

**IS THE U.S., THE WORLD'S CHAMPION BULLY,
OR THE WORLD'S CHAMPION POLICEMAN ?**

Due to the unswerving and advertised adherence to the Christian ethic by the President of the United States of America (USA), it is highly unlikely that the world's most powerful nation and, by extension, the most important power of the world, today, will ever become the world's champion bully, although it does favour itself as being the world's champion, self-appointed '*policeman*'.

To the Western World, this must be perceived to be the case.

But, to the Eastern World, there may be a slightly different perception of the US, and of its Texan President, Mr George W. Bush.

The difference between a policeman and a bully is that a policeman acts in accordance with the law and enforces it; whereas, the bully cares nothing of the law and is habitually cruel and repressive, especially in his dealings with weaker people, or people who are smaller than he.

President Saddam Hussein of Iraq, prior to the outbreak of the 21-day war when he and his Regime were driven out of office, claimed to be a devout Muslim.

President George W. Bush claims to be a devout Christian and goes to Church every Sunday so that the world may witness his devotion to his God.

The photographers click away as he enters and leaves Church; it is historical proof of the devoutness of this God-fearing politician, who is the most powerful man on the globe, today.

There are dozens of photographs of President George W. Bush, attending Church services; and, there are, literally, libraries of photographs of the former President of Iraq, adopting the supine position, or prostrating himself for morning or evening prayer, in devout Muslim fashion.

Of course, President Saddam Hussein had 24 years to have his photographers record his devotion to Allah, whereas President George W. Bush is just a beginner when it comes to politics and the advertising of his devotion to God.

Religion and politics are known to be the basis for great success in the political arena, in the US and in most other areas of the world – even in Asia, where pantheism is more acceptable than monotheism.

Mr George W. Bush would like, now, to democratise that part of the Middle East where the US has control, military control and political control.

To the Arab world, this is a non-starter, of course, because, over the centuries, Arab potentates have guided the affairs of their peoples in the name of all that is right and Holy, and with the blessings of Allah.

The acts of the US, in invading Iraq without the blessings of the United Nations (UN) (actually, it was in defiance of the UN's Security Council's determination) and without a formal declaration of war, would appear to be, to many people of the Arab world, the acts of a bully.

Not that any self-respecting Arab ruler would not have done exactly that same thing, if he could have justified such an act to his people and his Arab neighbours, and if he had had the means so to do, but, since an infidel perpetrated the act of aggression on his Arab (and Muslim) neighbour, it is worthy of scorn in the eyes of all Arabs.

Few people, relative to the population of the world, are going to complain about that which the US has done in Iraq because he who complains too loudly will be punished, directly or indirectly, by the US Government.

And that punishment could be very painful.

(**TARGET** is well aware that, by the publication of this political analysis, it, too, is tempting fate – and **TARGET**'s Editor is not a religious man)

The 21-day war between the US and Iraq has taught the world that, once again, Might is Right (this axiom was first thought to have been coined by Gorgias, a Greek philosopher, who lived from 485–380 B.C.).

Nobody has yet chastised the US, in stentorian fashion, for its acts in conquering (in the US President's vernacular, '*liberating*') Iraq and its peoples from the oppressor's rule of nearly one quarter of a Century.

That President George W. Bush may, in the final analysis, be proved to have been correct in attacking Iraq is not to be questioned by **TARGET**'s political analysts, but one has to ask whether or not the end justifies the means.

No doubt, President George W. Bush, not being a Communist, would not like to learn that, some years ago, the following expression was coined: '*The end may justify the means as long as there is something that justifies the end.*' (Leon Trotsky: 1879–1940)

If **TARGET** wanted to be very cruel and to paint the worst possible picture about the political events of the past 6 months or so, and of the part, played in those events by the US Government, it could be said that man dreams of equilibrium in his world of wild aberrations; he hopes to find the end to his errors of fact, of judgment, or his lopsided view of his oftentimes independent relationships with his fellows, but, in truth, he is not much better than a child, with presumptions of childlike authenticity and veracity.

And, now, the child will determine to direct history with his mirky view of world events, those that are and those that he will attempt to fashion for us, all.

