

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

SEPTEMBER 3, 1951

FIVE CENTS

## India Speaks Up Against Rubberstamp Treaty

By RICHARD TROY

Saying openly what most of Asia believes, India has refused to rubber-stamp the Japanese treaty in spite of the State Department's whip.

As the date for the signing of the Japanese peace treaty nears, the opposition among Far Eastern countries to its terms has solidified. But the American government appears more determined than ever that the treaty, as it now stands, will be signed at the appointed time by the appointed powers. Thus the suggestion, made several weeks ago by a Burmese newspaper, that in reality the peace treaty is no more than a bilateral pact between the United States and Japan appears more and more justified.

The president of the Philippines, on leaving for Washington to sign a mutual-defense pact with the United States, hinted that he might push for certain revisions of the peace pact; sentiment in Manila was strongly against certain provisions. Sources in Indonesia revealed that only 20 per cent of the Indonesian parliament is in favor of signing the treaty as it now stood. In Hong Kong vigorous criticism of the treaty was heard. And the

More—  
On the Japanese Treaty  
page 2

Dutch representatives made it plain that their government—which still has considerable interests in the Far East—was none too satisfied with the terms of the treaty which the United States and Great Britain have offered to the world.

But the most outspoken and decisive opposition is coming from India where the Nehru government has publicly announced, before a cheering parliament, that it will not attend the peace conference at all. According to Nehru the pact has three

(Turn to last page)

NEXT WEEK

### The Triple Crisis Of Zionism

An Analysis of the World Zionist Congress Just Concluded in Jerusalem

Won't Warm a Seat At the Autograph Meet



## Remington Reversal:

COURT RAPS VICIOUS GOV'T TACTICS, USE OF 'SUBVERSIVE LIST' AS PROOF

By L. G. SMITH

The United States Court of Appeals has unanimously reversed the conviction of William W. Remington, former government economist, on charges of perjury. The grounds of the reversal, and even more, certain observations made by the court in handing down its judgment, are of considerable importance to the fight for the preservation of civil liberties in this country.

Remington was convicted last February 7 on a charge that he had perjured himself when he told a grand jury, under oath, that he had never been a member of the Communist Party. Federal Trial Judge Gregory F. Noonan then imposed a maximum sentence of five years in prison and a fine of \$2,000 in a case in which U. S. Attorney Irving H. Saypol was the chief prosecutor.

The verdict of the lower court was reversed on account of the inadequacy of Judge Noonan's charge to the jury. This charge made it possible for the jury to convict Remington if they were, from all the evidence, convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that he had been in fact a member of the Communist Party. The rules of evidence in perjury cases in the federal courts, however, require that there must be direct proof of the crime by two witnesses who testify that the accused violated his oath, or direct proof by one witness plus corroborating circumstances.

#### VICIOUS PROSECUTION

The judge did not make this clear to the jury, he did not specify exactly which evidence was acceptable as direct proof, and he failed to point out that all the jurors must agree that Remington had been proved to have been a member of the CP at a particular time and place. This left the jurors free to convict on the

basis of the whole of the testimony of all the government witnesses.

But the important aspect of the decision is not so much the technical rule of evidence which the appellate justices required. From the point of view of the rights of persons who are accused of membership in the Communist Party, or in other organizations which the government may decide from time to time as being "subversive" or as falling under the criminal ban of the Smith Act, much more important are the court's attacks on the arbitrary, prejudiced and vicious manner in which judge and prosecutor collaborated to deprive the accused of his elementary rights of defense.

At no time was Remington given a bill of particulars as to what specific acts were to be used as proof of his membership in the CP. A motion for such a bill was denied by the judge. "The accused never learned until the filing of the government's brief on appeal what acts the prosecution would contend showed that he believed himself to have been a member of the party," states the appellate court's ruling.

Further, the government prosecutor refused to define what constitutes membership in the CP, so that the defendant did not know "even at the end of the government's case what he had to meet."

Further, the court refused to give him access to the minutes

(Continued on page 5)

Does Moscow Want Franco to Fall? ... page 3

How They Make Stalinist Bureaucrats ... page 6

Ersatz 'Youth Movement' at Ithaca ... page 5

Poland: Main Danger for Stalin? ... page 3

## Their Congress Readies New Tax Steal for Rich

By SAM FELIKS

To complement a "price control" law written by the lobbyists, Congress is getting ready to pass an equally reactionary tax bill. Once again the low and middle income groups are going to be handed the short end of the stick for the support of the war economy.

