

# Letter From Kantorovitch Asks For Critical Attitude

To the Editor:

One protest is as good as another, and so is one reader. After having printed the protest of Comrade Stanley Most, I hope you will grant space for my protest as well.

Comrade Most with one stroke of his pen disposes of three of your contributors. But the editor made no comment either in their defense or in defense of the paper. If the editor shares the opinions of Comrade Most, why were these objectionable articles printed? If the editor does not agree with Comrade Most, why does he hesitate to state his position?

As far as I can gather the meaning of Comrade Most's letter it is this: a good Socialist paper is one which tells its readers, week in and week out, that capitalism is no good, but does not say anything about Socialism. Discussions on Socialism necessarily include distinctions between various kinds of socialism and various proposed roads to socialism. We are not merely a discussion club; we are, or at least aspire to be, a Socialist party.

We believe that the road to socialism which we propose is the only right road, the only road which will eventually bring us to the promised land.

This sounds very egotistic, but this egotism is the foundation of every revolutionary party. No one will take a revolutionary party seriously that is not sure of itself, that will for example publicly declare; well, maybe we are right, and maybe we are wrong. This bourgeois modesty may be all right at a social gathering of disgruntled intellectuals, but it is suicide for a revolutionary party. We are members of the Socialist Party because we are sure, absolutely sure, that it is, in contra-distinction to all other parties, right. If we did not feel this way, we would not belong to it.

## MANY ROADS PROPOSED

If, however, we are sure that our way is the right way, then it is our duty to the working-class to caution it against other proposed roads that in our opinion are wrong. It is our duty, by intelligent criticism, to caution the workers that if they take the other, the wrong road, the consequences will be disastrous to both the Socialist ideal as well as to the working-class.

At the present moment there are two major proletarian parties fighting for hegemony in the labor movement, the Communist Party and the Socialist Party. They represent two different roads to socialism. The workers are approached by both. They have to choose between the two.

The business of the Socialist press is to influence them in their choice. Of course, criticism must be more than name-calling; to say that whoever disagrees with us has sold himself to the capitalists, or is a lackey of the bourgeoisie, a social-fascist, etc., is not criticism at all. This is the kind of criticism that the Communists for years have tried without success.

## SOVIET RUSSIA

And while I am "protesting," permit me also to voice my disagreement with your editorial on Soviet Russia.

That it was necessary for the Call to draw the line between our critical attitude to the Soviet Union and the uncritical attitude of the Forward and the New Leader, I admit. But according to the editorial, we accept everything in the Soviet Union now as the necessary means of building socialism.

I cannot speak for others, but

for myself I must say that as a Socialist I cannot accept this view. I cannot convince myself, try as I may, that Stalinism is synonymous with proletarian dictatorship, that the suppression of workers democracy and the jailing of Communists and Socialists for disagreeing with Stalin, are necessary means of building socialism. In the light of your editorial, Comrade Most is right in his criticism of Gitlow's article. You simply must not criticize Soviet Russia from a Socialist and internationalist point of view. Such articles as the ones by Gitlow and Zam on the dangers of the new nationalistic and militaristic meaning of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union are of the greatest importance. We do not want the working-class to be caught unaware in the next war and fight a capitalist war to save the world for Stalinism, as they fought to save the world for democracy.

I should perhaps say a word in defense of Sam DeWitt, but what he said about the Forward is obviously so true and necessary, that no defense is necessary.

The CALL is a fine, clean, Socialist paper, and it must fight against everything that is not fine, not clean, and not Socialist. That will make it even a better paper.

HAIM KANTOROVITCH.

Kantorovitch mistakes the intent of the editorial. It read in part:

We do not hold to the notion that criticism of the Soviet Union is taboo. We reserve the right to criticism in the case of the Soviet Union as we do in the case of other sections of the International Labor movement, of which we consider the Soviet Union to be an important part. . . . Our objective is to help the work of establishing a Socialist society . . . so that the entire Socialist movement will be strengthened.—Ed.

## LID Holds 1 Week Summer Conference

NEW YORK—The annual summer conference of the League for Industrial Democracy will be devoted to discussion of White Collar and Professional Workers Under Capitalism—Their Relation to Social Change. The conference will be held at Northover Camp, near Bound Brook, New Jersey from Friday night, June 21st, through Sunday, June 23.

Among the speakers and discussion leaders will be Norman Thomas, Harry W. Laidler, Raymond Gram Swing, Professor Abram Harris of Howard University, B. Charney Vladeck and Sidney Hook.

