

FOR WHAT WILL PRESIDENT GEORGE W. BUSH BE REMEMBERED ?

President George W. Bush need never concern himself about being compared with President Thomas Jefferson, the 3rd President of the United States (US), because he does not have the intelligence or wit, and, in any event, President George W. Bush is far from being a man of letters.

President George W. Bush need never concern himself about being compared with President Richard Nixon, the 37th President of the US, because President George W. Bush has never, yet, been involved in a scandal, involving abuse of power by a public official, being a violation of public trust and, it follows, a Contempt of Congress, as was the case in August 1974 when President Richard Nixon was forced to resign over the Watergate Scandal.

President George W. Bush need never concern himself, also, about being compared with President Bill Clinton, the 42nd President of the US, because President George W. Bush has not been found with his penis in another lady's mouth (such as a Monica Lewinsky, a former White House intern, who had a kind of sexual affair with President Bill Clinton) and, in any event, President George W. Bush is not known to have been found to be a perjurer.

The one act of President George W. Bush, for which he will be remembered, is the falsehood, perpetrated by the Bush Administration in order to justify going to war against Iraq, a war that, so far, has cost upwards of 90 American lives and about \$US1 billion a week since the middle of last March (that is about \$US180 billion, according to **TARGET's** rough calculations).

It would be unfair to state that the impelling force for the March 2003, US-Iraqi war was because of the contract that Saddam Hussein, the former President of Iraq, had put out on President George W. Bush's father – President George Herbert Walker Bush – back in 1991, but some people, today, claim this to be the underlying motivation, consciously or subconsciously, for the pre-emptive attack on this Middle Eastern country, rich as it is in oil reserves.

President George W. Bush, acting, without question, on very dubious intelligence, stated in January and February, this year, that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, capable of imperiling the safety and sanctity of the US.

He repeated these same allegations, just before pushing the red button in March, this year, thus signifying that it was time to do battle with the forces of evil in Iraq.

Had it not been for the September 11, 2001, attacks on US soil by Osama bin Laden and his Arab madmen, more pointed questions might have been asked by the US Congress about the many unsubstantiated suggestions with regard to Saddam Hussein, having a material stockpile of nuclear weapons, biological weapons and weapons, mounted in missiles, capable of reaching more than 1,000 kilometres.

As it was, with more than 6,000 innocent civilians, having been killed in the attacks on New York, Pennsylvania and Washington D.C. in September 2001, the US Congress gave its consent to wage war on the perpetrators of those cowardly acts.

And President Saddam Hussein won the prize of the year, as about 240,000 US and United Kingdom (UK) troops attacked Iraq.

Within about 21 days, the war was over.

It was Champagne for the leaders of the victorious armies of the US and UK – even though, at international law, the US and the UK had not the authority from the United Nations to make such an incursion on the soil of Iraq.

When this matter was raised at a June breakfast meeting with Mr Michael Wilson, the former Finance Minister of the Government of Canada, Mr Wilson, who now heads a division of UBS Bank (Canada), said to **TARGET**:

‘What do you, now, propose: To kick out the US from the UN?’

As history will record, Saddam Hussein was an incorrigible tyrant to the Iraqis; his Regime, having been besotted with family members, many of whom were megalomaniacs, rapists, murderers, and thieves.

The removal of Saddam Hussein as head of state in Iraq was a good thing for the people of Iraq, to be sure, but it is equally clear that President George W. Bush had not the legal right so to do.

In all cases of morality, it may be held that the moral results are, always, the test of efficacy.

While man may spout the many high principles of morality, it is the final result, which will determine whether or not the moral machinery of his postulations had been running smoothly ... or whether the bearings of that machinery needed some moral oil.

A proper concern for one’s action is mandatory for the person, who has been handed a mandate to be the head of government by the majority of the voting population of a territory.

Without regard for the circumstances of one’s acts of today, the greatest, perceived-to-be-good can, in a very short space of time, be construed as being the greatest, perceived-to-be-evil.

