

## ISOLATIONISM

The path of isolationism is the last to be considered and for good reasons. It is morally the basest of the courses open to the American people. To the internationalist pleading with Saint Paul, "Bear Ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ," the isolationist brazenly retorts with the words of Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Rationally speaking this course is the least worthy of respect, being counselled by ignorance and shortsighted selfishness. Farsighted national self-interest, mindful of the lessons of 1812 and of 1917, agree with idealism that the only escape from involvement in a world war is through the prevention of the outbreak of a world war.

Lastly this course deserves the emphasis of final consideration because isolationism is the path that will undoubtedly be followed by our policy in the present and the immediate future, although history has shown that it is but the primrose path which leads inevitably, however slowly and deviously, to the camp-fires of a new Armageddon. Yet narrow nationalism is the ruling spirit of our foreign policy today, because of which the United States denies to the League of Nations that cooperation without which great questions of international importance never can be settled except by war.

It is this short-sighted nationalism which has caused the rejection of the Waterways Treaty with Canada, a rejection supported by senatorial arguments that the treaty, in spite of physical and political geography, would endanger the sovereignty of the United States over Lake Michigan. When one hears such fantastic theories put forward, and when one hears the doctrine advanced that the United States, a compact, continental power, must spend dollar for dollar on naval construction with Great Britain whose loose-knit dominions are scattered over the seven seas of the globe, one is tempted to inquire how many senators ever look at a map.

It is this nationalism which stubbornly refuses to face the fact that Europe cannot pay its war debts to this country, and which remains stupidly blind to the fact that it would not pay them if it could. A settlement of the war debt issue on the basis of a maximum of money and a minimum of mischief could doubtless be obtained if Congress empowered the President to discover what sum each of the debtor nations would pay to avoid the stigma of default, and empowered him to accept that sum and cancel the debt. But the isolationist majority in Congress cannot forget that Franklin Roosevelt campaigned for the League of Nations in 1920; and the recently passed Johnson Act by which Congress repudiates the common sense doctrine that even one thin slice is better than no bread at all, shows how little likelihood exists of the President's receiving authority to settle the war debt question upon the only possible basis.

It is all too evident, indeed, that Mr. Roosevelt has no intention whatever of endangering his party leadership and his domestic policies by advocating entrance upon the path of international cooperation. Those who believe that it is both the interest and the moral duty of the United States to protect the free democracies of Europe against the red fool fury of the Communist and Nazi will find