

to crush Socialism and promote its own Imperialism in its own way.

In another part of his address, the President said:

"But you understand that the nations of Europe have again and again clashed with one another in competitive interest. It is impossible for men to forget those sharp issues that were drawn between them in times past. It is impossible for men to believe that all ambitions have all of a sudden been foregone. They remember territory that was coveted; they remember rights that it was attempted to extort; they remember political ambitions that it was attempted to realize, and, while they believe that men have come into a different temper, they cannot forget these things, and so they do not resort to one another for a dispassionate view of the matters in controversy. They resort to that nation which has won the enviable distinction of being regarded as the friend of mankind."

The implication is that the United States has never coveted or seized territory. The war with Mexico, in 1848, it is admitted by historians, was an act of brigandage. Then there was the war with Spain, an adventure in developing Imperialism, and the seizure of the Philippines. Intervention with Mexico was attempted, and prevented only by fortunate circumstances; and today there is an aggressive campaign for war against Mexico and the seizure of that country in the interest of American Imperialism. The President says not a word about the Republics in Central America and the Carribeans, which are absolutely under the control of the United States, armed force being used to terrorize the people.

No; America is not the "friend of mankind," it is in words, but not in deeds. Acts speak louder than words; while negotiating to free the small peoples of Europe, why not free the small people in Central America and the Carribeans from the yoke of American militarism and Imperialism? To discover America's intentions, one must not study the words of Wilson at the Peace Conference, but the acts of Capitalism at home,—its aggressive Imperialism, its repression of the proletariat, its jailings and deportations.

In its January 11 issue *The New Republic* says: "If there is one characteristic that America today appears not to present, that is Imperialism." It then says that "no competent psychologist or historian looks to surface indications only for a revelation of the real character of a man or a nation, still less for a revelation of destiny." It proceeds:

"We have a vivid sense and impression of unbounded power. We raised great armies, and, man for man, we are firmly convinced they were of as good fighting quality as ever moved upon the earth. We exhibited colossal industrial strength. In science and invention, in mechanical skill and organizing ability, we accomplished marvels, so we believe. Our financial achievement was prodigious. We developed strength beyond our belief, nevertheless we feel balked. The war ended before we had proved to the world the existence of the might we were conscious of bearing within us. ... Our Allies reiterate that we did extraordinarily well in the war. Yes, but nothing like what we could have done, and shall do next time. Next time: but there is to be no next time. Are we not entering now upon an era of permanent peace? Yes, if our European Allies will it so; but if they do not will it, there are hundreds of thousands of young Americans of just the most active and energetic type, the men most likely to color our political thinking in the next generation, who will not shrink from the thought of a war in which we may really make good."

This is an indication of the belligerent psychology in the American ruling class, provocative of war. *The New Republic* places the onus of war or peace upon the European nations; but this is a begging of the question, since Imperialism is international. It then proceeds to show the necessity of a large navy—"we shall seek to build, not merely a powerful navy, but an all-powerful one. Secretary Daniels and his naval programme are symptomatic." *The New Republic* proceeds:

"Behind the American navy of the future and the American mercantile marine stands American export industry, bursting with energies demanding a vent. Behind American industry stands American finance, capacious enough, when it gets through with war priorities, to float the commerce of a world. Shall not American goods penetrate every market within reach of the salt seas? Shall not the American financier take mortgages upon whatever properties can be made to serve as guaranties for purchases? And shall we not find ourselves holding virtual mortgages on backward and improvident governments, and thus driven to meddle with political concerns, after the manner of every imperial nation since the days of Rome?"

"Quite unconsciously America is being drawn toward Imperialism. The logic of defence urges an all-powerful navy. A predominant merchant marine is a corollary of naval supremacy. The extension throughout the world of American industrial and financial power is not only a natural consequence of sea power, but there is an inherent force of expansion operating from within."

There you have it, in spite of its dodging the real issue. America is imperialistic; America is potential of aggression.

The United States was drawn into the war because it was part and parcel of the imperialistic interests of the world; it was drawn into the war because its "splendid isolation" had ceased, and its developing commercial and industrial supremacy required that it

should pursue an aggressive world policy. And while it talks "self-determination" in Europe it holds in bondage millions of our neighbors in adjoining lands; while it talks of freeing mankind, it enslaves the working class in our own country; while it talks peace, it is developing the reserves for new industrial wars, financial aggression, Imperialism and war.

The United States, our Capitalism, has no territorial stake in Europe; but it has a stake in the division and re-arrangement of the world; it has a stake in suppressing the proletarian revolution; it has a stake in preventing its European rivals from being aggrandized. That is its stake at the Peace Conference.

The policy of the United States in the war was an "idealistic" policy in this sense: that it insisted upon a settlement that would mean neither an aggrandized Britain nor a crushed Britain; neither an aggrandized Germany nor a crushed Germany—but a balance of power: two rivals neutralizing each other, instead of one big rival. Force of circumstances impelled it to go further; and now it is allied with the four great imperialistic powers, preparing to determine the policy of the world, to crush revolutions and stake out claims.

