

Rebuttal of Sunny Lovetts article “Truth”, 4/15/09, per 10/19/10 Infowars blog on “War, What is it Good for?”

### Reply to Anti-war Activist Comments

We cannot make the illogical generalization that all wars are unjustified, or morally wrong for all parties. Sure, we realize that many wars are driven by hate, intolerance, aggression, radical religion, ideology, or politics, etc., none of which justify violence, or wars against others,

But that is the attacking side cause, or fault, not the ones attacked—unless something less than violent provocation might cause over-reaction by those of more warlike characteristics. Then, the latter would be the more guilty party.

Self-preservation is the first law of nature, or the instinct of maintaining security, or survival. It inheres in the animal world, as well—of which we have all seen examples. In fact, if the circumstances require it, there is no limit to what means should be employed to protect oneself against life-threatening acts.

From the standpoint of personal, or national security, all reactions against violent assaults are not motivated by a desire of revenge, as the Lovetts blog emphasized. If an aggressor mortally threatens our right to live, we must act appropriately, and sometimes immediately to protect ourselves. Survival is the natural, instinctive motivation to respond to the danger involved. Revenge may enter into it, for some, which is a wrong reason for retaliation. But, if one’s life is imminently endangered, the primary self-preserving reaction is naturally, and blamelessly right.

God, himself, does not outlaw or speak against all wars as being wrong, or unjustified. Various biblical accounts, and references discuss soldiers and combat, including fitness, training, strategy, readiness, etc. The contributing causes of wars always involve underlying sinful, or evil factors—particularly in the case of the aggressor, but possibly in both parties. The moral imperfections of fallen man render serious conflicts, i.e., wars, inevitable, and permanent peace practicably impossible.

Forgiveness, is cited by some as the only morally correct response to offenses against us.. While, it is what we should always endeavor to practice in obedience and respect to God’s commands, and principles-- in severe circumstances, it may be more of what we should invoke God to give to the person(s) at fault, than for us to do it, even as Jesus did on the cross, by his words of “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do” (spiritually, that is).

Only God has the power to forgive sins, while we should be willing to forgive offenses against us on the human level, too! But, it is not logical to think of it as an effective alternative to physical protective action in an emergency, or protracted life threatening situation. Natural instincts would be to do anything required to stay alive, or keep from being seriously injured.

While the hearts of many anti-gun advocates may be in the right place about the violence of tragedies involving gun-related crimes—our minds must prevail in favor of bearing arms for self-

defense, and protection of lives. Only the ridiculous use of extreme passiveness, or radical expediency would outlaw guns for everybody, trying to stop or minimize the criminal or aggressive use of them.

To leave a person defenseless against someone who could wield a weapon of destruction against him, is a cruel restriction to place upon a citizen, who has the natural right to be able to protect his life, and property. And a country that has been attacked by a violent life taking assault from known terrorists, must respond in defense, even proper counter-offensive action, to protect its citizens, property, and freedom.

Unbalanced soft-heartedness, which may lead to soft-headedness is a bad combination, especially in persons of authority who might adversely affect other people's right to use necessary maximum means to protect themselves. For example, the above-noted commentor said we should always "think with our heart first, not our head." But, letting our emotions control our minds, is irrational and illogical. To have tempering effect, is one thing, but control is the dangerous part.

If the writer had directed her sentiments to offenses, abuses etc., in situations less violent than war, she expressed some good thoughts, and advice that we all need to think seriously about.. But, just as it can be wrong to be too hawkish about possible mortal conflicts, it can be very unwise, and dangerous to be too dovish. While we should all strive to be peacemakers, whenever possible, we cannot forsake our natural right, and responsibility to take defensive, even offensive action, when there is no safe, or reliable alternative.

Anti-war activism, driven by emotional extremism, and illogical, or oversimplified reasoning clouds the issue of war, more than it helps to end it, or evaluate its causes and effects. As much as we all should hate it, we cannot automatically attack war, as if it is never justified, or realistically unavoidable.