

# SPEAK YOUR PIECE

## Holds Miss Strong's Views Are 'Utopian'

NEW YORK

Editor, Daily Worker:

The Daily Worker's page on August 21; "Two Views on the Road to Peace and Socialism," is an important contribution to the discussion of these vital issues.

I fully agree with Wm. Z. Foster that "it is premature for Miss Strong to conclude that the fight for Socialism is won." The road to this "consummation devoutly to be wished" is still long and very difficult. As of now two-thirds of mankind are still forced to live under capitalist domination. Foster's argument that world peace itself is dependent on the peoples' advance toward Socialism—(and not the other way around—is near reality than Miss Strong's interpretation. The United States and the so-called Free World are deterred from their designs to rule the world, if need be by force and violence, by the strength and amplitude of the Socialist advance. Should this advance weaken, or be deflected to other channels, then the gains achieved by mankind so far, and not the gains alone, but mankind itself, may be extinguished.

Miss Strong's advice that "man's new crusade lies elsewhere" seems to me decidedly wrong. To replace the fight for Socialism by "a crusade for the

survival of the human race and its planet" is like putting the cart before the horse. The fight for Socialism is all embracing; it includes the fight for peace, for co-existence, for man's advance in every direction, to peace, to security, to material and spiritual progress . . .

With all my admiration for Miss Strong's earnestness, I think her views do not express "the science of Marx," but the speculations of the Utopians.

A. A. HELLER

8/22/57

## Invective Held Not Discussion

Editor, Daily Worker:

In a letter in the DW of Aug. 22 Billy Allan of Detroit speaks of the "crawling anti-working class performance of Earl Browder" on the Mike Wallace TV program some time ago.

Whatever criticism Allan has of Browder's statements he should certainly make. He should do it by specifying what he disagrees with and why. That takes more work than resorting to invective but it is the minimum for political discussion.

It is one thing for Speak Your Piece to be an avenue for free discussion. But invective is not discussion. I am surprised the editors printed this remark by Allan which convinces nobody of anything and only serves to discredit the letterwriter and Speak Your Piece.

A READER