

### ALL YOU EVER NEEDED TO KNOW ABOUT DOUBLESPEAK

On the assumption that US President George W. Bush does not write his own speeches, then, his speech writers are, clearly, advocates of the art of doublespeak.

This is the use of words and phrases, first thought to have been promulgated by British writer George Orwell (1903-1950), who, through the use of intelligible words, managed to make a nonsense of a phrase, within a sentence, or parts thereof.

The deliberate use of evasive or ambiguous language, guaranteed to confuse or obfuscate an idea, is the essence of doublespeak.

President George W. Bush's White House staff, it appears, are becoming very adept at employing doublespeak; and, this was made only too clear on Saturday, January 4, 2003 when the Texas cowboy took a little trip to Fort Hood, Texas.

*'You'll be fighting' soon, he told the eager US soldiers. 'We are ready. We're prepared. ... Some crucial hours may lie ahead.'*

He, then, explained that the US was not going to invade Iraq, but it is determined to liberate the country.

He said: *'Should Saddam Hussein (the President of Iraq since 1979) seal his fate by refusing to disarm, by ignoring the opinion of the world, you'll be fighting not to conquer anybody, but to liberate people ...'*

So, *'to liberate'* is not to be construed, or to be confused with the concept of, as an invasion and/or an attempt *'to conquer'*, according to the President of the largest and most powerful country of the world, today.

Strangely, President George W. Bush was talking for his country, only, the country of which he is the Head of State, not for the United Nations, or other members of that international body, which has yet to make a determination as to whether or not Iraq is in contempt of UN Security Council Resolution 1441, a Resolution which orders Iraq to reveal any chemical, biological or nuclear programmes or long-range missile projects.

The object of this UN Resolution is to prevent the Saddam Hussein Regime from obtaining, using, or manufacturing weapons of mass destruction, weapons that could be used, willy-nilly, by Iraq against any country or group of people, including, but not limited to, the population of the United States of America, or to assist, aid or abet any terrorist group, where-ever they may be operating.

Strangely, too, the United Nations has yet to suggest that Iraq needed to be *'liberated'* from anybody, although it is widely accepted, internationally, that Iraq thinks little of human life, other than the lives of certain people, close to President Saddam Hussein and his immediate family.

But, such a statement as *'to liberate'*, could, also, have been made in respect of the Roman Empire, one of the most cruel and brutal regimes that ever existed. It lasted for the best part of 400 years.

President Bush talked of a pre-emptive strike against the regime of Saddam Hussein: *'This war (which has yet to start, by the way), like others, is not going to be won on the defensive. So, we're going to take this fight to the enemy.'*

Analysing this part of his speech, the US President is claiming (a) that the war between the US and Iraq has, already, begun and that (b) the US will be the aggressor, taking the fight to enemy.

(One wonders whether or not Iraq has the ability to bring any sustained aggressive act to the US, or to any other nation outside of the Middle East, in fact. **TARGET**'s information is that the country has little to no ability to bring such an action, at this time. But, perhaps, President George W. Bush is better apprised of Iraq's military capability than little **TARGET**)

Then, there is a change of pace in the President's monologue: *'If force becomes necessary to secure our country and to keep the peace, America will act deliberately. America will act decisively. And America will prevail.'*

At this point in his speech, the President is claiming that if, and only if, force becomes necessary ... etc.

But, he had, already, stated, earlier in his pep talk to the troops, that armed force was necessary; and, he had, already, told his troops *'You'll be fighting'*.

To **TARGET**'s reading of the President's speech, he has, already, made up his mind: A massive and sustained armed invasion (liberation?) force is necessary, as far as he, that is the US, is concerned. Further, the US is willing to go it alone.

There are no ifs or buts about this situation.

President George W. Bush made mention, also, of *'moral clarity'* in the war against terrorism.

*'Either you're with us, or you're with the enemy. Either you're with those who love freedom, or you're with those who hate innocent life,'* he said.

Now, the world, and that must mean all nations of the world, is given an ultimatum: You either work or fight with the US; or, you suffer the consequences of your acts, or non-acts.

Put another way: Either get on our bus; or, the US bus will run over you.

That President Saddam Hussein does not consider the US his bosom buddy is to state the obvious, but that does not mean that Iraq is preparing to attack the US although, to listen to the speech of President George W. Bush, one may come to that conclusion.

It, also, does not mean that Iraq does not want to be in a position to be able, militarily, to attack the US – as a matter of guaranteeing its peace, to steal President George W. Bush's thunder.

But with what navy and air force?

Because President Bush did use the phrase *'to keep the peace'* which, one may rightfully adduce, means that US bellicosity guarantees the peace?

President Saddam Hussein's hatred of the US is being used by the Texan as being one of the main reasons for the US to go to war against Iraq.

He said: *'The Iraqi regime is a great threat to the United States. Why do I say that? Well, first or all, the leader of Iraq has publicly proclaimed his hatred for our country and what we stand for.'*

This, therefore, is another dimension: Either you love me and love my dog; or, you are an enemy of mine – and my dog.

**TARGET** knew, from the moment that Mr George W. Bush was elected President of the US, that he was not, exactly, the greatest brain that ever wore a pair of underpants, but **TARGET** had no idea that some of his speech writers were cut from the same cloth as the President.

When the President of the US talks, he speaks as the most powerful, single man in the world, today.

He has, at his disposal, the strongest and most formidable military machine that the world has ever seen. It is very fortunate for the world that there is accountability in US politics otherwise abuses of power in that country could equal those abuses of power of some of the most hateful leaders of the Roman Empire, Emperors such as Gaius Caligula and Nero, just to mention 2 emperors who, clearly, were potty.

-- E N D --

***While TARGET makes every attempt to ensure accuracy of all data published, TARGET cannot be held responsible for any errors and/or omissions.***

*If readers feel that they would like to voice their opinions about that which they have read in TARGET, please feel free to e-mail your views to [editor@targetnewspapers.com](mailto:editor@targetnewspapers.com) or [targnews@hkstar.com](mailto:targnews@hkstar.com). TARGET does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the laws of libel.*