As is, clearly, happening in Iraq, today, with the *‘liberated’* peoples of the country, clambering to be rid of the *‘evil’* invaders.

Rationalism – the reliance on reason as the best guide for belief and action – is unbounded by any restriction, in the same way that imagination is without any horizon, allowing man to conceive of that which, once, was considered the inconceivable.

The 1903 Wright Brothers’ concept of a powered, heavier-than-air craft in the face of more than 220 years of free-flying, lighter-than-air vehicles – balloons, flying over Europe – is but a tiny example of imagination, being applied, and having a basis in fact in the consummation of the act.

But the concept, germinated in the minds of Messrs Orville and Wilbur Wright, preceded the fact of the take-off of the first, powered flight, near Kitty Hawk, North Carolina, in December 1903.

Unfortunately – or fortunately, depending on one’s perception of humankind – a man is, generally speaking, not only a rational animal, but he is driven by his nurture, which, in and of itself, is rooted in the history of man; in addition, the rational animal, man, when he is not restrained by feelings and morality, can become the prisoner of strong and ruthless emotions.

As one may suggest was the overriding consideration in the mind of President George W. Bush when he pushed the red button of war.

History has countless examples of men, being driven by the spurs of power, being dug deeply into their flanks.

There appears to be, in all men, that thirst for power, the lust for glory, the unending embellishment and polishing of one's ego.

And, while man is drunk in the pursuit of his immediate goals, he is likely to enshroud those innate drives, most piously, stating the abstract good of his actions and, of course, the abstract right of his actions.

Would it not be correct to state that the American liberties of today are secured only by the quality of restraint?

Jurisprudence is the pride of humankind; it is the collected wisdom of ages, long gone.

From its fountains, bubble forth some of the highest intellectual pursuits of men, greater, in most cases, than those who came after them.

To drink at this fountain is the privilege that is bestowed on all who have sufficient nous and perspicacity.

With all of its defects and redundancies, jurisprudence stands, today, as a beacon, guiding man through unsafe waters, affording him the calm seas of righteousness and morality.

One may wonder whether or not President George W. Bush is a little thirsty, these days?

And, yet, the arrogance and pomposity of some people, especially those in positions of power, people who have never experienced an intelligence, greater than their own, would usurp a tribunal in order to guarantee the perfection of their own images of life.

It is held, and rightly so, too, that law, coupled with arbitrary and unbridled power, is in eternal enmity.

Ultimately, and President George W. Bush may soon learn this unless he determines to change some of the instruments of his governmental orchestra, for all forms of government, the people is the true legislator.

This legislator, ultimately, is the instrumental cause of the law.

All leaders of great and wilting powers, those of today and those of yesteryear, have, eventually, to concede that they must bow to the efficient cause and consent of this legislator – because this legislator is the law.

No government can survive without the consent of the governed.

It is a well-worn maxim that has proved to be immutable.

Further, there is no room for partiality in the law – and in government – for that would be a contradiction in terms.

History guides actions of today, but today's actions are taken from the experiences of those, who tested yesterday's actions.

Those actions that have stood the test of time and continue to work, today, continue to be applied and considered in future acts.

But therein lies the conundrum because, as no law can be considered eternally immutable, so no historical acts may be replicated, in total.

If an action falters in our time, then, reforms must be instituted in order to put it, once again, on its correct course.

Yet, the lessons of the human race are mere reflections of past acts, perpetrated by those who went before us and from whom there is a wellspring of knowledge if man will stop to drink at this spring.

Customs may be the wisdom of an age, but customs change with the coming of every summer sun.

Virginity, purity and marriage, in that order, at one time, were synonymous terms, internationally, but, in today's world, how many young men would want to marry a virgin; and, how many ladies, getting married for the first time, are virgins?

One may well wonder whether or not President George W. Bush considered any of the above.

Or, does he know it, all?

-- 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.