



## *The Betty Letters*

*My Dear Grandchild,*

*Looking through my scrapbook of lovely past memories and of the world events that I attended, such as the lovely time that I spent, taking tea in the Vatican with Mrs Pope John Paul II, and after viewing Grandpa's photographs of the bullet-riddled bodies of the two dead sons of the former President of Iraq, Mr Saddam Hussein, and after reading the reports of how the two sons were slaughtered, I began to wonder as to the efficiency and efficacy of the US Army and, in particular, of the individual American soldier. I have come to the conclusion that Chinese soldiers are far superior to their American counterparts. While the American Government tells of ninety-plus American soldiers, having been killed in Iraq, most of whom were killed in the cities of that Arab country, following the cessation of twenty-one day war, it is known that thousands of innocent Iraqi civilians have been killed, accidentally, alongside the Americans – including new members of the Iraqi police force, all of whom were encouraged to join up by the Americans. The logic of the Americans, when bombing and bombarding areas of Baghdad and other cities where it was known that innocent Iraqis were living, was that the Iraqi civilians had to be sacrificed so that future Iraqi generations would not have to die at the hands of ruthless governmental regimes, such as that of Mr Saddam Hussein. It is an interesting piece of logic, don't you think? I wonder, however, how that logic differs from the suggestion of wiping out all of the present generation of a certain race in order that future generations may benefit from the slaughter of human life? For what reason, therefore, is genocide worse than killing all aristocrats, or killing all bourgeois ... or all solicitors and barristers, for that matter? If one accepts the logic of today's US generals, that some of the present, innocent Iraqi civilians have to die in order to guarantee the safety and continuance of future Iraqi generations, is one to assume that the present Iraqi civilians are not as important as future generations? That type of logic reminds me of those people, who, during the Second World War, said that it was against their religion to kill another person, for whatever reason (conscientious objectors), but, at the same time, they were quite willing to die for their beliefs. Put another way, the pacifist would say that life, all life, is precious and, that being the case, he could not take somebody else's life. However, having said that, the pacifist would, nobly, offer up his life in order to save another's on the premise, I suppose, that all life is sacred – except his. The problem that I have with this kind of logic is that today is guaranteed to be tomorrow's past, while the future must be built on the precedents of the past. What tomorrow will bring to civilisation is determined by history, you see. The actions of today, therefore, cannot be easily expunged from the memory banks of civilisation. Unless, of course, we indulge in Orwellian concepts of erasing all trace of certain words or deeds from books.*

*Then, there is, of course, the question as to the reasoning in the US Government when it was felt that it had to permit the killing of its sons and daughters. Was it truly necessary? Was it a case that these sons and daughters of American mothers and fathers had to be killed for the sake of future generations of Americans, who would not have to make the same kind of noble sacrifices? In the first war between the United Nations (UN) and Iraq, following Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, the United Nations demolished Iraq's Army, but the President of the United States (US), in 1991, Mr George Herbert Walker Bush, the father of President George W. Bush, determined not to try to depose President Saddam Hussein and, instead, allowed him to stay in power, subject to a UN mandate.*

*The 1991 Prime Minister of Great Britain, during that war, was Mrs Margaret Thatcher, who maintained, then, and still maintains, today, that President George Herbert Walker Bush was mad to allow President Saddam Hussein to get off, scott-free. She maintained that what should have happened was for the UN to enter Baghdad, depose President Saddam Hussein, and, then, turn him over to the people of Iraq. In that way, there would have been no question as to who killed whom, and under what circumstances. Also, there would have been no question of his death and/or the possibility of him, returning to power. But note the difference in the treatment of President Saddam Hussein in 1991 and the treatment of his two sons, recently: The US Army was given instructions, clearly, to kill the sons of Saddam Hussein instead of trying to capture them, alive. With only a few people in a house, the US Army bombarded it with enough firepower to make the edifice have the appearance of a piece of Swiss cheese. The attack on that villa in Mosul, Iraq, where Messrs Uday Hussein and Qusay Hussein were discovered to be hiding, was carried out with the use of helicopter gunships, which rained down missile after missile on the villa, while a ring of soldiers discharged tens of thousands of bullets and what-have-you into the villa. When the dead bodies of the four inhabitants were retrieved and the two sons of Saddam Hussein were identified, positively, all that was left of them were heads of the two sons, both of which were full of holes and shell fragments, lodged in their skulls. One has to ponder: With the sons, known to have been outnumbered, one hundred to one, with no chance of escape, was it necessary to mangle the bodies to smithereens? If the US Army had not attacked the villa, do you think that the boys would have surrendered as soon as they ran out of water and food? According to reports, no real attempt was made to enter the villa – until the greater part of it had been demolished by missiles and a heavy barrage by tanks and things.*

*Talking of killing and things like that, here comes Grandpa, all fired up from his session with some of those bothersome democrats.*

*Must go to take care of the poor dear.*

*Love you.*

*The Chief Lady of Hongkong*

***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.*