

# Pacifists deeply misguided

April 19, 1999

Some are opposed to war period, and specifically today to NATO's actions in the former Yugoslavia. They're pacifists; they argue it's wrong to intervene in the affairs of a sovereign country; and they couldn't be more wrong.

In the aftermath of the Bolshevik Revolution, the free world lent arms and aid to the "White Russians" who were resisting the Reds. Under the auspices of encouraging "self-determination" (and at the behest of some commies who had infiltrated the organization) the League of Nations—the precursor to the UN— withdrew said support. Of course, the Kulaks and bourgeoisie were no more determining their own fate than fly to the moon. It was being violently forced on them by the ascendant communists and their so-called police force, the Cheka, that had the authority to investigate sedition and execute on the spot. So sometimes intervention is exactly what the doctor ordered.

"But people will be killed," the pacifists argue, returning to the issue at hand (Yugo). In fact, people are being killed with or without military intervention, and those who argue against it argue against history. The bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki caused inestimable damage and suffering, for instance, but so did the war that those bombs brought to an end. And if you happened to be either a military or civilian POW being worked to death in a Japanese slave labour camp, Fat Man and Little Boy couldn't come soon enough, and for many didn't.

Of the 880 Europeans and Indonesians forced to work on the Pakanbaru railway, for instance, barely 10% survived the ordeal,<sup>18</sup> and but for those ordnances they likely would have soon been joining the other 90 in the hereafter. And this is

to say nothing of the losses both sides would have inevitably incurred in what would have otherwise been a protracted ground war. It is widely held that Truman was wrong to lower the boom on those cities, but he had a duty to the American people to bring that war to a satisfactory conclusion as quickly as possible, and he stepped up to the plate.

Pacifists believe that one can negotiate with devils. Again they argue with history, Hitler having entered into pacts of nonaggression with just about every country he shortly thereafter invaded. And why did he do so? Because he knew that he could beat the tar out of them after the relative success of that era's peaceniks in disarming the western democracies.

Pacifists are almost invariably from the left of the political spectrum. Those on the right seem more acutely aware of the depths to which the human heart can plumb, and that as a result of which, war is sometimes simply unavoidable. I suggest that those who believe otherwise clearly do not well understand human nature.

**UPDATE:** While on the subject of left-leaning peaceniks, Margaret Atwood, Naomi Klein, "former" Marxist Judy Rebick and then socialist MP Svend Robinson issued a letter in 2002 declaring that war with Iraq would be immoral because it was "unprovoked."

Unprovoked? Saddam Hussein bombed several neighboring countries, gassed tens of thousands of his own countrymen, and was before his ouster both a financier and provocateur of terrorism. According to a physicist formerly in his employ, he was also actively investing in nuclear and biological weaponry development. That's what was known in 2002.

Foreign policy is not an exact science. It's based on other countries' leaders' histories and capabilities, and Hussein's history certainly didn't endear him to anyone. He was a terrorist and a thug, and as for his capabilities, there was the very real possibility that he had some hardware with which to deliver his spite.

What we now know, thanks to one General Georges Sada, Vice Marshall of the Iraqi Air Force, is that it took 56 sorties of jumbo jet flights to hide the country's stockpile of chemical, biological and nuclear materials in Syria in advance of the first Gulf War.<sup>19</sup> Then sanctioned by Oil for Food which was none too effective, he thereafter continued to invest multiplied millions in advancing his nuclear ambitions. Now I'm no more a foreign policy wonk than a biblical scholar, but in light of all this I think it would have been irresponsible for Dubya to have *not* invaded the country, with or without the physical presence of weapons of mass destruction.

While on the subject of foreign policy, what did Canada's experience in Afghanistan, America's experience in Iraq and Israel's ongoing conflict with its neighbours all have in common? Only that we were/are fighting deeply misguided zealots with no regard for human life and Hitleresque ambitions of world dominion.

That disregard for human life was on open display on October 7, 2023 when Hamas fired more than 3,000 rockets on Israel in a single day, overran its borders, and in what can be called genuine hate crimes murdered over 1200 non-combatants including babies, teenagers and grandmothers in acts of unadulterated evil.

Note that fifteen years earlier those perps were children in the classroom being applauded by their elders for mutilating dolls. In short, they were brainwashed, much like those celebrating the events on this side of the world, but that doesn't mean the former shouldn't pay dearly for their crimes or the latter be sent packing.

Women and children and grandmothers have been killed in Gaza as well, but not only were they not targeted, they had been warned to evacuate hot spots. Fleeing, they were driven back by their own government to be used as pawns in a public relations war, the late Hamas leader Ismail Haniyeh openly claiming that their blood was necessary to motivate further acts of violence.

I reckon we're all created in God's image, and that anyone can be adopted into His family. That said, on one side of this issue we have God's chosen people (who I'm confident would be happy to live in peace with their neighbours if they would just let them be) while on the other we have brain-washed displaced Syrians who, with others in the neighbourhood, hate all Jews with what can only be described as demonic zeal.

The Bible is clear that at some point the whole world will turn against Israel, but has it already? On August 30, 2021 the American government pulled their troops out of Afghanistan leaving behind billions in military assets, some of which reportedly ended up on Israel's borders in October. If that was done with foreknowledge (and frankly a cognizant five year old could have foreseen it) would that not make the Biden administration at least indirectly complicit in what has become known as Israel's 9/11?

And speaking of that infamous date, how is it that a BBC journalist reported on the collapse of Bldg 7 that day with Bldg 7 standing proudly in the background enjoying its last 20 minutes of structural integrity? If one isn't careful, one might jump to the conclusion that someone in that outfit had foreknowledge of the event.

Now on the issue of Afghanistan, whether or not we or the Americans should have been there in the first place is debatable, and certainly no one wanted to be there forever, but the previous rise of ISIS in Iraq, and that group's unspeakable atrocities committed against both Christians and their fellow Muslims leads one to question whether we can ever entirely leave that part of the world. But on the question of the timing of a nation's withdrawal from the field of battle, there's one group that no government should ever listen to.

In June, a Gallup poll revealed that 25% of Americans wanted their troops brought home from theatre. *That was five months before Germany unconditionally surrendered to the Allies!* The year was 1945, I'm referring to peaceniks, of course, and all one can say is thank God for the politicians who ignore them, both past and present.