

UNDERSTANDING THE WORKINGS OF THE MIND OF A U.S. PRESIDENT,'Bushspeak' Is Not 'Doublespeak'

Management of **TARGET** () is unashamedly in favour of the democratic principles, propounded by such great democracies as those of the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

That does not mean, however, that **TARGET** endorses all of the actions of governments, democratically elected, and, in fact, in the case of the United States and the United Kingdom and the actions in attacking Iraq on March 20, 2003, **TARGET** maintains that these 2 democracies acted contrary to their respective undertakings, given to the United Nations.

In other words, they acted illegally.

Be that as it may, today, Iraq has a democratically elected government – and that has to be a great improvement over the tyranny of President Saddam Hussein.

But one has to consider: Does the end justify the means?

It is, indeed, difficult to understand, at times, the workings of some governments and, especially, those of democracies since, from time to time, the electorate, clearly, endorses the wrong man to lead the country.

(Remember January 30, 1933, when there was widespread elation and adulation as Mr Adolf Hitler was sworn in as Chancellor of Germany).

To say that the electorate is more often than not fickle is to state the obvious.

How many people recall the hysterics of Mr David Duke, whose electoral platform included sending all of the black people, resident in the United States, back to Africa from where they were kidnapped by American and British slave-traders more than 300 years ago.

Mr David Duke, a former Grand Wizard of the hated **Ku Klux Klan** (KKK), was democratically elected to the Louisiana House of Representatives in 1989, but he ran unsuccessfully in that State's gubernatorial election in 1991.

The Louisiana electorate had come to its senses by 1991, it appeared.

It is often difficult to understand the utterances of some of the leaders of the great democracies of today, and, even, to understand how certain of these leaders had, ever, been able to reach their present high offices.

Take Mr George W. Bush, the President of the United States, as an example.

It would appear to this medium that, basically, he is a good man, good, that is, in terms of his present moral standards and his dedication to the tasks at hand as the most-powerful, single man on earth.

Which is unlike the moral standards of his predecessor, President Bill Clinton, who, aside from fornicating in the Oval Office, he, also committed perjury while in office.

As a clear example of President George W. Bush's loquaciousness and clarity of mind, **TARGET** offers the following monologue, following on from a speech that he delivered on December 13, 2005.

In trying to explain his Medicare Drug Bill to the assembly, he was asked by an elderly lady:

'I don't really understand. How is it the new plan going to fix the problem?'

President George W. Bush, condescendingly, responded as follows:

'Because the ... all which is on the table begins to address the big cost drivers. For example, how benefits are calculated, for example, is on the table. Whether or not benefits rise based upon wage increases or price increases. There's a series of parts of the formula that are being considered. And when you couple that, those different cost drivers, affecting those ... changing those with personal accounts, the idea is to get what has been promised more likely to be ... or closer delivered to that has been promised. Does that make any sense to you? It's kind of muddled. Look, there's a series of things that cause the ... like, for example, benefits are calculated based upon the increase of wages, as opposed to the increase of prices. Some have suggested that we calculate ... the benefits will rise based upon inflation, supposed to wage increases. There is a reform that would help solve the red if that were put into effect. In other words, how fast benefits grow, how fast the promised benefits grow, if those ... if that growth is affected, it will help on the red.'

George Orwell might have called President George W. Bush's answer as being '*Bushspeak*' because the Orwellian '*doublespeak*' would, certainly, not have been an accurate description of the utterances of this great man – who was, clearly, caught with his pants, down around his ankles.

Then, again, it was a little unfair of that lady to expect President George W. Bush to be able to answer such a question while standing up, especially without having his speech-writers flash an answer, no matter how obfuscating it might have been, on the TelePrompter.

To the President's credit, he did not even sweat when cornered by this little lady.

This attribute is said to be one of the signs of a great leader of the free world: Answer a question with authority and justify that answer at a later date, regardless of its veracity.

-- **END** --

***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.*