Already as a result of the "price control" law, prices rose two-tenths of one per cent in the month ending July 15. This is the highest point in the history of the consumer price index.

But it is only the beginning. The forecast is for a rise in meat prices as well as hundreds of other increases. Caught between the rising prices and the new tax boosts, low and middle income families are really in for the old squeeze play.

This will be especially disastrous for the 20 per cent of all American families with incomes under \$2000 a year who receive only 5 per cent of personal income after taxes.

President Truman in his tax message to Congress several months ago proposed a tax boost of \$10 billion. This figure was scaled down to \$7.2 billion in the House bill. And at the present writing, it is under consideration at the Senate Finance Committee.

The Truman proposals placed a heavy burden on the low and middle income groups, while the House bill reversed the relative weight of the high and low income groups. And now the Senate has reduced the taxes on the high income groups.

#### INCENTIVE—FOR SOME

But all three groups of proposals placed an additional burden on those least able to afford

it. In the mid-year 1951 report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, crocodile tears are shed over the plight of the lowest paid families:

"While, on the average, income after personal taxes will probably rise under the impact of the defense program, even with the proposed individual income-tax increases, many families with relatively fixed incomes will have no alternative but to adjust to a lower level. Even when disposable income rises, this does not necessarily mean an improvement in the individual's real income position and in his standard of living. In measuring real income, price rises must be taken into account."

But what did Truman propose for these lowest paid families? Nothing but an increase in individual taxes as well as an increased sales tax. No doubt he found it "regrettable." But when he made the proposals for the highest income groups, it was found necessary to preserve the production incentive of big business.

(Turn to last page)

Labor Action FORUM • New York

Thursday, SEPTEMBER 6, at 8:30

### The 'Loyalty' Program And Security Screening

HOW IT THREATENS OUR DEMOCRACY

Speaker:

ROWLAND WATTS

Secretary, Workers Defense League

LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street







# India Speaks Up for Asians — —

(Continued from page 1)

particularly objectionable features: The retention of U. S. troops in Japan; the failure to return Formosa to China; and the transferral of former Japanese islands in the Pacific to the United States. The core of the objections is opposition to increased American-Japanese hegemony over the Western Pacific, and opposition to Washington's use of Japan as a military base.

That Nehru can speak so boldly reveals the wide popularity of anti-American and "Asia for the Asiatics" policies; and the cheers in the Indian parliament are also an echo of Indian resentment over the long delay in Congress over dispatching the much-needed grain to India this spring.

The Indian government pointed out, further, that, in reality there is no need for it to attend the San Francisco parley anyway, since the State Department, by announcing in advance that no amendments will be accepted to the treaty, has, in effect, only asked for rubber-stamp approval from its former allies.

The only opportunity the delegates will have to participate in the proceedings is in the one hour of speaking time allotted to each nation. But the Indian govern-

ment says that it can just as well voice its one hour of opinion on the treaty from New Delhi; and this is exactly what it has done.

The nations whose governments oppose the terms of the treaty are, of course, taking their lives in their hands when they make it public. The reaction of American officialdom and the press has been, as might be expected, sharp—to the point of frothing. It is immediately suggested that any and all opposition to the treaty is playing into the hands of the Russians, who oppose it. The Dutch representative, for example, expressed the fear of many that a pro-Russian label will be fastened on him if he speaks up. "On the one hand the draft is unacceptable [to the Dutch] on three points; on the other hand, the Netherlands wishes to avoid being classed with the Soviet Union and its satellites as obstructionists."

#### OLD DEVICE

All powers which object to any aspect of American foreign policy face this risk. The New York Times—which hews closely to the State Department line on most international questions—writes that India, by taking the position it has, "has, perhaps [sic] quite unwillingly or unwittingly, given more ammunition to the Soviet delegation if it attempts as is expected, to impede, and possibly sabotage, the treaty signing."

This is an old and familiar device which the State Department has used to force the weaker na-

tions in the Western bloc into line. "... there can never be united action for peace," the State Department told the Indians, "unless the nations are willing to accept what, to each, may seem imperfections." The question may well be asked as to precisely what serious "imperfections" the United States has accepted for the sake of unity on this matter.

