

# SPEAK YOUR PIECE

## Tax Revision Bills in Congress

Editor, Daily Worker:

In the first six weeks of the 85th Congress, over 430 tax bills were introduced. This does not mean that all except five Congressmen introduced a tax bill. Most of the bills are official patches to repair the present patchwork law, which is not the perfect thing that the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 was stated to be when it was enacted. It does mean, though, that every Congressman can make known to the appropriate committee which bills he would like to see reported out for legislative action. It means also that constituents can prod Congressmen into making moves of this kind.

There are 24 bills directed to. Any increase in personal exemption for personal income taxes. One resolution calls for a \$2,500 exemption for a single person, \$3,500 for the head of a family, and \$5,000 for a married couple. Another would raise the present \$600 to \$1,200. Seven bills would raise it to \$1,000; nine to \$800 and six to \$700.

Any increase in personal exemption is an effective step in tax revision, more important than shaving the rates a little. But any exemption of less than \$1,000 is too small. An exemption of \$1,000 would be only \$4,000 for a family of four.

Congressmen should be requested to support the better of these bills, and to report progress. And letters to newspapers help to educate and agitate these issues. A recent letter in the "New York Times" from a San Francisco correspondent ridicules the \$600 exemption and says the honest "little guy" is "becoming a cheat and tax dodger" to survive the burden imposed by means of the present low exemption.

Small business also looks for tax reductions. Senator Fulbright, with 35 sponsors, is ready to amend the Technical Changes Bill by attacking a provision for lower rates for small corporations to be offset by higher rates on big corporations.

As an aid to anyone interested in helping get lower tax exemptions the recent pamphlet by Labor Research Association, "The Burden of Taxes," is well worth reading. It is not too technical

and it will help you in influencing your Congressmen in the direction of a people's anti-monopoly tax program.

FOSTER I. KING

## The Will Of The Majority

Editor, Daily Worker:

It is impossible for the Daily Worker to be in full agreement with any one of the various ideological trends now current in the communist movement. The best thing that the D.W. can and should do is to follow the collective will of the majority as expressed through the Communist Party convention.

To my mind, it is of the utmost importance that the Daily Worker should not delay one bit the necessary adjustment of its editorial policies to the decisions of the C.P. convention. And I want to emphasize two of the more important decisions on which, it seems to me, the D.W. has not yet made the necessary change.

First, the Convention decided that, along with the main fight against left-sectarian errors, all needed efforts must be exerted also against errors in the opposite direction.

Second, the Convention decided that the right to friendly criticism of brother parties or the actions of socialist governments shall be exercised "within the framework of recognition that the fundamental conflict of all peoples is with the forces of imperialism."

In connection with the first point, I think that the D.W. has not dealt properly with the question of Howard Fast. Without a thorough critical evaluation of Fast's action, without pointing out very critically the roots of his defection (in order to help him overcome the serious errors in his thinking), the Worker just goes ahead and reprints (in its Feb. 17 issue) an excerpt from Fast's "The Unvanquished" along with the "by permission of the author" notation.—That does not help the communist movement, nor does it help Fast.

In connection, I think that it is badly violated by Joseph Clark in his column in the D.W. (Feb. 25) on "The Tito-Khrushchev Discussion."

The heading itself is tendentious and smacks of the N. Y. Times. Clark distorts completely the true meaning of the discussion that is taking place—not be-

tween two individuals, but between two different approaches to some basic questions and problems of the communist movement. Various Communist parties and many individuals are participating in this discussion. But to Clark it's just "Tito-Khrushchev Discussion." Instead of giving objective information to the readers on the course of the discussion, and, of course, expressing his own opinions, he seems to have had only one aim; namely, to create the impression that Tito beats Khrushchev on all points, let the fight against imperialism go as it may.

The way it looks to me:—The decisions of the C.P. convention are of the utmost importance for preserving the unity of the Party and for the future of the entire communist movement in this country. Non-compliance with these decisions, on the part of Party members and on the part of the Daily Worker and Worker, is bound to bring about the most serious consequences for the Party and for the Press campaign.

