

cause of complaint—she paid for our food in good current cash, and being strictly neutral English money is as good as German money.

Then came the German submarine, which really threatened "our" trade. Not in the way the British blockade did—by making us take English money for our exports instead of German money, but by making us lose our war-trade upon which "we" have been growing fat. So we threatened war, unless Germany modified her submarine policy so as not to interfere with our gathering in of the shekels. Allied shekels in this case. But it is their being shekels that counts, not their nationality. And as long as Germany was willing to accommodate us in this respect, we were "patient" and "long-suffering" as far as her other iniquities and "horrors" were concerned.

On February 1, 1917, Germany refused to accommodate us any longer. During the month of February our war trade fell off to an alarming extent, and was threatened with extinction. So we were at war with Germany on April 5.

Here, in these few and simple facts, is the true nature of the beast—Capitalism—and the perfect consistency of its American jockey, Mr. Woodrow Wilson.

Both beast and jockey are thoroughly selfish, and do not permit any "outside" considerations to influence their course! They have no "sympathies" nor "general principles." The God they serve is the only God they know—*Business*.

B.

AMERICA IN THE WAR—WAR AIMS

The reason why a nation enters upon a conflict and the aims which it pursues in prosecuting it are not merely closely connected. Ordinarily, these are merely two ways of expressing the same things, and a difference between them can only exist if in the course of the conflict something has occurred which has brought about a change in the original object of the war. As we are still at the beginning of the war, our aims and objects in entering upon it, and the reasons for doing so are, of course, identical.

Our war-enthusiasts, particularly among radicals and Socialists, continually prate about our high aims, purposes in this war: destruction of militarism and autocracy; preservation and extension of democracy; international organization of the world for peace and progress, etc.

We have already pointed out the real reason for this country's entry into the war; and it is clear that a country entering upon a war for such sordid reasons cannot possibly prosecute it for high aims and purposes. And it is interesting to note that we have official confirmation of our view that this war was entered upon by us, and will therefore be prosecuted on our part purely and solely for our selfish and sordid interests. This confirmation is contained in the debates in Congress upon the war question—the reasons given by the pro-war speakers why we should go to war, and the opinions expressed by them as to the aims which we should seek to accomplish thereby. We cannot, of course, reproduce here all of these speeches, so we shall give a few typical samples.

Senator Kirby (Democrat, Arkansas) expressly stated that we were "not going into a world war to establish a democracy for the nations of the earth." Our aim in this war, according to this authority, is "to protect the lives of our people on the open sea, *and our commerce*."

Senator Harding (Republican, Ohio) said:

"It is my deliberate judgment that it is none of our business what type of government any nation on this earth may choose to have." Which may be good enough doctrine, but rather peculiar for those entering into a bloody war against autocracy and for democracy.

As to our real reason for entering the war, Senator Williams, of Mississippi, a leader among the Democrats in the Senate and an administration spokesman, said, apostrophising Germany:

"We have got nothing to do with the question of your whipping Great Britain; you whip her all you please or can, but do not undertake to whip us (i. e., *do not spoil our business*) while you are about it."