

# SPEAK YOUR PIECE

A Reply by  
James W. Ford

BROOKLYN

Editor, Daily Worker:

I must rely, and I hope I'll be accorded the courtesy of having it printed, to "F's" complaint that I didn't make my criticism of the Daily Worker's editorial on 'Aid British Labor' clear enough. In my letter of April 3, I showed that the said editorial was inadequate and opportunistic. I didn't mention George Morris' article on the same subject, but I'll now include it too.

In its editorial, the Daily Worker urged the American trade union movement (CIO-AFL) to rally to the support of British workers in their general strike against British monopolies. It is obvious to all class-conscious workers that this was a justifiable obligation, mutually beneficial to both American and British workers and urgently necessary at this moment of international tension and cold war. My view was and still is that an act of working class solidarity on the part of American workers was urgently necessary for the following reasons.

A national general strike is a major political weapon and a major political action of workers. Not since the general strike of 1926 has the British ruling class been confronted with an action of such magnitude as the recent general strike of the workers of Britain. It was an heroic and gigantic action. As T. Graham, assistant secretary of the Amalgamated Union of Foundry Workers of London, said, the wage negotiations "affected the livelihood of one-fifth of Britain's population and the rest of the population cannot remain unconcerned." Moreover, the general strike itself was an expression of a combination of economic and political factors which are summed up in the decline of the British Empire and of the general crisis of capitalism. Nonetheless, U. S. imperialism's foreign policy of world domination and cold war urges along Britain's doom and further aggravates the general crisis of capitalism.

As I wrote in my letter of April 3, "Britain is smarting under the insistence of U. S. monopolies, and not without success, that British economy be crippled by the maintenance of armament burdens—nuclear and launching bases for guided-missiles on British territory. . . . As a consequence of British adventure in Egypt, U. S. monopolies are further strangling British economy. . . . U. S. imperialism is demanding that Britain

abandon any notion of East-West trade particularly with China." I further showed that the "Eisenhower-Smith Conference at Bermuda succeeded in further leading Britain down the road of economic and cold war disaster." All of this, I wrote, was the cause of the catastrophic state of British economy and was "one of the causes of the plight of British workers."

As I now write, I have before me the British White Paper (N.Y. Times, April 5) and it reveals for all to see that U. S. imperialism has projected Britain as the spearhead of attack on the Soviet Union and is increasing the danger of a new war. In this general situation, the general strike of British workers was directed against their own bourgeoisie and indirectly against U. S. imperialism, and called forth aid from the American working class in the spirit of working-class solidarity.

The Daily Worker editorial urged American workers to support the general strike with "moral and financial" aid. This was inadequate, and alone, represented political bankruptcy. For American workers were duty bound to expose and oppose the political policies of their own bourgeoisie, U. S. imperialism. Failure to do this plays into the hands of U. S. monopolies and is pure opportunism.

The key issue, as I wrote, was "replacement of the cold war by peaceful co-existence, renunciation of aggression, banning of nuclear tests and the abandonment of NATO and the use of Britain as a base of U.S. guided-missiles." The Daily Worker plugs for these issues in general. But when the Daily Worker leaves out these issues in the immediate context of the general strike of British workers, one can only draw one conclusion: OPPORTUNISM. I'm sure my sarcasm about "American bankers helping poor British workers" did not escape "F."

JAMES W. FORD

## Taxation And Welfare

Editor, Daily Worker:

Two letters from readers, April 6, one in the Herald-Tribune the other in the N. Y. Post, dealt with the matter of taxation. One writer offers what he calls "ten acts to ponder about Federal taxation." In none of them appears the slightest mention of the enormity of the sums allotted for military purposes, nor does the other writer pay any attention to such monstrously extravagant expenditures for

what are destructive endeavors.

In both houses of Congress there is a sickening rush to cut the size of the budget in most items except the biggest one of them all: the one for military appropriations, 43.3 billions which, it has been estimated, take not less than 62 cents out of every dollar making the total of the budget for military purposes. These, more than anything else, cause a steady increase of the size of the budget.

No good for the welfare of the people is likely to result from this atrocious violation of governmental responsibility.

CONSCIENTIOUS  
April 7,

## The Unjust Income Tax

Editor, Daily Worker:

In the paper of April 3, Al Richmond showed how the income tax, which was originally based on the principle of taxation according to ability to pay, has been changed from an instrument of equalizing incomes to an instrument of soaking the poor. The upper income brackets are actually paying less taxes today than in 1941, while the burden on the lower income brackets has more than doubled. (For other details see Labor Research Association's recent pamphlet *The Burden of Taxes*).

The present federal tax law not only places an unfair burden on the poor by providing for exemptions of only \$600. It also discriminates against a man who works for a living as opposed to a man who lives off dividends.

A married worker with two children, who is lucky enough to earn \$5,000 a year, must pay \$420 in income taxes. On the other hand, a married idler with two children who receives dividends of \$5,000 a year pays a levy of only \$321.60. (This, of course, assumes he is honest and does not resort to various evasive procedures open to all who do not have their taxes withheld from their wages or salaries).

The tax bill of the man who OWNS, rather than WORKS for a living is thus almost 25 percent smaller than a worker with the same income and the same number of dependents.

Thus, under our present tax law a man who lives off dividends gets a better break than a man who works. The idler, the parasite, gets preference over the socially useful laborer. All this in the name of a law which was originally intended to help the poor at the expense of the rich.

ROBERT M. HENDERSON.