it intended to enter into the intractable debate about revolutionary terror and the dictatorship of the proletariat. It seeks to make one simple point: the Revolution was Trotsky's war. *Our wars* are usually capitalised: they are the Civil Wars, the Wars for Independence, the Liberation Wars, the People's Wars, the Peasant Wars, the Revolutionary Wars, the Great Patriotic War, the War on Terror, even the Great War, and they are mostly *just wars*. Other people's wars, whose motif is unclear or not immediately appealing, are just *wars*, calamities. With time this befalls gradually the capitalised wars too, once they pass from memory into history. This happened both with the Balkan Wars and with the October Revolution.

There are some obvious points and conclusions to be made. Firstly, memory alone is meaningless. We make sense of it through a framework. In his first chapters, describing his early years, Trotsky did not want to impose a framework, a 'meaning' to his childhood, and they are full of vivid memories that belie his claim of a weak memory in the absence of ideas. Their impressionistic

character, however, cannot be subsumed in a single consistent narrative, which begins only with his adolescence, when he is swept by the revolutionary ideas, and subsequently the 'revolution' becomes the overarching framework of his whole life. Memory thus is 'packaged' and the historian's task is to un-package it, but, even more importantly, to study the packaging itself in its different forms: autobiography, biography, memoirs, academic histories, popular histories, journalism, novels, poems, monuments, cemeteries, museums – each having their specific narrative sways and consistencies.

---

**History offers accurate accounts of past events and has credibility, but witness accounts, just like myths, possess both credibility and authority.**

---

Secondly, 'making sense' of memory comes at a moment of rest, some time after the event, usually during peacetime, or as Trotsky himself called it a moment of 'pause [in the author's active political life]'.<sup>66</sup> For him this was the year 1929 in Istanbul. And, finally, there is the all too obvious conclusion that these moments themselves change, that it is always the present moment of recollection that most decisively inflects the memory. Immediate experience is

the crucial vector. In the much cited words of Michael Oakeshott: 'The past in history varies with the present, rests upon the present, is the present... There are not two worlds – the world of the past happenings and the world of our present knowledge of those past events – there is only one world, and it is the world of present experience.'<sup>67</sup>

If all this seems too obvious, is it worth restating it? The memory of war is today a formidable business, in a very literal sense, with tourism at war sites, principally of the First and Second World Wars, but also going as far back as the Napoleonic Wars, and in some rarer cases medieval battles, in addition to commissions to sculptors, architects, filmmakers, fiction writers, and, let us face it, also to academics. The most lucrative topic in United States history is the Civil War. One can be certain to find work with this topic of war history, and with its paraphernalia, such as violence and its containment. All of this is packaged under the rubric 'learn in order to prevent'. There is undoubtedly an idealistic element in this appeal and while not wishing to deny genuine idealism in many cases, one suspects that in many other cases, there is a certain degree of voyeurism about violence, garnished with a puritan moralising and hectoring. Today the memory and commemoration of the Second World

War are an especially important topic in Europe, because of the search for a common *lieux de mémoire* in an attempt to build a common culture of the European Union.

Two ideas, which were not so obvious immediately after the end of the Second World War, have now become central (one very gradually from the 1970s onwards, the other in the last two decades). The first is the mandatory elevation of the Holocaust as the metaphysical event of the twentieth century, something that deserves its own history, but in a nutshell it is the remarkable transformation of the Holocaust from a German guilt to a pan-European one, and the imposition of the specifically German *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* as a normative solution even in cases that fell outside the paradigm. The second is the equalising of Nazism with the Soviet experience at large, not simply Stalinism. Both ideas have their supporters and detractors, both have weighty arguments and, without delving further into them, one wishes to point out that this is the present state of 'war and memory' in Europe today. However, as with any historical space, it is not all-encompassing and it is transient. Take the delicate issue of the comparison of the two totalitarian regimes of Hitler and Stalin. While the extent of the crimes committed by both sides was recognised, until recently

the emphasis in its assessments was on the difference between the two, but today the dominant trend is to point out the similarities. Perhaps the most reductionist, but also the most powerful, move is the broadening of the notion of 'genocide'. Does it matter, the most extreme yet also the most powerful argument goes, whether one is killed because one belongs to an ethnic or religious group, or to a social and political one? Most likely not. But let us imagine that a hundred years from now a global history of the twentieth century will appear from a new hegemonic centre and in a new hegemonic language- Chinese. One can imagine that the mass violence of the twentieth century will be painted with a broad brush, not making much distinction between regimes, because, in the end, does it matter whether one died in the gas chamber, with a bullet, or in a labour camp in Europe in the first half of the century, or because one was being saved from unsavoury regimes while being napalmed or bombed into democracy as collateral damage in Southeast Asia and the Middle East in the second half of the century?