The New York Times, in an editorial, proclaims that the aim of the peace treaty is "peace in the Far East." Yet it can write that "India's approval for the terms of peace with Japan is, of course, not essential. Indeed, it might even be suggested that since the Congress Party, now in control in India, objected to waging a war against Japan and sought to obstruct it with a giant civil-disobedience movement in 1942, India's attitude toward making a peace is somewhat irrelevant." In other words, the question of a settlement in the Far East is "irrelevant" to a government in the Far East which represents 350 million people... because of the refusal of that government to sacrifice its independence movement to the second World War.

#### SLOT-MACHINE FACTS

But the conference plans steam ahead full-speed. The program of events is mapped out with a view to signing the maximum number of treaties in the minimum number of days, belt-line fashion.

August 30: Signing of Philippine-American mutual-defense

pact.

Sept. 1: Signing of an Australian-New Zealand-American defense pact.

Sept. 4: Opening of the Japanese peace conference.

Sept. 5: Election of conference president; U. S. and Britain explain treaty to the delegates.

Sept. 6-7: Series of statements

on the treaties by the various delegates.

Sept. 8: Signing of the Japanese treaty.

Sept. 9 or 10: Japanese-American security pact to be signed, providing for retention of U. S. troops and bases in Japan.

And thus the Far Eastern problem will be "settled."

## After All We Did for Him . . .



"The tragedy of India's Prime Minister Nehru is his dark suspicion of the West. Perhaps because of his long suffering in the struggle with Great Britain, including 18 years in British jails, he seems always ready to believe the worst about the West. . . ."  
—Marquis Childs.

"We have good grounds for our impatience with Nehru's stand on the treaty. Item one: We have helped the Indian people with our wheat shipments, and here they are biting the hand that has fed them. . . ."  
—Max Lerner (who thereupon presents his own reasons for justifying Nehru's stand in spite of the above serious difficulty).

# New Tax Steal for the Rich — —

(Continued from page 1)

ness. The liberal and labor supporters of the Fair Deal ought to inquire why the Fair Deal does not find it necessary to protect the incentive and the standard of living of the lowest paid families.

The Senate Finance Committee has decided to raise income taxes by \$1.43 billion in those groups over \$5000 a year, and to raise \$95 billion from those under \$5000. The \$1.43 billion is to be \$0.9 per cent of the total personal tax to be raised. The House bill proposed a similar distribution of the taxes.

This demonstrates the iniquitous and inequitable distribution of the tax bill. The 20 per cent of the families with incomes over \$5000, who receive about 45 per cent of personal income will only pay about 60 per cent of the income-tax increase. While the 80 per cent with incomes under \$5000 who receive about 55 per cent of personal income will have to pay 40 per cent of the increased taxes.

#### GIFT FOR FAT BOYS

The House bill had similar provisions where the groups with incomes over \$5000 would pay 62 per cent of the increase. But since the total amount to be raised was to be higher, the lower groups would have to pay more.

The Senate committee, in dealing with the corporation-tax features of the bill, appeared hell-bent on easing the burden as much as possible on the corporations.

- It eliminated a House provision that would prevent chain stores from claiming multiple deductions on the basis of individual stores.
- It allowed corporations to lug-able assets to obtain tax deductions.

- It kept the present excess-profits tax and deductions credit at 85 per cent before payments begin. This one saves the corporations over \$600 million.

- It is considering the taxation of cooperatives and mutual banks. This has been a target of big-business agitation for many years.

The result of these proposals

was to decrease the tax boost on corporations by \$760 million under the House figure of about \$3 billion.

Still to be considered is the excise (sales) tax. In all likelihood, neither the House nor the Senate will give Truman the \$3 billion he has asked for in sales tax. But this is hardly out of any consideration for the low income groups.

#### NEW TAXES AHEAD

Congressional leaders on financial matters have long ago announced that, with the next round of tax increases, a sales tax would be the prime source of additional revenue. It is not unlikely that the reason for their refusal to include it in this tax bill is that it is being saved for the next one. That there will be new tax bills in the near future is not in doubt. The report of the Council of Economic Advisors arguing for the present tax bill stated:

"With federal expenditures for the fiscal year 1953 expected to total between 80 and 90 billion dollars, compared to the fiscal year 1952 estimate of 68 billion, an even larger deficit rate is indicated for that year.

"As was emphasized when the \$10 billion program was first presented, it is a *minimum* program which, if speedily enacted, would meet the immediate revenue needs." (Our emphasis.)

