CLOSE observers of the Mexican situation realize that while the triumph of Carranza removes the immediate danger of intervention, Mexico's sovereignty and future are being threatened in other ways. One of these ways—the most threatening—is foreign financial pressure. Mexican resources are mortgaged to foreign capital. That Carranza realizes the necessity of Mexico being inde-

pendent of foreign financial control was attested during the revolution when he financed his movement with Mexican money, and refused the financial assistance of foreign concessionaires. A recent decree of Carranza's concerning the redemption of notes in gold, and the storm aroused, is symptomatic of the new danger. "Official communications" to our State Department report threats to close the foreign banks in Mexico City and the destruction of Mexican credit. The embassies in Mexico City, after unsuccessful attempts to influence Carranza directly to rescind the decree. have made "vigorous representations" to our State Department. This is the first skirmish in a war of finance that involves the integrity and future of Mexico. American Imperialism has not yet given up its rapacious desire for the complete control of Mexico—an ideal country for the export of capital. The task of political and economic reconstruction in Mexico depends completely upon how thoroughly the schemes of foreign capital can be thwarted.—*F.*

The Newest "Impossibilism"

THE great argument against the old S. L. P. and "Impossibilism" generally, was that they considered nothing mattered but the fight against capitalism, the overthrow of capitalism. The chief point at issue was the question of reform—whether Socialists should go in for reform or should not. One side dismissed the whole question with an emphatic negative; the other side with an emphatic positive. And the Socialist reformers argued that you cannot fight capitalism without fighting the *manifestations* of capitalism. The gyrations of time has brought this peculiar change: the very people who argued against the policy of fighting for the overthrow of capitalism alone, are now using that argument in dismissing the question of preparedness. "Preparedness isn't a fundamental, we must get back to fundamentals; let's fight capitalism and stop bothering with that manifestation of capitalism, 'preparedness.'" That is the way they argue, these old "opportunists" turned "impossibilists."—*F.*

The Working Class or Capitalism?

THERE is a strong group of pacifists and some Socialists who are placing reliance upon the forces of capitalist internationalism for the ending of war. The argument is that nationalism—economic nationalism—is the cause of war, while internationalism makes for peace. The argument forgets the essential fact that only one aspect of capitalist internationalism makes for peace; that, like national capitalism itself, international capitalism is compounded of various tendencies, some of which make for war and some for peace.

Imperialism, for example, is essentially belligerent, commerce as such essentially peaceful. The commercial forces bringing nations closer together economically make for peace; but Imperialism, while also an expression of the capitalist revolt against the bonds of nationality, separates nations and makes for war. This indicates the necessity for a study of capitalism—in its national and international aspects—and the forces making for war and peace.

The Socialists who expect the end of war through the forces of capitalist internationalism err as much as the Socialists who maintain that Imperialism is a necessary transitional stage to Socialism. And their common error is this: instead of relying upon the development of *the power of the working class,* they rely upon the development of capitalism. The former is dynamic, Socialist, the latter mechanistic, Utopian.—*F.*

Where is the Marx of Yester-Year?

IN a recent issue the Milwaukee *Leader,* arguing against the internationalists, says:

"They don't want Socialism according to Marx. He indorsed national defense; a national militia; universal military education; Socialist partisanship in international problems for definite national governments offering the best outlook for working class growth; voting for the least objectionable old party candidate when Socialists were out of the running; centralization of power in the hands of the party executive; and affiiliation of Socialists with the most representative labor unions for the purpose of supporting their most advanced members."

If the *Leader* has any self-respect or any respect for the Socialist movement, it will prove these assertions by citing book and chapter.—*F.*

BOARD OF EDITORS

Frank Bohn
William E. Bohn
Louis B. Boudin
Floyd Dell
W. E. B. Du Bois
Max Eastman
Louis C. Fraina
Felix Grendon
Isaac A. Hourwich
Paul Kennaday
Robert Rives La Monte
Joseph Michael
Arthur Livingston
Robert H. Lowie
Helen Marot
Moses Oppenheimer
Herman Simpson
Wm. English Walling

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Arthur Bullard
George Allan England
Charlotte Perkins Gilman
Arturo Giovanitti
Harry W. Laidler
Austin Lewis
John Macy
Gustavus Myers
Mary White Ovington
William J. Robinson
Charles P. Steinmetz
J. G. Phelps Stokes
Horace Traubel
John Kenneth Turner

Published by the New Review Publishing Association

256 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY

ALFXANDER FRASER, President — JULIUS HEIMAN, Treasurer — LOUIS C. FRAINA, Secretary

Subscription $1.50 a year in United States and Mexico; six months, $0.75. $1.75 in Canada and $2.00 in foreign countries. Single copies, 10 cents.

Entered at the New York post-office as second-class mail matter.