This brings us to the last point, that of experience. The stakes today are high, because what is being remembered still has the status of testimony, of immediate experience. In my Balkan history class I did a little exercise with my students and

asked them, among other things, how war is best remembered. While I had the expected array of answers – art, poetry, literature, cinema, monuments, history – the overwhelming majority pointed to personal stories, witness accounts, especially ones they had heard themselves from participants. The Second World War is immensely popular, because grandfathers served in it (or were its victims). Witness accounts are not necessarily the most accurate ones, but they have a particular legitimacy. History offers accurate accounts of past events and has credibility, but witness accounts, just like myths, possess both credibility and authority.<sup>68</sup> In a sweeping move, I will suggest as a hypothesis that the power of personal testimony, its authority, is at its height for three generations. There is the Swahili saying that the deceased who remain alive in people's memory are the 'living dead'. It is only when the last to have known them passes away that they are pronounced completely dead.<sup>69</sup> I would venture that this process begins roughly at the third generation, and then is accelerated until it reaches obscurity. Conversely, the premium of immediate experience goes beyond the individual who has experienced an event; it also anoints those who have had immediate knowledge of that person.

Pierre Nora has become an obligatory footnote to any study of memory, but

few pay attention to the fundamental distinction he made between *lieux* and *milieux de mémoire*. English does not translate *milieux*, although there are quibbles over *lieux*, ranging from 'realms' to 'sites' to 'places' to preserving the French original. *Milieu* indicates sites of living or lived memory, or rather sites that provide direct access to living traditions. Once these traditions have passed away, the sites evoke only intimations, often nostalgia. Nora uses *lieu* to designate the exterritorialised sites of collective memory. Speaking specifically about contemporary France, he maintains that a shift has occurred from a kind of naturalised collective memory to a self-conscious, uninspired and rather mechanistic activity of preserving memory. He thus posits a transformation from sites of internalised social collective memory to fixed externalised locations. These sites form an exhaustive inventory, consisting of architectural and textual artefacts: monuments and shrines, histories and textbooks, museums and archives. Commenting on the *lieux*, Nora says, 'It is no longer genesis we seek but rather the deciphering of who we are in light of who we are no longer.'<sup>70</sup>

This seems to be happening also with the Balkan Wars. Between 2012-2013, there has been a proliferation of celebrations, commemorations, documentary and photo exhibits in all

participant countries. There are school and academic competitions on the topic. Academia is using the centenary to organise national and international workshops and conferences all over Europe and North America. There are reprints and new publications, especially memoirs and other witness accounts.<sup>71</sup> The press in the Balkan countries does not miss the opportunity to publish interviews with historians, literary scholars and politicians. The web is a particularly rich source of activities.<sup>72</sup> However, no new monuments are being

erected, and there have been merely calls to repair the older ones that have been allowed to crumble.<sup>73</sup> It seems that they had lost their function as *milieux*, and now there is a desire to turn them into attractive *lieux*. The passage from *milieux* to *lieux* is inevitable, because in the broadest sense it hinges on the immediacy of lived experience. There is nothing tragic about it. If only it were possible in the future that ‘war and memory’ would be enshrined solely in *lieux de mémoire!*

