

others were humbly convinced was right, he could rightfully seek God's help, and could regard success as evidence of His help. So speaks the President's announcement of the victory of Gettysburg: "For this he especially desires that on this day He whose will should ever be done be everywhere remembered and revered with profoundest gratitude." What-ever may be said about blessing war, Lincoln could and did ask God to bless him and bless the country in waging war in a good cause. As the war went on, he was evidently more and more overshadowed by the sense that God was on the scene and was working out some high purpose amid terrors and sorrows. He rose to mystical certainty of God's guidance and God's call to him and the country to go on in the way that He taught was right: "We hoped for a happy termination of this terrible war long before this. But God knows best, and has ruled otherwise. We shall yet acknowledge His wisdom, and our own error therein. Meanwhile we must work earnestly in the best lights He gives us, trusting that so working will

conduce to the great end He ordains. Surely He intends some great good to follow this mighty convulsion, which no mortal could make, and no mortal could stay."

That war cannot be conducted without hatred is a necessary deduction for those who hold the dogma that war is always and altogether evil. The same conviction is maintained by many who support particular wars; it was maintained in the Civil War on both sides. Of all this Lincoln is the standing refutation. In him there was no bitterness, malice, or vindictiveness. He proves that a man can wage a war in what he under God believes a good cause, without hating his fellow-men.

From the beginning of this war British Christians have found precious light and comfort and strength in the example of Lincoln. His own countrymen in their crisis now enter into this sacred heritage. What this light, comfort and strength are require no words from any other. Lincoln's own words and deeds suffice.

The New Menace in Isolationism

ROBERT E. FITCH

WITH the formal entry of the United States into the World War, most isolationists have put patriotism ahead of their former scruples, and have indicated their readiness to support their country to the limit. But the old temper of mind still survives under the new circumstances. We may expect, therefore, that it will continue to nourish attitudes and to encourage policies that are incompatible with the successful prosecution of the war, and with the effective establishment of the peace.

In this connection, it is helpful to distinguish between the robust isolationist and the tender-minded isolationist. The robust isolationist is, at heart, a rabid nationalist. When he is awakened from his pipe-dream of isolationism, he is ready to outdo in ferocity and in vindictiveness all those whom he formerly denounced as "war-mongers" and as "imperialists." The tender-minded isolationist is simply a comfortable nationalist. During the past two years he built up a series of rationalizations to protect himself in his complacency: that we didn't need to fight, because we weren't really implicated in the war; that we couldn't beat Germany, anyway, if we did fight; that probably the British and the Russians could handle the job fairly well without our aid. These last two propositions may not be logically compatible, but they were part of the apologetic of complacency.

Already in the pronouncements of men like Sena-

tors Pat McCarran and Burton Wheeler, we see the workings of robust isolationism when it has been converted to war. We are still told that "Every other country is looking out for itself, and we should look out for ourselves." And, while regret is expressed that the United States "does not now have the bombs and the bombers to bomb hell out of Tokyo, Kobe, and other Japanese cities," we are assured that, when our turn does come, "we shall retaliate by making a shambles out of their cities," and it is urged upon us that we "certainly show them no mercy."

Now it is true that we must look out for ourselves. But, if our concern is only for ourselves, then this war will have been fought in vain. Also, one need not deny that the military necessities in defeating a tough and suicidal foe like the Japanese may involve the bombing of large centers of civilian population. But the program recommended by the robust isolationists is not dictated by military expediency. It is dictated by selfish nationalism, by blind hatred, by vengeful ferocity, that, on some occasions, will exceed the requirements of military expediency, and that, on other occasions, will go counter to the demands of military expediency. In any case, we shall not be well led in the war, or well led in the peace, by men whose one ambition is to atone now by savage cries and gestures for their own political blindness in the past.