The war has made the United States the dominant industrial and financial power; and it will prepare itself to become the dominant naval power. Its industry has developed a new efficiency; its reserves of surplus capital are enormous; it must have new outlets for its products, new investment markets for the absorption of its surplus capital; it must become the most aggressive of all imperialistic nations. This accumulation of surplus capital is proceeding at a terrific pace; and it must find outlets, a "must" which will produce financial and territorial aggressions. Economically, the United States is belligerent; and economic belligerency ultimately produces military belligerency. It is, moreover, becoming the centre of reaction, the nation wherein the final struggle between Socialism and Capitalism will be waged, which will decide the destiny of the world.

How can it be otherwise, under the system of Capitalism and Imperialism? How can the multiplying contradictions and antagonisms of bourgeois society be ended upon the basis of a rapacious Capitalism?

Under Capitalism, there is no way out. Economic and financial aggression, territorial and military aggression, and new wars: all this is inevitable while Capitalism and Imperialism are in control. The proletariat must organize itself for the conquest of Capitalism and Imperialism. As against Imperial America, we shall oppose revolutionary Socialism.

#### MASSACHUSETTS NOTICE

At its last session, the C. C. C. of Local Boston, Socialist Party, decided to endorse the following nominees for members of the State Executive Committee of the party in Massachusetts: Chester Bixby; W. T. Colyer; Julius Cornell; Louis Henderson; Charles Jansen; Frank Mack; William Sharpshooter. —For the Committee: Amy Colyer, Secretary Pro-Tem.

A dispatch to the London *Daily News* from Arthur Ransome reports that the union of other Socialist parties with the Bolshevik government is now in course of progress. The Mensheviks' Party Committee has declared against intervention. At the same time the powerful Co-operative Societies have decided to abandon their policy of neutrality and "to put the whole of their experience at the service of the Soviets in the work of establishing Labor Communes."

### N. Y. City Membership Meeting

BROOKLYN LABOR LYCEUM

949 Willoughby Avenue

Monday, March 10th, 8 P. M.

to discuss

### The Left Wing Movement

Prominent speakers will address the meeting

ADMISSION BY PARTY CARD ONLY

Arranged by Left Wing Section Greater N. Y.

## Bolshevikjabs

IF "the people are in the saddle" then we must come to the conclusion that in Lawrence the cossacks are the people.

\* \* \*

Judging from Congress and the Senate if the League of Nations produces as much harmony abroad as it does at home, we are of opinion that all true pacifists will urge the continuance of the war.

\* \* \*

At any rate we are sure that the musical world is glad that it was not called the Concert of Nations.

\* \* \*

In view of the President's Boston speech we wonder are the deportations one of America's delicate ways of sending freedom to Europe.

\* \* \*

Perhaps the freedom that has gone to Europe accounts for the shortage here.

\* \* \*

Every aspect of this ill-fated league seems to cause trouble—the Boston *Transcript* has just discovered that it is a British League of Nations and not a Wilson league at all.

\* \* \*

The offer of the Bolshevik Government to exchange two American citizens for Mooney and Debs arouses great wrath on the part of the press. One editorial indignantly asks "Are Mooney and Debs Russian citizens?" These two men were American citizens but America has withdrawn their citizenship and if Russia is quick enough to pick up the good things we discard we should take the loss in good part and determine to profit by our experience.

\* \* \*

After all both Mooney and Debs are citizens of the working class, that's the reason they have been prosecuted and that's the reason Russia is interested in them.

\* \* \*

We will have to revise our opinion of the Bolsheviks. Hitherto we have been led to believe that they were ferocious looking, long haired, unshaven, dirty people, but we now find that they are very fastidious indeed. Beauty parlors, manicurists and hairdressers are doing a flourishing trade in Moscow and Petrograd we learn from the press reports.

\* \* \*

Even Leon Trotzky, who when in this country was invariably referred to as "a dirty foreigner," has apparently mended his ways. He has a special manicurist all to himself. It is at least pleasing to know the hand that signs the death warrants of the bourgeoisie is dressed in the approved bourgeois fashion, and we are awaiting with interest the announcement by our manicurist that she will clip nails a la Trotzky at the usual prices.

\* \* \*

Lenin, however, does not seem to be so fastidious regarding his personal appearance but confines himself to the more substantial things of life.

He is strong on the menu, spending 60,000 roubles a month for food which doubtless leaves him very little to squander on personal adornment. All of which just goes to show that "you can't change human nature."

\* \* \*

The Sinn Feiners cannot accuse the Peace Conference of discourtesy. They have at least got an acknowledgement of their memorial. Might we venture the opinion that the Peace Conference, and particularly that portion of it which represents Britain, paid much more attention to the Belfast Strike than to all the petitions and memorials that have been presented since the sittings began.

\* \* \*

A memorial always invites refusal, industrial action always threatens refusal.

\* \* \*

Press reports say that the Soviets won full powers in Munich. No wonder Herr Scheidemann felt the ground shaking underneath his feet. We imagine the shaking must have become a regular earthquake by now.

\* \* \*

As the Senate is about to conclude its inquiry into Bolshevism and as we are convinced that inquiries are necessary to the public welfare, if for nothing else than to keep its mind off more important things, we are shortly going to conduct our own inquiry into Democracy in this column.