## Endnotes

- 1 *Pravda* had 25 issues between 3 October 1908 and 23 April 1912, and with its non-factional politics became popular with industrial workers as well as with different émigré factions. In 1910, for a brief period from January to August, it was made the central, and thus party-financed, organ of the temporarily reunified Russian Social Democratic Labor Party.
- 2 Leon Trotsky, *My Life: An Attempt at Autobiography*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930, p. 127.
- 3 Leon Trotskii, *Sochinenia*, Seria II. Pered istoricheskim rubezhom. Tom VI. Balkany i balkanskaia voina. Moskva, Leningrad, Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, 1926. The collected works of Trotsky – *Sochinenia* – were conceived as a major enterprise comprising 23 volumes in seven series. Editorial work began in 1923 and the volumes began to appear from 1924 onwards. In fact only 12 volumes were published (3 appeared in two parts, thus 15 volumes altogether) before work was suspended in 1927 when Trotsky was expelled from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. In January 1928 he was banished to Alma Ata and in February 1929 was exiled to Turkey where he stayed until 1933. A digitised version of all volumes in Russian can be accessed from Lubitz' TrotskyanaNet (LTN) at <http://www.magister.msk.ru/library/trotsky/trotsky.htm>; Volume 6 can be found at <http://www.magister.msk.ru/library/trotsky/trotm083.htm> [last visited 22 March 2013].
- 4 Leon Trotsky, *The War Correspondence of Leon Trotsky. The Balkan Wars 1912-13*, transl. Brian Pearce, New York, Monad Press; Australia, Pathfinder Press, 1993, (first published 1980). The phrase 'Third Balkan War' is sometimes used by journalists and historians to refer to World War I (as in Joachim Remak's famous 1971 article in *The Journal of Modern History*), but is mostly used to refer to the Yugoslav Wars of the 1990s: Misha Glenny, *The Fall of Yugoslavia: the Third Balkan War*. London, Penguin Books, 1992.
- 5 Isaac Deutscher, *The Prophet Armed: Trotsky: 1879-1921*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1954, p. 228.
- 6 Trotsky *My Life*, p. 227.
- 7 *Ibid.*, p. viii.
- 8 Thus, he wrote dismissively of the remarkable Georgian Menshevik Tsereteli (1881-1959), who had joined the Provisional Government after the February Revolution as Minister of Post and Telegraphs, and returned to Georgia after the Bolshevik Revolution, from where he finally emigrated to Paris in 1923, that he 'had a profound respect for liberalism; he viewed the irresistible dynamics of the revolution with the eyes of a half-educated bourgeois, terrified for the safety of culture. The awakened masses seemed to him more and more like a mutinous mob', '[i]t took a revolution to prove that Tsereteli was not a revolutionary' (Trotsky, *My Life*, p. 289). And he did not mince his words about the tragic leader of the Provisional Government Alexander Kerensky (1881-1970), whom he thought 'personified the accidental in an otherwise continuous causation. His best speeches were merely a sumptuous pounding of water in a mortar. In 1917, the water boiled and sent up steam,

and the clouds of steam provided a halo' (ibidem). The revolution should be viewed from a 'world' point of view, concluded Trotsky, 'to avoid getting lost in complexities' (ibidem). His greatest wrath, however, was heaped on Pavel Miliukov (1859-1943) – a leader of the Constitutional Democratic Party (Kadets), right-wing Slavophile and promoter of Russian imperialism and later an intractable foe of Bolshevism who was editor-in-chief of *Rech*, the organ of the Kadets – the true *bête noire* of *The War Correspondence*.

- 9 See readers' reviews of the book on Amazon: [www.amazon.co.uk/War-Correspondence-Leon-Trotsky-1912-13/dp/0913460680](http://www.amazon.co.uk/War-Correspondence-Leon-Trotsky-1912-13/dp/0913460680) and [www.amazon.com/War-Correspondence-Leon-Trotsky-1912-13/dp/0873489071](http://www.amazon.com/War-Correspondence-Leon-Trotsky-1912-13/dp/0873489071) [last visited 5 April 2013]. Some read it because it is 'an indispensable background to the fighting going on in the region today' providing a *déjà vu* picture. Others appreciate it for its anti-imperialist passion and materialist analysis. Still others see precursors of Serbian mass murder of the Albanians, or read it for the roots of anti-Semitism in Romania. Some are fascinated (or perhaps nostalgic given the paucity of today's print journalism) by the profundity of discourse, the ability to bring in complex analyses of the economy, politics and religion in an expressive style.
- 10 Trotsky, *The War Correspondence*, pp. 3-4.
- 11 Ibid., pp. 3, 12-13.
- 12 Ibid., p. 3.
- 13 Dimitir Genchev, *Pirvoapostolite na ideala*, Sofia, Izdatelska kishta 'Khristo Botev', 2006, p. 23.
- 14 Trotsky, *The War Correspondence*, p. 38.
- 15 Ibid., p. 39.
- 16 Given the fact that Trotsky lived at the time and place of the blossoming of the sophisticated Austro-Marxism, his own views on the rise of the national ideal were deterministic, not to say dogmatic: 'Economic development has led to the growth in national self-awareness and along with this a striving for national and state self-determination.' (Ibid., p. 157.)
- 17 Ibid., p. 12, 39-41, 152.
- 18 Ibid., p. 49.
- 19 Ibid., p. 82.
- 20 Ibid., p. 76.
- 21 Ibid., p. 53; The Zajecar revolt in Serbia was brought down with 'Asiatic ferocity'.
- 22 Ibid., p. 58.
- 23 Ibid., pp. 54, 157.
- 24 In the chapter on post-war Romania, however, he juxtaposes the Bulgarian army of 'free, literate peasants, possessing the vote' and the 'Romanian army of serfs'; Ibid., p. 390.
- 25 Ibid., pp. 73-74.