As a recent divorcee or widower will search and gravitate toward another mate in the same or similar mould of the position of the mate, just vacated, so it would appear that man inherits his folie à deux from his ancestor and continues to perpetrate them in the name of righteousness.

The countries that stand shoulder to shoulder with the US, today, will benefit, without question; and, a new global order may, well, be created, with the seemingly graceful political phoenix, rising from its own ashes, wearing the red, white and blue as its predominant colours.

The phoenix will be fashioned and guided in its flight by the US Government.

Iran, Syria and North Korea, in particular, will, now, be fitted to wear the US yoke of supination.

The Jewish State of Israel will be happy to see that Syria's President will have to kowtow to the demands of the US.

Iran, no doubt, will follow in the political wake of Syria: What choice will that country have, otherwise?

Iran has no army that could withstand a determined onslaught of the likes of the 21-day war between the US and Iraq.

North Korea, however, is another matter because that country is ruled by a man, who has yet to taste absolute defeat, and whose bravado is akin to the analogy of the ant, attacking the elephant.

Mr Kim Jong Il believes himself to be able to rely on the Government of the People's Republic of China (PRC) to come to his country's rescue when needs be, as was the case in the 1950-1953 war when North Korean troops crossed the 38th Parallel and took Seoul, the Capital City of South Korea, only to be driven back by UN troops, with the help of the US military might, which, that time, was sanctioned by a UN Resolution.

But the PRC Government is unlikely to side with North Korea, if political push should come to military shove, and it will, as was demonstrated a fortnight ago, try to use its good offices to broker a deal between the US and North Korea.

The PRC Government holds a trump card in the case of North Korea in that it has been, during the past 50 years or so, a great benefactor to North Korea, having supplied its 20 million human population with about 50 percent of its food staples.

Further, the PRC's People's Liberation Army knows full well that Pyongyang could never win a war against the US.

This warning will be relayed to Mr Kim Jong Il in vociferous terms, no doubt, if it has not, already, been driven home.

The PRC, while it may not be in love with the US and its ways, will not hinder President George W. Bush's global, political objectives except where sovereignty of the Chinese Motherland is concerned, or, where reunification of the PRC with Taiwan is concerned.

The PRC Government has quite a number of very intelligent people in its top echelon of Government.

These people will, without question, seek political solutions to any and all problems that appear to be about to fester into an international sore(s).

The PRC Government has discovered, over the past few decades, the benefits and joys of capitalism: It is unlikely, ever, to retreat to the position of yesteryear when, in the south of the country, the peasants were catching rats in the fields as a means of supplementing dwindling supplies of animal protein.

The events, leading up to the Iraqi-US war, caused there to be a divisiveness in the UN to be created, with Germany, France, the PRC and Russia, in one camp, and the US with its 40-odd *'friends of convenience'* in another camp.

The US, by its acts, fostered and promoted constructive sycophantism, by waving 'old glory' in the face of those countries, which would not like to be known as not being a friend of the US.

These countries had been told: *'You are either with us (the US), or against us.'*

It was cut and dried.

The US, also, gave promises of aid to those governments, which joined the camp of President George W. Bush in that Christian's avowed intent to rid the world of Saddam Hussein and his evil cronies.

History may well rue the acts of President George W, Bush in the broader scheme of things.

It is unlikely that a move, such as dividing certain members of the UN, will, in the long run, be conducive to the Charter of the UN, which derives the very planks of its foundations of its platform in the League of Nations, which was formed at the conclusion of World War I (1914-1918).

The UN is supposed to be an international organisation, which is based on the concept of the equality of its members, all of whom are pledged to settle international disputes by peaceful means, refraining, where-ever possible, from threats of the use of force.

Whereas, one may applaud the precepts of most religions of today, because most of them advocate non-violence, love and understanding, adherents of today's religions, and leaders of some of the most powerful countries of the world, today, may act in a manner that is contrary to the teachings of the Bible, the Torah, the Q'ran, the Zend-Avesta, etc.

One should not blame the teachings of a religion for the fault of any individual, who advocates that religion's tenets, in the same way that one should not sacrifice known good principles on the alter of expediency; and, one does not sacrifice a good and true principal due to one individual's malfeasance.

-- 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 or targnews@hkstar.com. TARGET does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the laws of libel.