

EDITORIAL

## JINGO INTERNATIONAL LAW.

By DANIEL DE LEON

**W**HAT is considered “the ablest, subtlest jingo-paper in the United States”—the Washington, D.C., *Post*—has this to say on the Mexican situation in its issue of August 29:

“The comparative ease with which Madero overthrew Porfirio Diaz when advised, aided, abetted, and supplied with arms and ammunition by juntas operating from bases in the United States; the clean sweep that our naval and maritime forces made of the revolutionary armies in Nicaragua when we landed to preserve law and order, and to maintain the existing administration there; the story of Panama, where an independent nation was created in a day and night when a Latin-American republic became obstructive; these are significant of our influence in the affairs of those countries, and emphasize the importance of closer knit and more fraternal relations.”

Another article, dealing with the same subject, and published on the very next day, furnishes the interpretation of what the *Post* understood by “closer knit and more fraternal relations.” It says:

“The problem today lies outside the scope of diplomatic doctrines and codes, and it is vain longer to observe formalities.”

As the passage throws light upon the closing words of the previous day’s passage, so does the sequence of historic facts cited in the previous day’s passage illumine the passage of the second day. Jointly the two passages amount to this:

“The United States must and will declare war against Mexico to be followed with the annexation of Mexican territory. This is the only logical course, the course being mapped out by the series of precedents which closed with ‘the story of Panama.’”

There is one link in the series of events, quoted by the *Post*, which the *Post*

omits mentioning. It is withal the most important link needed to arrive at the correct conclusion. The link is the overthrow of the decadent Capitalist, hence, Feudo-Ultramontane Administration of Taft, under whom and his “illustrious predecessor” the series of international outrages ranging from Panama to Nicaragua were perpetrated, and the substitution of that Administration with an Administration of the bourgeois at his best.

No more than the Administration of Woodrow Wilson felt itself bound by the “precedent” introduced by the Taft Administration of conspiring with American Financiers to the end of obtaining a footing in China that should furnish the U.S. Government with the pretext to take a hand in the internal administration of the young republic in the Far East, and the ultimate pretext for war, intervention and, possibly, occupation also,—no more than that precedent was found binding, may the “precedents” in Central America and Mexico be found of compelling force. With the identical emphasis and directness that the present Administration announced its repudiation of the Taft “precedent” regarding China; may we expect to see it repudiate the “precedents” established by the Roosevelt and Taft Administrations in Central America and Mexico as already it has begun to do.

The *Washington Post* may be “subtle”; it may even be “able.” Yet, such is the fate of ability when it is turned to ignoble purposes, that all the ability the *Washington Post* is given credit for has not been able to save its bourgeois-vulgar jingoism from the fatal slip of reasoning from incomplete premises, thereby tumbling into a preposterous theory of International Law and Practice.

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official website of the Socialist Labor Party of America.  
Uploaded February 2016

[slpns@slp.org](mailto:slpns@slp.org)