- 26 Trotsky, *My Life*, p. 204; Deutscher, *The Prophet Armed*, pp. 155-157.
- 27 Bulgarian Central State Archives, TsDA, Sp 3049 B, pp. 35-37.
- 28 Trotsky, *The War Correspondence*, p. 117.
- 29 Ibid., p. 288.
- 30 Ibid., p. 134.
- 31 Khristo Kabakchiev (1878-1940) was a leader of the Bulgarian Workers Social Democratic Party (the 'Narrows'). Educated as a lawyer, he was the editor-in-chief of its print organ 'Rabotnicheski vestnik' (1910-1923). In 1927 he emigrated to the USSR.
- 32 Leon Trotskii & Khristo Kabakchiev, *Ocherki politicheskoi Bolgarii*, Moskva, Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, 1923. The articles in question are "The Balkan Countries and Socialism" (*The War Correspondence*, pp. 29-37) and 'Echoes of the War' (Ibid., pp. 213-225).
- 33 *The War Correspondence*, p.194.
- 34 Ibid., p. 194-197.
- 35 Ibid., p. 194.
- 36 Ibid., pp. 211-212.
- 37 Ibid., pp. 117-131, 266-271. While Trotsky does not acknowledge his source, this was most likely Dimitrije Tucović, the founder of the Serbia Social Democratic Party and the editor of *Borba* and *Radničke Novine*. During the Balkan War in which he was mobilised, Tucović wrote extensively about atrocities against the Albanians, later published as *Srbija i Albanija: jedan prilog kritici zavojevačke poliike srpske biržoazije*, Beograd, Kultura, 1946.
- 38 Ibid., pp. 287-312.
- 39 Ibid., pp. 304-305.
- 40 Ibid., p. 329.
- 41 Ibid., p. 258.
- 42 Ibid., pp. 26-261.
- 43 Ibid., pp. 263-264, 282. Given the eminent stature of Simeon Radev (1879-1967) as one of the major political and intellectual figures in the modern history of Bulgaria, this abuse is especially jarring. Trotsky admits that Radev was "a journalist not without talent" (p. 263), but his condescending dismissal is ridiculous. By 1912 Radev, who had graduated in law from the University of Geneva and was an active journalist and diplomat, as well as a highly cultivated intellectual, had published his major history of post-1878 Bulgaria – *The Builders of Modern Bulgaria* – a work that is still considered a masterpiece.

