

IRAQ: YOU EAT WHAT YOU SHOOT

Carefully noting what is transpiring in Iraq, with questions, being raised as to how the democratically elected government of Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki got its knickers in their present twist, the conclusion that this medium has reached is that the root of the numerous problems have their foundations, firmly planted in the thinking of the Government of the United States of America – especially when President George Walker Bush was trying to run the show.

The thinking of the US Government with regard to Iraq, during the eight-year reign of the 43rd President, was that it dreamt of democratising the entire Middle East and that the Government of Iraq, under President Saddam Hussein Abd al-Majid al-Tirkriti, was an evil Administration that, inter alia, had a stockpile of weapons of mass destruction and was a breeding and training place of international terrorism.

The successful invasion of Iraq that lasted from March 19, 2003, to May 3, 2003, named ‘*Operation Iraqi Freedom*’, led by 195,194 US, British, Australian and Polish armed forces, proved, conclusively, that Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction and that the Government of President Saddam Hussein was a government where might was, always, right: The President ruled with an iron fist.

President George Walker Bush went on record, stating that the military mission of the nearly 200,000-member coalition force had its principle aims of disarming Iraq of its (non-existent) weapons of mass destruction, freeing the 32 million people of Iraq from the oppressive regime of President Saddam Hussein as well as the support that the country had shown to known terrorists and terrorist organisations.

That President Saddam Hussein was an evil dictator goes without saying, but, by the same token, the dictatorial mind-set of the US Government, under the able direction of President George Walker Bush, was found to have been sadly lacking and was, as history has proved, myopic.

It was this mind-set that, probably, is at the core of the present situation whereby the Iraqi Government is on the horns of a dilemma.

This situation could easily lead to a civil war that, if it does escalate to this level, has all the hallmarks of becoming into a terrible bloodbath.

As **TARGET** () has written in the past, with the best intentions in the world, a country cannot hope to impose, by direct or indirect force, its governmental modus vivendi on another civilisation and expect the same, or similar, end results that it has achieved over the years.

This medium wrote, some time ago, that when the Indian Government of years gone by asked an American sociologist to visit the country in order to suggest a comprehensive method by which poverty and starvation might be eradicated, the American wrote, in his summation, among other things, a concept that invoked utter disdain to the majority of the population.

The American stated that there were tens of millions of well-fed bovines, roaming the countryside and through many cities, throughout India, all of which could be rounded up and slaughtered, and the meat, given to the poor.

The American had failed to realise that, to the Hindus of the world, numbering more than one billion

adherents and representing about 80 percent of the total population of the Indian subcontinent, the cow is a sacred animal.

History is a wonderful teacher of right-minded people, but rarely to the overly proud.

The Iraqi Governmental regime under President Saddam Hussein was based on the minority Sunni population (about 32 percent of the entire population), governing the Shia population (about 62 percent of the entire population).

While both Muslim sects have many things in common, the Sunni adheres to the orthodox tradition and acknowledges the first four caliphs as the rightful successors of Muhammad, whereas the Shia maintains that believing in Ali – the cousin and son-in-law of Muhammad –and the Imams are the rightful successors of Muhammad and in the concealment and messianic return of the last recognised Imam.

When the invasion force of about 200,000-strong coalition men claimed success in toppling the Government of President Saddam Hussein in May of 2003, the US determined that the people of Iraq should select their own leaders in the democratic way à la America.

This, to President George Walker Bush, must have been seen as the first step in his grand plan to democratise the Arab world.

Two years and five months later, a national referendum was held and Iraqis approved a new constitution.

Three months later, in December of 2005, a 285-member of the Council of Representatives was elected.

In May 2006, the Council of Representatives approved most cabinet ministers and thus it came to pass that Iraq made the transition from a dictatorship to a constitutional government.

In March of 2010, Iraq held a national legislative election.

In the middle of 2011, the US Government removed its military mission from Iraq.

But, today, the US Government, now well into the reign of President Barack Hussein Obama, wants to oust the elected Prime Minister of Iraq, Mr Nuri al-Maliki.

In a democratic government, it is held that the people, by Universal Suffrage, vote into positions of power, those candidates that they select to rule them.

Hegemonic interference by a foreign power is not supposed to play any part in a free, democratically elected government although the US Government, clearly, does not subscribe to this basic concept.

