

# Speak Your Piece

## On the Discussion Of the 'Welfare State'

NEW YORK

Editor, Daily Worker:

On Nov. 25th, there was a letter by "Bill," complaining about the apparent contradiction between articles, by Alexander Bittleman and William Z. Foster, as they concerned approaches toward the Welfare State.

It seems to me these "contradictory views" are no more than typical and logical paradoxes resulting from two apparently opposing stages of a correct, dialectic approach in the struggle for Socialism.

When capitalism seems, to the people of a nation, to be answering the basic economic needs of that people, as during "boom" times, then it is a correct and needed approach by all true radicals, to support fully, the efforts of liberals, trade unionists, and all others, for the evolutionary steps toward a "Welfare State," or if need be to give leadership toward such efforts.

However, when one of the deepening and innumerable crises of capitalism destroys its ability to answer the people's needs, or as Foster powerfully writes "the great economic crisis of 1929 knocked to smithereens the whole 'New Capitalism' house of cards" then it becomes the duty of all clean-thinking people, while supporting the measures for maintaining welfare state rights, at the same time to expose the inadequacy of these measures as satisfactory answers.

We are today, apparently, at a milestone between two such periods, and therefore the views of both Bittleman and Foster, with reference to one or the other of these periods, are correct. I imagine that both, for purposes of simplicity, clarity, and brevity, felt it superfluous to expound on the other point of view.

In connection with the latter I would like to make some additional remarks.

Since the XX Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the broadening of inner-party discussion there has been a great increase in examining, with microscopic thoroughness, all the statements of party leaders.

This is extremely valuable and

all to the good. At the same time, it seems to me, I often detect a caustic and "prosecuting" quality in some of these examining remarks. I believe this is unworthy among comrades in a great and historic struggle.

We must consider as precious all those who remain active in progressive affairs in these difficult times, though not by having a "precious" attitude since such activity is no more than a normal, healthy response to our times.

SAUL GROSS

## A Charter Reader

CHICAGO

Editor, Daily Worker:

This morning I received your appeal to help save the workers' best paper—the Daily Worker and The Worker. I am only a kid of 79; will be 80 next March 29. I have been reading The Worker since Jan. 13, 1924, and prepared the first office here in Chicago.

I realize what the loss of our paper would mean to the movement as I have seen the daily Socialist paper perish. Many other papers folded up and died all through lack of support.

After being in the struggle for more than 61 years I cannot bear to see all our past sacrifices were in vain. I am no longer able to get a job in industry at my age but do help out at the Committee for the Portection of Foreign Born and in defense of civil rights.

As I was in the office on Friday I received news that Pat Cush had died. In the recent past we lost David Poindexter, Alfred Wagenknecht and Sam Hammersmark.

There are still a few of us oldsters left. Maybe we can show the younger generation how to sacrifice for a cause and be happy in so doing. My income is limited to \$72 a month, out of which I must pay \$32 rent. That leaves me \$40 for all other expenses including clothing, food and incidentals. Well I have decided to eat less and here is \$10 for the press.

You may use my name if you wish. I have nothing to hide.

HARRY GREENWOOD

Dec. 14