- 44 Petko Yurdanov Todorov (1879-1916) was a major poet, dramatist and writer. As a high school student he was influenced by socialist ideas and was in contact with Jean Jaurès. He studied law in Bern and literature in Leipzig and Berlin. In 1905 he became a co-founder of the Radical-Democratic Party. In 1912 he was on Capri where he befriended Maxim Gorky. He died in 1916 from tuberculosis.
- 45 Trotsky, *The War Correspondence*, p. 277.
- 46 To his credit, Trotsky saw the Balkan War as having “more in common with the Italian War of Liberation of 1859 than it has [...] with the Italian-Turkish War of 1911-1912”; *Ibid.*, p.152; In a remarkable article “Bulgaria’s Crisis” he even agreed with the analysis of a Bulgarian officer, who admonished Trotsky that “the duty of Russian journalists, and especially of those who are combating the reactionary nonsense of the Slavophiles, is to explain the role and significance of a free, independent, and strong Bulgaria for the destiny of Southeastern Europe”; *Ibid.*, pp. 346-347.
- 47 *Ibid.*, p. 278.
- 48 *Ibid.*
- 49 *Ibid.*, p. 279.
- 50 *Ibid.*, pp. 282-283.
- 51 *Ibid.*, pp. 283-284.
- 52 *Ibid.*, p. 304. Trotsky evidently used the dispatches of Vasil Kolarov from his diary as an officer in the Balkan War, which he published regularly in *Rabotnicheski vestnik*. They were published separately only in 2001 as *Pobedi i porazheniia. Dnevnik*. Sofia, Izdatelstvo ‘Khristo Botev’. Kolarov (1977-1950) was a lawyer and one of the leaders of the Bulgarian Workers Social Democratic Party (the ‘Narrows’). Following 1923 he lived in emigration in the USSR.
- 53 *Ibid.*, pp. 284-285.
- 54 *Ibid.*, p. 148. The famous report of the Carnegie Commission came to a similar conclusion that “war suspended the restraints of civil life, inflamed the passions that slumber in time of peace, destroyed the natural kindness between neighbours, and set in its place the will to injure. This is everywhere the essence of war” (Report of the International Commission to Inquire into the Causes and Conduct of the Balkan Wars, Washington, D.C., Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1914, p. 108).
- 55 Deutscher, *The Prophet Armed*, pp. 180-181.
- 56 *Ibid.*, pp. 182-185.
- 57 Cited by Slavoj Žižek, “Trotsky’s Terrorism and Communism, or, Despair and Utopia in the Turbulent Year of 1920”, in Leon Trotsky (ed.), *Terrorism and Communism: A Reply to Karl Kautsky*, London, Verso, 2007, p. vii.
- 58 Filippo Tommaso Marinetti, “From the Café Bulgaria in Sofia to the Courage of Italians in the Balkans and the Military spirit of Désarrois”, quoted in Leah Dickerman (ed.), *Inventing*

- Abstraction 1910-1925: How a Radical Idea Changed Modern Art*, New York, Museum of Modern Art, 2012, p.136.
- 59 Filippo Tommaso Marinetti, *Zang Tumb Tumb-Adrianopoli: Ottobre 1912: Parole in libertà*, Milano, Edizione Futurista di Poesia, 1914.
- 60 *Le Figaro*, 20 February 1909. English translation from James Joll, (1960) *Three Intellectuals in Politics*, New York, Pantheon Books, 1960, p. 140.
- 61 Deutscher, *The Prophet Armed*, p. 421.
- 62 Leon Trotskii, *Terrorizm i kommunizm*. Peterburg, Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, 1920. The book was immediately translated into English and published as *Dictatorship vs. Democracy (Terrorism and Communism)*. New York, Workers Party of America, 1920. It was published, with a foreword by Slavoj Žižek, and by Verso in 2007. It can also be accessed online at [www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1920/terrcomm/index.htm](http://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1920/terrcomm/index.htm)
- 63 Karl Kautsky, *Terrorismus und Kommunismus: ein Beitrag zur Naturgeschichte der Revolution*, Berlin, Verlag Neues Vaterland, 1919, p. 133.
- 64 *Ibid.*, p. 152.
- 65 *Ibid.*, p. 154.
- 66 Trotsky, *My Life*, p. v.
- 67 Michael Oakeshott, *Experience and its Modes*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1966, pp. 107-108.
- 68 I am adapting the argument by Bruce Lincoln on fables, legends, history and myth; *Discourse and the Construction of Society. Comparative Studies of Myth, Ritual and Classification*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1989, pp. 24-25.
- 69 David Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign Country*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1985, p. 195.
- 70 Pierre Nora, "Entre mémoire et histoire", in *Les lieux de mémoire*, Paris, 1984, p. 1: xxxiii, cited in Patrick Hutton, *History as an Art of Memory*, Hanover, University Press of New England, 1993, p. 148.
- 71 In Bulgaria, alongside a plentitude of other minor publications, the Institute for Historical Research published a *de luxe* edition of war memories: *Balkanskite voini 1912-1913. Pamet i istoriia*, Sofia, Akademichno izdatelstvo, Prof. Marin Drinov, 2012.
- 72 Bulgaria alone has more than 700 websites dedicated to some aspect of the centennial. A game by Joseph Mirand, *Balkan Wars*, can be downloaded. It is only on these websites that one can gauge the reaction of the younger people to the anniversary, ranging from openly nationalistic ones to others critical of any display of jingoism. Even these blogs, however, which are usually fiery and confrontational, are relatively subdued.
- 73 See, in particular, <http://www.100godini-nalkanskivoini.bg>, the rubric on monuments, which lists dozens of monuments that should be or are under repair.