

History

In another of his superb, moving essays, **History**, Bill Whittle places the present war in its broadest context, analysing it from the perspective of other times, other conflicts, and other universes too. Read this piece, and when you have finished, read his other essays.

Wed, 04/02/2003 - 22:37 | [permlink](#)

Understatement

To call it "moving" is an understatement. I have tears pouring down my face. In amongst the powerful words about history is the following important argument we should never forget:

No sane person wants to fight a war. But many sane people believe that there are times when they are necessary. I believe this is one of those times.

For it seems to me that if you are against any war ♦ if you believe that peace is always the right choice -- then you must believe at least one, if not both of the following:

1. People will always be able to come to a reasonable agreement, no matter how deep or contentious the issue, and that all people are rational, reasonable, honorable, decent and sane,

or,

2. It is more noble to live under slavery and oppression, to endure torture, institutionalized rape, theft and genocide than it is to fight it.

History, not to mention personal experience, shows me that the first proposition is clearly false. I believe, to put it plainly, that some people have been raised to become pathological murderers, liars, and first-rate bastards, and that these people will kill and brutalize the good, meek people and steal from and murder them whenever it is in their personal interest to do so. [...]

We fight wars not to have peace, but to have a peace

worth having. Slavery is peace. Tyranny is peace. For that matter, genocide is peace when you get right down to it. The historical consequences of a philosophy predicated on the notion of no war at any cost are families flying to the Super Bowl accompanied by three or four trusted slaves and a Europe devoid of a single living Jew.

It would be nice if there were a way around this. History, not merely my opinion, shows us that there is not. If all you are willing to do is think happy thoughts, then those are the consequences. If you want justice, and freedom, and safety, and prosperity, then sometimes you have to fight for them.

by **Sylvia Crombie** on Mon, 04/07/2003 - 15:54 | [reply](#)

Man's best friend

Actually, this piece is a well done romantic job to make midinettes cry; I suggest it has little rational content, and certainly no libertarian wind. It is more glorification of the state than humanistic poetry. Read this: "these kids died for all of us. We asked them to go, and they went." Jesus Christ! just like Him!

We should not be cynical towards heroism, as we might need some in the future (and it is not going to be against some little foreign tyrant!), but the more sober truth in this case is probably that the men who died in Irak (I don't mean the Irakian conscripts or brainwashed thugs) are adventurous men who do a fun job (they are all volunteers), like to obey orders, and who, more often than not, will shoot a suspected drug smuggler when ordered to.

And read this: "Today, the United States is at war with Iraq." Oh! I thought that the U.S. state was at war with the Iraki state. But perhaps there is no difference: in a Rousseauvian way, the state is us.

What a naiveté towards the state perceived as man's best friend! The author should read Christopher Browning's Ordinary Men. Some Public Choice readings wouldn't hurt his warrior poetry either.

The reference to Lincoln is truly fascinating. Indeed, one could possibly argue that, just as Lincoln liberated the slaves and enslaved free men(see Jeff Hummel's fabulous book on the Civil War), Bush will liberate "the Irakis" and enslave Western individuals.

Pierre Lemieux
<http://www.pierrelemieux.org>

by **Pierre Lemieux** on Tue, 04/08/2003 - 02:52 | [reply](#)

Copyright © 2006 Setting The World To Rights