

Individual terror and violence as a theory is a petty bourgeois policy. The proletariat depends upon mass action to accomplish the conquest of power; and after this conquest, the revolutionary proletariat may resort to the use of mass terror, if necessary, in order to establish and protect the conquests of the revolution.

Whether these individual acts function in the development of mass action, is doubtful. The important thing is to impress upon the proletariat, not the ideology of individual action, but the ideology of revolutionary mass action, of mass effort and discipline. This is Bolshevik policy, the policy of revolutionary Socialism.

We cannot, considering the circumstances and the provocation, violently condemn Emile Cottin—his was an heroic, if ill-judged act; but we can and must condemn his policy of individual terror as a tactic of the militant proletariat.

Balkan Mexico

THE imperialistic phrase, "Mexico is our Balkan peninsula," used by Theodore Roosevelt, is becoming very popular. It is instinct with the threat of aggression. Immediately after the armistice, there developed a violent imperialistic campaign against Mexico, a campaign having as its avowed object the conquest of Mexico by the United States, for American Imperialism. Scores of newspapers fulminated against Mexico; in the Senate, a resolution was introduced that would create antagonism against Japan and Mexico; and American finance-capital is preparing itself for the financial conquest of Mexico. In the epoch of Imperialism this necessarily means military and political conquest.

News reports are coming that "Mexican bandits" are again active on the border, threatening the lives—and property—of Americans. Villa again stalks though the press, sinister and merciless, as the pretext for developing feeling and action against Mexico. The Mexican government has acquired "stability" (largely by means of mercilessly suppressing radical labor), its finances are in excellent condition, law and order prevails; all this, naturally unpalatable to the imperialist, necessitates a new line of attack against Mexico in order to bring intervention and conquest, and the new attack consists of the charge that the Mexican government is "expropriating the property" of American citizens.

The adventures of American Imperialism in Mexico are characteristic and instructive. They cast a light upon the actual purpose of intervention and reveal it as a means of promoting finance-capital and Imperialism.

Under the regime of Porfirio Diaz, foreign capital secured a strangle hold upon the natural resources of Mexico, which are enormous, and of tremendous potential value. By means of bribery, the merciless suppression of the rights of the people and a complete refusal to recognize ordinary decency, the Mexican people were made the actual serfs of foreign capital. Millions of dollars were invested in oil wells, in docks and railways, etc., an investment which represented powerful financial groups and which weighed down upon the Mexican people. The corrupt government of Diaz combined with corrupt foreign capital to steal all that was of value from the Mexican people; "concessions" were granted to American investors, "concessions" which meant giving over control of the people's resources without any substantial return, actually stealing these resources.

Mexico's industrial future was mortgaged to international Imperialism, particularly to the Imperialism of the United States. There were two aspects of this situation which developed revolt against foreign capital: its merciless oppression of the Mexican workers, and the fact that Mexican Capitalism, the Mexican bourgeoisie, was expropriated, and could not really develop power while the basis of its power, the natural resources and the railways, were in the control of American Imperialism.

The Mexican revolution, while in its fundamentals a revolt of the peons against the landed aristocracy, was in one phase equally a revolt against the domination of foreign capital. The press of international Imperialism was hostile to the revolution, not only because it was destroying the immediate profits of foreign investors, but because it threatened the future supremacy of foreign capital. A terrific campaign, accordingly, developed in the American press for intervention in Mexico,—to prevent starvation, to restore order and protect humanity; precisely the sort of buncombe which is now being used to favor intervention in revolutionary Russia. But what international Imperialism was actually afraid of was that out of the revolution might develop a national Capitalism in Mexico, a homogeneous capitalist class which would threaten the supremacy of foreign capital and diminish its opportunity for plunder.

This is precisely what happened. The government of Carranza established itself firmly in power, and immediately developed a campaign against revolutionary labor and against foreign capital. Labor was "disciplined" by means of merciless repression and massacres during strikes. But it was much more difficult to discipline international Imperialism; although the war gave Carranza's government an excellent opportunity, which it used to the utmost. The purpose of this government was to destroy the strangle hold that foreign capital, particularly American, had upon Mexico's natural resources. This was accomplished by means of a clause in the Constitution, which provides that "all contracts and concessions made by the former government from and after 1876, which shall have resulted in the monopoly of land, waters and natural resources of the nation by a single individual or corporation, are declared subject to revision, and the executive is authorized to declare those null and void which seriously prejudice the public interest." Ownership in lands or waters may be acquired only by Mexicans "by birth or naturalization," and in Mexican companies subject to the sovereign authority and laws of Mexico; ownership may be acquired by foreigners "provided they agree before the department of foreign affairs to be considered Mexicans in respect to such property, and accordingly not to invoke the protection of their government in respect to the same, under penalty, in case of breach, of forfeiture to the nation of property so acquired." The purpose of these constitutional provisions are clear: they are means of establishing the national sovereignty of Mexico, and of Mexican Capital.

The provision stipulating that foreigners may own certain property "provided they agree before the department of foreign affairs to be considered Mexicans in respect to such property, and accordingly not to invoke the protection of their government in respect to the same," is of especial importance, and characteristic of the general purposes. Foreign investors use their particular national governments to secure special "rights" in the country in which they invest, and intrigue to have their governments secure political control of the country. The mechanics of Imperialism develop out of investments in "backward nations" the owners of which appeal for "protection," after which an imperialistic nation has the pretext for intervention and conquest. The Mexican government wants no interference from foreign governments; the fundamental law of Mexico must be supreme, and must control the investors. This is an important measure, which if realizable, would lower the ascendancy of foreign capital and promote the hegemony of the national Capitalism of Mexico.

