

call up certain possibilities. A government bankrupted through armament might hope to reimburse itself by tribute levied upon Wall Street; a dictator might seek to retain power through the prestige of foreign conquest or through the spreading of Fascist ideals by fire and sword. Modern history contains no instance of such frankly unprovoked invasion; even Italy in Ethiopia and Japan in China claimed the lame excuse of raids to be avenged and armies to be dislodged, and the Japanese attacks upon Pearl Harbor and the Philippines, in spite of their treachery, were not invasions as such but attempted seizures of naval bases in the course of a world war in which Japan was already involved. Official propaganda can do much, however, at least for a time, and we may suppose the enemy peoples wrought up through atrocity stories to the point of readiness to send their armies to invade a peaceful and unarmed neighbor.

Since there could be no mobilization on our part to make haste imperative, the foreign government would, of course, begin with negotiations of one kind or another—demands for tribute, territory, or complete surrender of political existence. These would be met by our government with diplomacy, with offers of arbitration and conciliation, and with formal recourse to the World Court. Only after deliberate defiance of world opinion could an enemy nation issue the ultimatum preliminary to invasion or proceed to a surprise attack without such notice.

We now have the United States faced with the alternative of resistance to the death or of “lying down” in submission. It is true that resistance is a lottery at best, and that even such absolute surrender as that of Germany in 1918 would have lost half its tragedy if it could have been put through in the summer of 1914, before a soldier had been mobilized. In the

absence of revenge any tribute must be imposed by greed alone, and in that case might prove as stimulating to the surrendered country as the tribute paid by France after the Franco-Prussian war. Cultural ideas which run counter to group spirit can, of course, be enforced in name only, and there is evidence that a nation united in devotion to its traditions may maintain its own way of life even after nominal surrender.

### ***How A Pacifist Nation Would “Prepare”***

In the present discussion, however, we are disregarding the alternative of submission in any degree, and assuming a people firm in the determination to die rather than yield as individuals, or as a nation, to the demands of an invader. No surrender but resistance to the bitter end is the national policy.

The country is prepared for the conflict, having taken the bold step of disarmament, after years of mounting pacifism and in full anticipation of a possible test. Adventurous spirits have even looked forward to the chance of invasion as to the literal “war to end war” in which their nation might be the protagonist, with opportunities of heroism for every citizen undreamed of under the old regime.

The entire populace has been continually educated by all the resources of school, church and radio. Recognizing that its own country embodies liberty in such concrete forms as freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and freedom of conscience, it has centered its patriotism about these realities rather than such abstractions as empire and victory; accordingly it is alert to challenge any violation of civil liberty by friend or foe and to refuse even at serious sacrifice to submit to them. It has learned that while an individual can be restricted or punished, he can never be compelled to action against his will; its heroes have shifted from Caesar and Napoleon to such men