

Unarmed defense, however, prevents all clouding of the ethical issues, and cannot fail to enlist on the side of the invaded people all men of good will, wherever found.

Where Non-Violent Resistance Is Strong

The unique strength of non-violent resistance as here outlined lies in two directions. In the first place the method it employs is not that of positive action, which is always at the mercy of physical impediments, including death, but that of passive refusal, which is essentially impregnable to physical hindrances, and in the last analysis to death itself. In the second place its carrying out is not confined to selected groups of professional soldiers, but is the responsibility of the people as a whole.

Has Unarmed Defense Been Tried Out?

History gives but one instance of its deliberate application by a government surrounded by warlike neighbors, that of the Pennsylvania Colony under the leadership of the Quaker William Penn. In this case the preliminary principles of the method succeeded so well that actual attack never had to be faced; for during the sixty years of non-resistance no Pennsylvania Quaker was ever killed by an Indian, though the other British colonies lived constantly under arms and under threat of massacre.

On the other hand, the various elements included in these tactics are far from untried and can show definite records of success in limited fields. The strike, long recognized as the characteristic weapon of labor, achieved signal results in the prevention of war between Norway and Sweden in 1905, in the defense of Berlin against the Kapp Putsch in 1920, and of the Ruhr Valley against French occupation in 1923. The withholding of money by citizen groups was an important factor in the overthrow of Charles First of England and in the capitulation of Louis of France to convoke the

Estates General. In 1921 seamen and dockers of Great Britain, by refusing to handle material destined for Russia, effectually prevented their government from sending troops to the aid of the counter revolution.

The most dramatic and comprehensive application of non-violence in history is of course the civil disobedience campaign of Mahatma Gandhi and his followers, deliberately undertaken in order to win freedom for India. Although this method proved completely successful in securing civil rights for the Indian minority in South Africa, it can claim only partial success thus far in the more extensive operations in India. Even partial success is astounding, however, in the case of open defiance of the greatest empire in the world by a poverty-stricken people whose armed rebellion had been ruthlessly crushed a century before. The failure of the movement so far to obtain a decisive victory seems largely due to two circumstances important to the present discussion. First, Gandhi has found his forces to be not yet completely disciplined in unity and non-violence; second, the tactics of passive resistance are clearly not so well adapted to an aggressive contest such as colonial independence as to a purely defensive struggle of the type we are here considering.

Has Armed Defense Been Tried Out?

While unarmed defense is thus in its first experimental stage, the time-honored method of defense by force of arms shows indication of having passed its highest point and entered upon a period of progressive decline along with the advent of mechanized warfare.

Experiments in military defense abound in recent history, Ethiopia, China, Spain—all complete and tragic failures, as such attempts in the future are likely to prove. Except under the stress of fear, aggressors usually select only weak nations or isolated colonies as their vic-