In order to realize this sovereignty over Mexico's industry and politics, the government imposed a heavy tax upon the development of oil. American and British interests have about \$3,000,000 invested in the oil wells, and they unanimously agreed that the tax was "confiscatory." They appealed to Ambassador Fletcher, who after discussing the matter with the American State Department, transmitted a note to the Mexican government early in 1918, declaring the tax law "confiscatory," that it was "taking property without due process of law," and that "it becomes the function of the government of the United States most earnestly and respectfully to call the attention of the Mexican government to the necessity which may arise to impel it to protect the property of its citizens in Mexico divested or injuriously affected by the decree above cited. If Mexico insists upon the execution of the law, there can be only one result."

This is typical imperialistic diplomacy. It is the expression of a tendency which might provoke war with Mexico, and is precisely the policy which American Imperialism will more and more compel the government to pursue. According to the law of nations, the Mexican government is perfectly within its rights in the course it has adopted; but as this course would monopolize the natural resources for Mexican Capitalism and break the control of international Imperialism, it must be changed. Raw materials are a necessity of modern Capitalism; Mexico is bursting with raw materials which international Imperialism covets; and so there develops a new campaign for intervention in Mexico, potential of a new war and aggression. The campaign is proceeding actively.

Mexico is the American Balkans. The Imperialism of the United States considers financial control of Mexico—and of the American continents—absolutely indispensable to its plans for world power. The attitude that "Mexico is our Balkans" contains the threat of a new world war.

It is authoritatively announced that the League of Nations will be incorporated in the Peace Treaty and it is authoritatively announced that the Peace Treaty will not include the League of Nations draft. Does it really matter?

Bolshevikjabs

IT is no wonder that our opponents constantly refer to Bolshevism as an "insidious menace." The Methodist Church is in a fair way to be split wide on the question, if we are to believe the newspapers. Dr. Harry Ward, professor of Christian ethics in a Methodist University, it appears, has refused to slam the Bolsheviks and his reverend colleagues are out for his blood, metaphorically speaking of course.

We may shortly expect to see the formation of the Bolshevik Methodists and the anti-Bolshevik Methodists and perhaps even the charge that Lenin is a Methodist.

From reading the newspapers on the 17th of March one would be inclined to believe that the Irish are tremendously popular, but when we turn from the front page headlines and run across "O'Leary an Aid of Germany" we come to the conclusion that the popularity is not wholly unalloyed.

How is it that with the reports of the way the Majority "Socialists" in Germany are terrorizing their opponents and indulging in mass murders we don't hear anything of a reign of terror? Perhaps it is because it all depends against whom the excesses are aimed whether or not the executions constitute a "reign of terror." We may expect to hear little of the "Yellow Terror" while the Scheidemanns retain control, but when the Spartacans rise to power then the press will shriek about the "Reign of Terror" every time one of the German bourgeois stubs his toe.

The Yellow Terror of the bourgeois-Socialists of Germany has not yet drawn a protest "in the name of our common humanity" from the "neutral powers" nor is it likely to do so. The "Red Terror" has "horrorified" the world but it would appear that the world's horror was inspired more by the color than the terror.

We suppose the reason the French government refuses passports to the committee elected by the Bern Conference for the purpose of investigation of Bolshevism is that it is afraid that if these gentlemen went to Russia they would become contaminated or perhaps that they might be tempted to tell the truth. Regarding the first supposition we would like to assure the French government that there is absolutely no danger of such a committee becoming contaminated with Bolshevism. The Bolsheviks pulled off a revolution that these gentlemen knew was premature and unscientific, and after all it is a human weakness to be unable to forgive those who have proven one wrong.

On the second matter we might say that the moderate Socialists, though they have sometimes fallen before the temptation of ministerial portfolios, have very successfully resisted the temptation to become revolutionists.

But perhaps the French Government is wiser than we were at first inclined to believe—maybe it thinks that if the Mensheviks could see their European prototypes they would immediately become converted to Bolshevism.

Strange are the ways of morality. The Committee of Fourteen that looks after New York's moral welfare is quoted to the effect that it "expected the police would detail women to walk the streets and if improperly accosted by men, to arrest the men under the law." It however omits to mention the ways in which it proposes to moralize the women who would accept such jobs.

Reaction and Finance in Russia

MORE and more the Allied intervention shows itself as not merely anti-Bolshevik, but as counter-revolutionary. All over the place the men of the old regime are "creeping out to see the sun again" and look to a return to power "in the baggage-wagons of the Allies." Even the anti-Bolshevik revolutionaries are taking alarm. The Omsk Government to which they pinned their faith has been overthrown by a military dictatorship. The reactionaries are coming more and more to the fore. And behind the reactionaries stand the financial interests whose object is the exploitation of Russia for the profit of Western Capitalism. There are schemes afoot for the formation of "chartered companies" which are to take over the running of whole branches of Russian industry. Finally, for the proper understanding of Allied policy in Russia, we commend a passage from the *Financial News*: "In the city it is realized that events are shaping more and more towards an international sovereignty over Russia, modelled on the British surveillance of Egypt. Such an event would transform Russian bonds into the cream of the international market." — *The Herald* (England)