

### DIEING FOR A KILLING

It has been many a moon since learning to be an efficient killer was considered among the most noble of professions for a young man.

Military service has, always, had its romantic appeal to youth, of course, but, as one watches American television, these days, one may be a little surprised to see an advertisement, depicting a young man or a young woman, loading a canon with a projectile ... and, then: Boom!

Into the ether goes the projectile on its assigned task – of destruction.

It would appear, clearly, that the Government of the United States (US) is cranking up the psychological pressure on its population in order to force it to accept the new order of things: The US is to become a nation with extensive military muscle, not seen since the days of Julius Caesar when he invaded Britain and crushed the army of his political enemy, Pompey the Great, formerly an ally of Julius.

In times of war, advertisements for cannon fodder have dressed up the business of killing in order to make it appear to be a patriotic duty of every citizen.

In times of war, it is mandatory to have an efficient military machine, especially for a country that wants to preserve its way of life.

For one, who is of an eligible age, being relatively sound of limb and mind, not do that which is expected of him as a citizen of his country, then, he must be a coward, a Communist, a Federalist, a Jew, an Arab, a Catholic, a black, a Chinese, a North Korea, an Iranian ... etc, etc, etc.

For whatever reason, he who does not go with the flow must be shamed by his peers.

As one American citizen remarked to **TARGET**, recently: *'He (President George W. Bush) is my President; whatever he says, I agree.'*

During the American War of Independence (1775 –1783), the British axiom, *'Right or Wrong, King and Country,'* was considered a stupid and an outrageous concept by the American colonialist rebels, led by what the British considered a traitor to His Majesty, King George III: A former Colonel George Washington, who had served in the Regular British Army with distinction in the French and Indian War in Canada in 1758. He resigned his commission in the Regular British Army (as it was, then, known), about one year after the defeat of the French by the British.

The circle is, now, complete: Americans seem to be embracing that formerly shunned British concept, with slight modifications: *'Right or Wrong, The President and the United States of America: God Bless Us All! We Shall Prevail.'*

Before some American patriot jumps all over **TARGET**, making claims of this and that, this medium wants it known that it does support the recent actions of the United States in its attack of Iraq and the eventual ousting of Saddam Hussein, its former President.

At the same time, **TARGET** has grave misgivings and reservations in respect of those gung-ho advertisements, which are aimed at making the youth of the US believe that the wearing of a US military uniform is a proper and noble thing to do.

There is no glory in death for that is reserved, exclusively, for life ... and for the living.

Yet, the American Government of today appears to be painting a picture for its youth, a picture that says that if you wear the military uniform of your country, you are one with the country.

Join the National Guard!

Be on the alert for the enemies of the United States of America!

Learn how to defend YOUR country from its enemies!

But who are the enemies of the US?

Osama bin Laden and his gang of killers, definitely, are the enemies of many a nation, to be sure, and to the Jews, where-ever they may be, especially.

These Muslim fundamentalists are consumed with hate, without question.

Life is not precious to them.

A person's life is merely a delivery system/method for the killing of others.

If anything, these Muslim fundamentalists are anarchists, but without a mandate of any note.

As international terrorists, they seem to be flying in the face of the teachings of the Q'ran, which is supposed to be the word of Allah.

One has to ask oneself, however, whether or not the present, subliminal psychological brainwashing by the US Administration of its youth, in telling them that learning how to kill, efficiently, is the manly/womanly part-time occupation to follow, is the moral thing to do.

One is reminded of that classic 1929 novel, written by Eric Maria Remarque: *'All Quiet On The Western Front.'*

In that story, one sees, first, a teacher in a gymnasium (a German high school), instructing his young charges of the greatness of the Fatherland and the reasons that Germany must win World War I.

Peer pressure results in all of the young students, joining the army of Kaiser Wilhelm II.

They are sent to the Western Front to learn how to kill the enemy from wet and filthy trenches, infested with rats and lice and with insufficient rations.

It does not take too long for the young men to become old, young men.

One by one, these young men are either killed or become disillusioned with the business of killing.

There have been many such stories, but they do not appear to have had much positive impact on '*civilisations*', except to teach different ways to kill one's neighbour, quicker and quieter.

It seems that no matter how long man walks upon this earth, he never learns how to live in harmony with his fellows.

The advertisements for the US National Guard, advertisements which, once again, applaud those young men and women who don the military uniforms of their country, can only proliferate the concept the killing for one's

country as being the correct and proper thing to do.

The US National Guard is not that which many Americans perceive it to be – young men and women, playing at being soldiers, occasionally, and having fun in the sun on certain Saturdays and Sundays of the month – for, in reality, it is a ready-made, well-trained body of men and women, who may be called up for active service with the stroke of the pen of the Commander-in-Chief.

The history of this planet has proved that killing has produced no progeny for peace.

It would appear that homo sapiens make the assumption that our intellectual development is greater than other life forms that share our home.

This is a logical assumption because, thus far, we, homo sapiens, appear to have no rivals for the mastery and dominance of the planet earth.

One may postulate whether or not the development of man's mind, as opposed to the development of man's brain, is an asset, at all.

Man's seeming disregard for his fellows, be they other homo sapiens, bovines, felines, formicidae, or any other life forms with which he shares this earth, appear to be contrary to the concept of civilised man.

Surely, the term, '*civilised man*', must include moral and intellectual advancement and the ability for man to live in harmony with his fellow life forms.

But that is, definitely, not the case: Man, therefore, is not civilised.

There has been little change in man's innate propensity, over the many centuries of his existence, to destroy himself, as well as his environment, and all life that live in it and around it.

What intellectual advancement in man has there been since the days of Julius Caesar and his creation, and the proliferation of, an expanded Roman Empire, the military might of which the world had never witnessed before?

Through natural selection, man has evolved with the most advanced brain of all other life forms on this earth, but it has been accomplished by accident, not by design.

The brain of man has advanced ahead of his ability to harness its powers for the good of man.

By simple extension, the advancement of man's brain, to be used for the good of man, must, inevitably, be for the good of this planet.

The brain of man is considered, scientifically, as being adaptive: The ability to have, imprinted upon it, certain repetitive acts, such as stroking a ball in a tennis game, punching an opponent in a boxing match, dancing the tango with grace ... or firing a rifle at somebody, with the intent to kill.

Most other life forms are imbued with instinct, as with a young bird, which instinctively knows how to build a nest, without the mother bird, having to teach it that art.

Only man has to be taught just about everything, from the initial sucking his mother's teat in order to obtain nourishment.

As man becomes more and more adept at teaching, so he starts to hunt for more and better ways to impart knowledge to his own kind.

Also, he looks for ways to manipulate his fellows, making full use of the knowledge of the adaptive brain and of the basic drives of man.

Sadly, man has learned to love the art of killing.

It is time for it to stop if man is to progress to the next plateau of intellectual advancement.

It is time to sheath the sword of war in favour of a lasting and constructive peace.

-- 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.*