

# Daily Worker Reveals Conflict In CP on Purge

By Murry Weiss

JULY 24 — Since the ouster of the Molotov-Kaganovich-Malenkov "anti-party group" by the Khrushchev faction in the Kremlin, the Daily Worker has been carrying articles, editorials and letters

indicating conflicting views over the Soviet crisis among the leaders of the U.S. Communist Party and profound dissatisfaction in the ranks. In today's Daily Worker, John Gates, editor-in-chief, undertakes to discuss some of these differences.

Gates devotes the greater part of his article to a criticism of Clark's position while defending Clark's right to a dissenting opinion. Clark's July 10 column carried a bold expression of opposition to the method used by the Khrushchev faction in ousting the rival group. He questioned the validity of the charge accusing Malenkov of opposing the policy of peaceful coexistence, pointing out that Malenkov as premier had promoted the coexistence line.

Clark granted that Malenkov may have changed his mind. "That's always possible," he said. "Indeed he had changed his mind in the few days since Stalin died, from supporting Stalinism to his later statement of post-Stalin policies.

"But," Clark continued, "if he [Malenkov] was guilty as charged by the recent resolution, the Soviet people were entitled to evidence and a statement from both sides. They were never given the benefit of public debate. The struggle was bottled up in the presidium and in the Party's Central Committee. If anything, the methods used in the struggle against Stalinism shows that it will still take considerable time before democratic controls and procedures and direct working

class rule in all phases of Soviet life are established." (Our emphasis)

Clark also took issue with the "fatuous" claim "that Khrushchev, Mikoyan, Bulganin and Voroshilov, remaining collaborators of Stalin, were also not responsible for the Leningrad frame-up and the repressions of the 20's for which they now blame Molotov."

At first glance it is hard to grasp the main point of the difference Gates has with Clark. Gates cites the Daily Worker editorial of July 9 which took the position that the ouster of the Molotov-Kaganovich-Malenkov forces would "strengthen the tide to peaceful coexistence and a durable peace," etc., and then went on to suggest that "a wide public discussion (should have) preceded the meeting (of the Central Committee)" and that the "process of democratization requires such a public debate; the process of correction of the abuses of Soviet democracy will undoubtedly provide new forms for such a public discussion."

After citing these points in the editorial, Gates turns to Clark's column which had, he said, "a somewhat different emphasis." True. Clark's article was a lot more emphatic in condemning the methods of Khrushchev and Co. Clark also repeatedly used the term "Stalinism" and even quoted from Deutscher, saying that "the studies of Isaac Deutscher on the Soviet Union have received startling confirmation once again." All this is quite radical for a Daily Worker

(Continued on page 3)

# ... Conflict in Daily Worker

(Continued from page 1)

columnist, whatever we may think of it.

However, Clark also took the same position as the Daily Worker editorial with regard to the "overall" progressive achievement seen in the Khrushchev victory. He also sees, like his new mentor Isaac Deutscher, the processes of democratization of Soviet life proceeding, even if at a painfully slow pace, through the mechanism of the Soviet bureaucracy.

Gate's criticism of Clark's article boils down to a complaint that Clark overemphasized the question of Khrushchev's method: "Clark makes the question of methods the main thing, while the editorial, in agreeing that the methods leave much to be desired, calls them distinctly subordinate to the historic events which will help shape a peaceful world."

Both viewpoints are imprisoned in a conception (never openly stated) that the Soviet bureaucracy is a fundamentally progressive historic institution, an institution which can make errors and mistakes — even commit crimes! — but is nevertheless the basic force that will lead Soviet society forward to a better future. Clark stresses the errors, mistakes and crimes; Gates, while recognizing the errors, stresses the progressive historic features.

But we have no desire to minimize the potential significance of such a difference. If Clark were to pursue his thoughts with sufficient boldness and vigor he would be compelled to examine the nature of the Soviet bureaucracy itself. He would be compelled to pose the question: wasn't the bureaucratic caste the social base for the rise of Stalin and Stalinism? And doesn't the present "collective leadership" in its own way express the political needs of the bureaucracy, just as Stalin did in his way at an earlier stage? He would then be smacked up against the key question: can workers democracy be restored in the Soviet Union without overthrowing the bureaucracy through a political

revolution made by the working class?