G. DIRBA

## More on Reparations To Israel

Editor, Daily Worker:

After publication of my letter in your issue of March 5 concerning my differences with Joe Clark on his estimate of the origins of West German reparations to Israel, several of your readers have inquired about my view of the East German government's statement, which Joe Clark discussed, I have read the text of the East German government's statement (*Neues Deutschland*, Feb. 22) and would like to comment briefly.

The statement condemns the declaration of West German Chancellor Adenauer that he would continue sending reparations to Israel even if the UN imposed sanctions on Israel. It accuses Adenauer of using the argument that reparations are based on moral grounds as a cover-up for support of Israel and negation of UN sanctions.

The issue of sanctions against Israel has happily been laid to rest by the withdrawal of Israel from Gaza and Sharm el-Sheikh. But it has seemed to me that a UN imposition of sanctions would not have been the best method of furthering peace in the Middle East. Israel, is to be condemned, along with Britain and France, for the aggression on Egypt, and told that it was in-

imical to peace and Israeli's own welfare.

But I maintain that there are important differences in the two cases. Since Israel has just demands on Egypt and other Arab states, whose fulfilment are a condition for peace in the Middle East—the right to free passage through the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal and security against the terroristic fedayeen attacks. The imposition of sanctions would not have brought Israel any closer to fulfilment of these just and necessary demands, but would have only aggravated the situation more and hence would have heightened tensions. The UN should undertake in the interest of peace to meet Israel's just demand, both in justice to a small nation and in making progress towards peace in the Middle East.

Since sanctions seem to me to have been an undesirable method of dealing with the question, and since the East German government's position favored UN sanctions, I therefore disagree with the East German government's statement on this point.

What, however, about the whole question of reparations? In my letter of March 5 I tried to show that in its origins, the reparations agreement was a cold war measure for promoting West German armament. I pointed out that in view of the fact that the West German people themselves were slowing down rearmament, the situation has changed and that, so far as I can judge, reparations have in some degree been of genuine help in Israel's economic development. If any question arises about the legitimacy of reparations, the least one can say is that the Jews have a right to financial compensation for the Hitler genocide. This moral

question cannot be judged in isolation from the effects of the West German government and our own State Department's support of reparations and from the consequences of these reparations in contributing to the cold war. It is this point on which I differed with Joe Clark's view.

Joe Clark implied that opposition to reparations to Israel was a mistaken policy from the start in view of the moral rights of the Jews in the situation. A re-examination of the question would be fruitful. And on the basis of the outcome of such a review one could reach a firm position on the East German government approach to reparations.

However, it seems to me that even without such a review, I cannot agree with the statement of the East German regime. The position on sanctions is similar to that of the Soviet Union and I agree with Joe Clark in recalling the position of the Soviet Union regarding Palestine in 1947 in contrast with the Soviet attitude toward Israel today. The overall approach to a solution of the Middle Eastern crisis expressed in the Soviet Union's six-point program of Feb. 11 seems to me to provide a real basis for lasting Israel-Arab peaceful co-existence. In any negotiations on the basis of this program, however, the just demands of Israel must be given full weight. But at times the Soviet tactical policies toward Israel do not seem to me to give proper consideration to these demands. The unqualified support for sanctions, shared by East Germany, against Israel seems to me a case in point.

Despite my disagreement with Joe Clark on some points, I think that the questions he raises require a good deal of examination.

LOUIS HARAP

## Poland Asks U.S. for Surplus Farm Products

WASHINGTON, March 10.—Poland has formally asked the U.S. to supply it with surplus American farm products, it was disclosed today.

The U. S. made no immediate response. But U. S. officials are known to be sympathetic to the idea.

The U. S. and Poland have been negotiating for a week.

The formal request for farm products came during a 75-minute conference yesterday between a Polish economic mission and an

American team headed by Assistant Secretary of State Thorsten V. Kaljarvi.

## State Rent Chief On Radio Tonight

Robert C. Weaver, State Rent Administrator, will discuss the Administration's program to extend the Rent Control Law and plug loopholes, together with opposition proposals over WMCA's Report to the People" at 9:30 tonight (Monday).

Mrs. Dorothy D. Bromley will moderate the discussion. Robert S. Fougner, counsel to the Metropolitan Fair Rent Committee, will present the real estate point of view.