And these new proposals by the Truman administration will also call for larger excise taxes. The report of the CEA states the justification from the point of view of the Fair Deal: it will serve as an anti-inflationary device. And this is the same argument that the Congressional reactionaries and the NAM have used.

#### WHERE ARE OUR "FRIENDS"?

In the August issue of the UAW's *Ammunition*, there is an attack upon the NAM for its sales-tax proposals, but nowhere is there a mention that the Fair Deal has already expressed its fundamental agreement with the NAM on this issue. It is also pointed out that in 1948, the 20 per cent of families with incomes

under \$2000 a year paid an average of 10 per cent of their income on sales taxes, federal, state and local.

One may justly ask: while the Senate reactionaries led by Senators George and Millikin were busy protecting the interest of the corporations and placing the load on those least able to pay, where were the Fair Deal senators? The fight over the "control" bill was marked by a conspicuous lack of leadership from those staunch defenders of the underprivileged.

## Voices from East Germany:

### 'War, Even Victory, Will Be a Defeat!'

"No alternative is being offered by you in the West. It is not enough to tell us the Russians or Communists are bad. Give us some sign that democracy will defeat them in the end. I do not mean by war. Even if you win for us, war is a defeat."

This, reports a N. Y. Times dispatch from Bonn in Western Germany (August 26) is what the refugees from Eastern Germany think and say.

As a change from the recent reports in the same paper and the rest of the press about the "failure" of the Stalinist youth festival in Berlin and the "longing" of the East German youth to get to the fleshpots of the West, the quotation from the refugee is an accurate reflection. The same speaker said:

"Those devils have our young people . . . we admire American optimism, but it will take more than some ice cream and a talk with Mr. McClellan (U. S. high commissioner in Germany) to break the Russian hold on them."

The leader of the German Social-Democrats, Kurt Schumacher, the dispatch points out, has been criticizing U. S. propaganda as lacking "real arguments." The State Department's propaganda

Where were Lehman, Humphreys and Douglas? Or the Senate Democratic Party leaders? Nowhere to be found—not even a word or a statement denouncing this assault upon the pockets of the working people.

Nor did the labor leaders put up anything approaching their fight over the "controls" bill. How could they really launch into an attack upon the tax hikers in Congress when Truman and the Fair Deal has gone them one better in asking for stiffer taxes? How

could they support Truman's request for a high sales tax when they know that it will have to be paid by the rank and file?

This tax bill and the subsequent ones to come are just as much a part of the Fair Deal controls program as was the Defense Production Act. As long as the labor movement remains, by and large, tied to the apron strings of the Fair Deal it means that they are giving support to those who are undermining the living standards of the American working people.

line has been almost exclusively concerned with the evils of the Stalinist regime and the material improvements in the Western sectors. The people of East Germany know all about that, but see no "hope and faith" in the West, which offers them only "liberation" in a Third World War, in the last analysis.

And war, even victory in war for the United States, will be a "defeat" for us, says the refugee.

Another is quoted: "Almost all adults in East Germany realize that the system imposed on us by Communists is harsh, cruel and inefficient. We know better than your propagandists that there is not enough to eat, that buildings are tumbling down from lack of repair and that secret police are everywhere. We know all that. What we want is some real hope for the future."

#### WITHOUT WAR!

The refugees deplore "the lack of any dynamic alternative offered by the West. 'Show us, prove to us how Western philosophy will conquer in the end without war,' they said."

The dispatch emphasizes that the refugees quoted are far from the socialists in their political viewpoints. They are not socialists, not radicals. Their senti-

ments are common to the whole people.

What they ask of American capitalism and the Western bloc is what the latter cannot give. They have no dynamic alternative to Stalinism. They can only preach the virtues of capitalism, when they find tongue to preach anything; and their idea of doing even that is to point to full shop windows in Western Germany.

The people behind the Iron Curtain hate the totalitarian regime, but do not look on a return to the old system of capitalism as a perspective which offers them "hope and faith," especially when the West makes clear that even this road backward must pass through the fires of war. What they are asking for is a political appeal to the peoples under Stalinism which can fire them to fight their masters—to fight for something positive, by which they mean a new and sane society—and not merely to go through another war to save democracy.

The report quoted, in the gripping language of the refugees, gives the basis for the independent socialist conviction that only a movement directed against both capitalism and Stalinism and their wars offers a road forward for the world.