

## For What War?

"There comes a time in the affairs of men when they must prepare to defend not their homes alone but the tenets of faith and humanity on which their churches, their governments and their very civilization are founded. \* \* \* To save one we must now make up our minds to save all."

In this implied warning to the fascist powers, President Roosevelt, in his address to Congress, originates a dangerous foreign policy for this country. Yet it is explainable. It is consistent with the spirit of internal paternalism to criticize the behavior of other nations. "Better than thou" punitanism knows no boundary lines.

But, which fascist power do we threaten? And if we shake our finger at any one, should we ignore the others? If fascism in Europe or Asia menaces our "tenets," how about the fascism of Central and South America? Where shall we stop in our righteous scolding? Whom shall we not chastise?

To prepare for this war against an unnamed fascist power the administration's plans call for the expenditure of \$1,319,588,000 for "national defense." This stupendous fund will be raised by a bond issue, undoubtedly; these bonds will be sold to the wealthy. For generations to come, perhaps until repudiation, the "interest" on these bonds will be a levy on the production of labor. For which labor will get an opportunity to go to war, to get killed.

And why this sudden excitement about the behaviorism of fascism? It has been going on for many years. Shall we begin with England's slaughter of Boers and East Indians? French killings in Northern Africa were not skimpy or clean. Russia for twenty years has been a slaughter house. Italy did a fine job on the Ethiopians. How about Haiti, Nicaragua, Venezuela?

It just does not make sense—this preparation for war against an undetermined enemy whose methods we do not like. Therefore, the possibility of another reason suggests itself. Can it be that the ancient trick of diverting the people's attention from their economic troubles has been resorted to? After all, six years of New Deal has not solved the problem of unemployment. In the last election the dissatisfaction with the party in power was rigorously expressed. Perhaps the administration has been forced to call on a bogey-man merely to "save face." Governments have been known to do this.

Or, is it possible that the failure of the W.P.A.-dole system is becoming so patent that another make-work program is being resorted to—armaments? Reports from England indicate that this program brought "prosperity" there.

Nobody in Washington seems to have thought of the idea that internal happiness and prosperity is the only way to solve our foreign problems. That if we destroyed privi-

lege in America, if we freed our own people from economic bondage, the example of our resulting civilization would make fascism and communism untenable. It might be a good idea to start our house cleaning at home.