But most isolationists are not robust; they are ten-

der-minded. From this quarter we may look for at least four continuing emphases. Those who have believed all along that we could not defeat Germany alone are not likely to believe that we can defeat both Germany and Japan. Certainly they will not have the vision to see how it can be done. They have not properly heretofore estimated American economic resources, and, above all, American resources in morale; and they are not likely to do so now. They enter this conflict with the rather desperate feeling that it is a hopeless and ruinous one, but that they must bravely do their patriotic duty, anyway.

In the second place, the representatives of this temper will be ready to quit the fight before it is fairly finished. They will be ready to quit, first of all, because they have never seen, and cannot now see, in what manner a genuine victory is possible. They will be ready to quit, in the second place, because they have never really believed in this fight, because they do not really believe in it now, and because they are still lacking in any adequate conception of the character of the total world situation, and of the nature of our intricate involvement in it.

In the third place, the tender-minded isolationists will continue to foster the fallacious belief in the possibility of a negotiated peace. They have never understood, and cannot now understand, why it is possible to negotiate with a country like China, but not with a country like Japan; why it is possible to negotiate with democratic Britain and with democratic France, but not with Nazi Germany; and why it is possible to negotiate, only to a limited extent, with Vichy-France and with Soviet Russia. They still hold on to the optimistic illusion that all men are rational beings. They do not see that rationality is a hard-won achievement—more hard-won for the nation than even for the individual. They do not recognize that “deliberative bodies” exist only in democratic nations; and that we can negotiate only with such countries as have built the habit of rational compromise and honest adherence to contractual commitments into their mores over a long and painful process of cultural evolution. And they are too tenderly sentimental to realize that, when a nation consistently exploits the techniques of negotiation in an unscrupulous manner and for predatory purposes, the only way of dealing with it is through force, and force without stint.

Finally—and this is most serious—the tender-minded isolationists will be the ones to frustrate the establishment of an effective world peace after this war, as they were after the first great war. They were opposed to the League of Nations, because, as they said, the League would get America into foreign wars. By the end of this conflict, they will probably be in favor of a League of Nations, because the League represents the technique of ineffectual de-

liberation and negotiation in which they so ardently believe. After this war, however, it will be necessary for one or two nations—like Great Britain and the United States—aggressively to assume the responsibility of policing and of ordering the world. They will have to do it according to democratic procedures, and not according to fascist procedure. But, at this point, we may be sure, the tender-minded isolationists will begin to scream “imperialism!” at our government, just as they screamed “war-monger!” at the government which tried to get ready for the conflict in which we now find ourselves.

To be sure, this is no time for recriminations against those who were not with us in the past, but are with us now. We must welcome gladly all those who are ready to cooperate in the present enterprise. Nonetheless, it is necessary to distinguish between the isolationists who have really been converted to a new outlook, and those who have changed their actions but not their minds. We can hardly entrust the leadership of this venture to those who have misjudged events in the past, and who do not yet understand the events of the present. The isolationist temper dies hard. And if we compromise with it now, it will both weaken our war effort, and frustrate the establishment of the peace after the war.

Post-War Reconstruction

Christianity and Crisis will publish a series of articles during the coming months by various specialists on problems of post-war reconstruction. Some of the topics to be considered are the following:

“National Sovereignty and International Federation” by Raymond Leslie Buell, editor of the *Fortune* Round Table and formerly president of the Foreign Policy Association.

“The Relation of Political to Economic Reconstruction” by Hans Simons, Dean of the New School of Social Research.

“The Small Nations and European Reconstruction” by Philip Mosely, Professor of History at Cornell University.

“Differences in British and American Conceptions of Post-War Reconstruction” by Henry P. Van Dusen, Professor of Systematic Theology at Union Theological Seminary.

“Spiritual Problems of Post-War Reconstruction” by Paul Tillich, Professor of Systematic Theology at Union Theological Seminary, and Jacques Maritain, eminent French philosopher.

“The Prospects for Christianity in Russia” by George P. Fedotov, a noted Greek Orthodox theologian, who is now a lecturer at Yale Divinity School.

“The Jewish Problem and Its Solution” by Eugene Kohn, Managing Editor of *The Reconstructionist*, a Jewish bi-weekly publication.