

PACIFISM 1. When looking at wars it is often claimed pacifism failed, that it hasn't worked. Pacifism never fails, it always works - no deaths, battles or wars result from pacifism. **H**owever, sometimes pacifism is ignored; so when it is not successful, it is always due to the ignorance of politicians and their failed diplomacy or negotiations - it's not due to the failure of the principles of pacifism. **I**f sufficient pacifism has been applied in a conflict, war will not break out; if war breaks out, it is for one reason: Not enough pacifism had been applied. **O**verall, in the history of humanity, pacifism has worked well, it has prevented many wars - just not the ones that broke out and were fought. **H**istory records mainly - indeed is defined by - wars; historians are seduced by the spectacle of war. Prevented wars rank lowly and are rarely mentioned; yet - they are evidence that pacifism works well.

I assume everybody would agree that the world needs less war and more peace. However, the problem is - and this is one of the gravest problems for humankind - too many people are of the belief that the 'Fight for Peace' will indeed bring peace. History shows wars may bring short-term advantages - but rarely long-term peace.*

At this point, the heavy gun usually levelled against pacifism is: Where would we be if we hadn't fought Nazism in WWII? This is hypothetical, of course - we will never know where Nazi Germany would have taken the world - but an indication is the fate of the Soviet Union and East Germany: In the end, they just petered out.

As regards Russia, consider this scenario: JFK decided in 1962 the Russians were too much of a threat and about to attack the USA with the missiles they had amassed in Cuba. As opposed to what history has recorded - he started and won WWII. The result? Russian Communism was defeated. The cost? Millions of dead on both sides.

Here's a third hypothetical: Say the problem with communist North Korea / China gets worse and the West decides to fight it. What would the cost be? Millions will die. The alternative? Keep using diplomacy and let communism run its course. In either case any communism is likely to collapse. Which of these scenarios is preferable?

The WWII case is complex and perplexing for pacifists. Bertrand Russell - a noted pacifist - argued that the necessity of defeating the Nazis was a unique circumstance and war was not the worst of the possible evils. H. G. Wells had stated, after the armistice ending WWI, that the British suffered more from the war than they would have from submission to Germany; he reversed his pacifist stance in 1941, as did Einstein.

*However, here's the rub: WWII would better have been avoided than won. This again is hypothetical, but consider this: When the US entered WWI, they broke its stalemate. Rather than tying the Germans down in a peace pact, Germany was soundly defeated and later bankrupted. The crippling economic hardship that followed led to the rise of Nazism, and WWII **. The point of pacifism is: Winning a war is not what's important - preventing it is.*

**Everybody except weapons manufacturers and providers of infrastructure for the War Machines
see also page XI (Foreword) blog 830*

***see also FIGHTING FOR PEACE
and my blog 840*