sively imperialistic with a lust for expansion . . . "

Here we have a viewpoint expressed by a man who is reputed to be an expert on the Orient which seems in total and direct contradiction to the official position on the Russian-Chinese alliance. Instead of regarding China as the tool of Russia in Asia. MacArthur contends that China is allied with the U.S.S.R. "for its own purposes" and that the "Red" Chinese regime is the enemy America must concentrate all her efforts upon. He contends further:

"I have, from the beginning, believed that the Chinese Communists' support of the North Koreans was the dominant one. Their interests are, at present, paralleled with those of the Soviet, but the aggressiveness displayed . . . in Korea . . . in Indo-China and Tibet . . . reflects predominantly . . . lust for expansion of power."

What to us is most interesting about MacArthur's estimate of the Chinese government is his making the terms "communist" and "nationalist" synonomous. This is an unusual approach even for a capitalist and certainly a man who in his youth graduated from West Point with the highest marks in the history of that school should know that a communist is not a nationalist and vice-versa. We suggest that a man who is clever enough to recognize that the "red" Chinese are in reality nationalists should be man enough to stop calling them communists. The same goes for Russia, her satellites and the whole "Communist" International, with Yugoslavia thrown in for good measure.

THE MAJORITY VIEWPOINT

The consensus of opinion among the Western allies is that Russia is the immediate menace; that the preservation of the European network of alliances is the more potent military strategy; and the bombing of Manchuria or the coast of China would be most likely to embroil Russia in the "police action" and transform it into global hot war.

Actually, there is not so much of a divergence on the question of the Chinese-Soviet relations as the surface noise would seem to indicate. The Western Allies, particularly Great Britain, appear to agree with MacArthur that the present Chinese regime is the "fruition" of China's nationalist revolution, that China in the final analysis has economic interests in conflict with Russia and that she appears to be dominating the Asiatic scene. The Western European allies also know, however, that should they become involved in a major Asiatic war with China, Russia is in an excellent position to gobble them up. The strategy of the U.N. militarists seems to be one of containing the war in Korea, killing as many Chinese as possible, and at **the same time trying to jockey China into a settlement and a break with her Russian ally.**

Take for example the viewpoint of General Marshall in his testimony before the Senate investigating committee:

"Now I will try to be brief again in regard to the difference I think [exists] in the Far East, and it is this in the main: that Russia possesses a very valuable ally in China. That you might say is a Russian protectorate in a sense, but one who is paying a great bill in human lives and other things in order to fulfill that role.

"Now in view of their treaty with the Chinese Communist regime or government, if it appears that they have failed to support that government in its fight in Korea, we have a very special situation because it effects every other satellite of the Soviet Government.

"Sold Down the River"

"They get their example from that, and to use the common expression in this country, that they have been sold down the river after a great sacrifice of life. So it has seemed to me and my associates and advisers that we are confronted by a Soviet Government in a very difficult position itself as to what it does in relation to the failure up to the present time of the Chinese Communist forces to drive us out of Korea."

N. Y. TIMES, May 13, 1951.

So goes American capitalism's latest and greatest "great debate." Was Truman right in firing MacArthur? Does MacArthur know more about the Orient and the strategy that should be employed there than the U. S. State Department? Would MacArthur's methods lead to global war or will the present U. N. policy bring it on?

So far as we socialists are concerned, the whole debate is relatively unimportant excepting that it gives the working class an opportunity to identify its own interests with those of capitalism, which is a mighty fine thing, for capitalism. One very important question they could bring into the committee's investigation of the nation's top brass and political chieftains — but undoubtedly will not is: What will be done with all the new defense plants in case there is no global war in the near future? According to John Harriman, financial columnist for the "Boston Globe" in an article on April 19, 1951, "The financial community of the nation is greatly worried over what will happen to the economy in 1952 and 1953 when it will have a productive capacity perhaps 20 per cent above today's and 50 per cent above that of 1939." . . . "What then" he asks, "in 1952 or perhaps 1953, if we have not in the meantime been forced into war? What then, when the new plants we are now building add their quotas to the stream of goods now being produced and the demands of the military have leveled off?" Mr. Harriman closes with the remark: "Perhaps we can put factories in grease and watch 'em grow obsolete. But what are we going to do with the human beings who have been working in those grease-encased factories."

In view of the fact that capitalism is caught up in an ever-narrowing cycle of war - prosperity - "peace" - depression - recession - dis-inflation, etc. the companion parties of socialism would like to present a different resolution to our fellow-workers which we earnestly urge them to debate, to wit: Resolved that in the interests of human decency, capitalism must be abolished and a sane system of society — socialism — introduced.

HARMO

NO MASTER

Saith man to man, we've heard and known
That we no master need
To live upon this earth, our own,
For us hath forged the chain,
The grief of slaves long passed away
Till now each workers' patient day
Build up the House of Pain.

And we, shall we too, crouch and quail,
Ashamed, afraid of strife,
And lest our lives untimely fail
Embrace the Death in Life?
Nay, cry aloud, and have no fear,
We few against the world;
Awake, arise! the hope we hear
Against the curse is hurled.

It grows and grows — are we the same,
The feeble band, the few?
Or what are these with eyes aflame,
And hands to deal and do?
This is the host that bears the word,
NO MASTER HIGH OR LOW —
A lightning flame, a shearing sword,
A storm to overthrow.

WILLIAM MORRIS

INDISPENSABLE READING

Two New Pamphlets:

THE SOCIALIST PARTY AND WAR — published by the Socialist Party of Great Britain — 25¢. 100 pages of the finest analysis of war to be obtained. It contains a chapter on Korea.

MANIFESTO OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF IRELAND — 20¢. An historic document. Order from Literature Agent, 3000 Grand River, Room 307, Detroit 1, Mich.

TRIAL SUB CARDS

BUY 3-month trial sub cards for 25¢ each. Sell them or make gifts to your friends. We MUST boost circulation of the **The Western Socialist.**