By referring to Deutscher, Clark has contradictory objectives in mind: on the one hand he wants a more plausible explanation of the profound crisis in Soviet society than the "fatuous" notion that Molotov, etc., were to blame for everything. On the other hand, Deutscher seems to offer a "safe" theoretical explanation of Stalinism for someone who is not ready to break with Stalinism all the way.

Deutscher explains Stalinism as necessity, arising from economic and historical causes. Substituting a mechanical, fatalistic method for the Marxist dialectic, Deutscher holds that since Stalinism arose due to certain causes, its rise was inevitable, and since along with the rise of Stalinism, Soviet economy experienced a progressive growth, therefore Stalinism carried through a progressive historic mission, despite its admittedly monstrous methods. The attractions of this kind of reasoning as a "second trench" to which Stalinist ideologists can retreat are quite obvious. By standing on Deutscher one can feel absolved of the monstrous methods which can no longer be justified. At the same time the uneasy functionary can feel himself a part of a progressive mission.

Deutscher's reasoning fails to take into account the fact that in contradiction to the rise of Stalinism there arose the opposition to Stalinism; and that just as Stalinism has its materialist explanation so does the opposition to Stalinism have its causes in the material foundations of society. Deutscher's type of reasoning is worthless to the working class which requires for its guidance the dialectic understanding of the class struggle — which in this case manifests itself as a struggle between the working class and "its" bureaucracy. Such an understanding reveals the causes of the rise of a privileged, bureaucratic caste feeding parasitically on the body of an isolated and encircled workers state, weighed down by its backward economic heritage and bled by imperialist war and civil war. By this method the

workers can also trace the heroic and tenacious struggle of the Soviet working class against the bureaucracy, the defeats and setbacks in that struggle and the new rise that it is experiencing today.

## DEUTSCHER'S METHOD

If you apply the method of Deutscherism you can easily explain the rise of the labor bureaucracy in capitalist countries, the rise of capitalism itself, and provide thereby — justification for labor bureaucracy and capitalism!

There is, however, a curious flaw in the notion that it is possible for Communist Party leaders to flirt with Deutscherism with impunity. It was one thing when some ex-Trotskyists embraced Deutscher's views some years ago and used them as a bridge to conciliation with Stalinism. For CP functionaries trying to move out of the unbearable contradictions of old Stalinist formulae the logic of the process is somewhat different.

For one thing, Deutscher employs the concept of a Soviet bureaucracy. Regarding all the main facts and much of the analysis of the material basis for Stalinism, he is frankly and openly indebted to Leon Trotsky. But the concept of a Soviet bureaucracy as a social formation has never been admitted by Khrushchev or any of the Communist parties. In this sense to play with Deutscherism is to play with fire — with something that can open the whole question of Trotskyism!

It should also be noted that Deutscher's very empiricism compels him above all to recognize the accomplished fact. In his recent essay, "Russia in Transition," Deutscher says: "The new working class which has emerged from the melting pot of forced industrialization is potentially a political power of a magnitude hitherto unknown in Russian history." This, mind you, is said about a working class that has made three revolutions in the last 50 years. Deutscher has by no means abandoned his Deutscherism; he is, however, forced to speak of a coming mass revolutionary upsurge in the Soviet Union and speculate on whether it will find its conscious political leadership from among elements in the bureaucracy.

## SPECTER OF TROTSKYISM

It is one thing for Deutscher to speculate from the sidelines; it is an entirely different thing for leaders of working class parties to play with ideas, ideas that have a burning urgency in the ranks of the class-conscious workers' movement. No, Deutscher will not suffice. His ideas will only pose the question of Trotskyism, which, after all, has been the specter haunting the discussion for over one year. Until the issue of Trotskyism is squarely and objectively posed and considered, the discussion must continue to have a vague, unreal and indirect character.

[First of a series. Watch for next installment on "Gates and 'one-party' Rule in the Soviet Union."]

## Now Available -- Two basic Works by Leon Trotsky

### Third International After Lenin

Pages: 416. Cloth: \$4.00...Paper \$2.50

Trotsky's criticism of the Draft Program of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International, held in 1928. This book is indispensable to students of Soviet history.

### The Revolution Betrayed

Pages: 308. Cloth: \$3.50. Paper: \$2.00

This work is the basic Marxist analysis of the material foundations for the development of the Stalinist bureaucracy in the Soviet Union, the contradictions in Soviet society and the historic tasks of the Soviet working class.

Order from:

Pioneer Publishers

116 University Place

New York 3, N.Y.