

# Pacifists deeply misguided

April 19, 1999

Some are opposed to war period, and specifically to NATO's actions in the former Yugoslavia today. They're pacifists, they argue it's wrong to intervene in the affairs of a sovereign nation, 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. At the behest of some commies who had infiltrated the organization, the League of Nations (the precursor to the United Nations) withdrew said support under the auspices of encouraging "self-determination." 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 the Cheka, their "police force" 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 a great deal of suffering and death, for instance, but so did the war that those bombs brought to a decisive 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. Like Churchill sinking the entire French fleet in 1940 after it fell into German hands (with the attendant loss of 1300 former allies) Truman understood that wartime leadership meant making life and death decisions, and he didn't shrink back from doing so.

Pacifists believe that one can negotiate with devils. Again they argue with history, Hitler having entered into pacts of nonaggression with a number of countries he shortly thereafter invaded. And why did he do so? Because he knew that he could beat the tar out of them after the 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. And that was what was known in 2002!

Foreign policy isn't an exact science. It's educated guesswork based on other countries' leaders' histories and capabilities. Hussein's history wasn't remotely endearing, of course, and odds are he had some hardware with which to deliver his spite.

In fact, according to General Georges Sada, then Vice Marshall of the Iraqi Air Force, 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, Hussein thereafter continued to invest multiplied millions in advancing his nuclear ambitions. Mine may be the minority opinion, but in light of all this I think it would have been irresponsible for Dubya to have *not* invaded the country, with or without hard evidence 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 a death wish on one hand, and Hitleresque ambitions of world dominion on the other.

And a complete disregard for innocent human life, as evidenced on October 7, 2023 when Hamas fired no less than three thousand rockets on Israel in a single day, overran its borders, and in what can only be described as 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 who celebrated the event 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 reportedly been killed in Gaza too, but unlike the October 7 victims 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. (The BBC reported on mass casualties in Gaza, but eventually admitted they had no evidence thereof and were merely repeating Hamas talking points.)

I reckon we're all created in God's image and 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 in the latter days the whole world will turn against Israel, but has it already? On August 30, 2021 the Biden administration left behind billions in military assets when they pulled their troops out of Afghanistan, some of which reportedly ended up on Israel's borders on October 7th. If that was done with foreknowledge (and a dimly cognizant five year old could have foreseen it given the alliances in the region) would that not make the American administration at least indirectly complicit in what has become known as Israel's 9/11?

And then there's us, Israel's former bestie, recognizing the statehood of their terrorist neighbour who wants to drive them into the sea. It's reprehensible, frankly.

Now on the issue of Afghanistan, whether we and/or the Americans should have been there in the first place is debatable, and certainly no one wanted to be there forever. That said, 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.