The Iraqi Situation, Today

Today, a predominantly Sunni army, calling itself The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (**ISIL**), over a period of less than one month, has captured large swaths of Iraq; and, it appears to be poised to attack the Capital City of Iraq, Baghdad.

ISIL is employing tactics, very similar to those of the late President Saddam Hussein: It is slaughtering, publicly, any and all surrendering Iraqi soldiers and/or anybody else whose name is written on a list of people to be expunged from this life.

The intent, obviously, is to strike terror into the hearts of the general population of the country lest they consider resisting the fighters of the black banner.

ISIL, in one shape or another, made known its intentions back in January, this year, when it took possession of the City of Fallujah, a city in the Iraqi Province of Al Anbar, located about 69 kilometers west of

Baghdad on the Euphrates.

It, also, took possession of about half of the Provincial Capital of Ramadi, at about the same time period.

Iraqi armed forces, in many instances, have determined to run away from the advancing fighters of ISIL as did the police forces of most cities that ISIL captured.

Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki has asked the US Government for assistance and President Barack Hussein Obama has agreed to send 300 military advisers to Iraq, but these advisers are not permitted to take part in any military action.

But Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki has asked for much more than just 300 US advisers: He wants the US to bombard ISIL fighters – now!

Last Sunday, speaking from Cairo, Egypt, US Secretary of State John Kerry went on record, stating, *inter alia*, that the Government of Iraq should ‘*rise above sectarian motivations and form a Government that is united in its determination to meet the needs and speak to the demands of all of their people*’.

This statement reeks of sheer ignorance on the part of this high-ranking member of the government of the strongest nation on the face of the earth.

As for the statement that the people of Iraq should ‘*form a Government that is united*’: Is that not that which took place with the election of Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki on May 20, 2006?

Is Mr John Kerry suggesting, by innuendo, that the present Iraqi Administration is not a united government, at all, and that it does not meet the needs of all Iraqis?

Mr John Kerry is likely to be somewhat shocked at the answer that he would likely receive were he to ask a devout Muslim man as to what comes first in his life: His government or his religion.

In the Moslem world of Iran, there is no separation of powers between the Executive and the Church.

It is called a theocracy: A government of a state by immediate divine guidance or by officials who are regarded as divinely guided.

Iraq is a Moslem country with 99 percent of the entire population, being either Sunni or Shia.

The Government of Iraq is not a theocracy, as is the situation in Iran, but ISIL, as its name connotes, is determined to carve out part of (or all) Iraq in order to form another theocracy by introducing Sharia law.

Sharia Law, simply put, is the body of Islamic Law and, as such, it is the legal framework within which most aspects of life are regulated.

Naturally, Iran’s Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei would embrace the formation of a Muslim theocracy on his doorstep; and, therefore, he is bound to be opposed to any US intervention, or even benign involvement, in the internal affairs of Iraq.

But, aside from the consideration of ISIL, obtaining its present goal – Baghdad – thus toppling the Government of Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki, there is the horror, as far as Ayatollah Ali Khamenei is concerned, of having a US-controlled, Iraqi Government on his country’s doorstep.

That which the US Government has created in Iraq, by accident, design or through sheer ignorance on the part of well-meaning, American Christians (inclusive of President George Walker Bush, of course), is to marginalise various ethnic factions within the Iraqi population.

This situation has returned to haunt the Iraqi Government as it flounders in the chaos in which it finds itself,

today.

But this is only one of the many factors that has contributed to the undoing of the present Iraqi Government.

Perhaps more importantly than just Iraq and the present situation in that country is that which the entire world is hoping will not be the logical sequence of events from ISIL's military successes: The emergence in the shape of a 21st Century's Salah ad-Din Yusuf ibn Ayyub.

If that name, Salah ad-Din Yusuf ibn Ayyub, does not nudge memories of yore, consider the name, Saladin, the name that the Western World adopted for this man.

Saladin was a Muslim of Kurdish original and he led the very successful Muslim opposition to the Crusaders in the Levant (Eastern Mediterranean) in the 11th Century.

His banner, also, was said to have been black as his troops, triumphantly, entered the City of Jerusalem on October 2, 1187, following a siege that had lasted just 12 days and culminated in Balian of Ibelin, surrendering the city to the man who became known as the First Sultan of Egypt and Syria.

-- 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. **TARGET**
does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the
laws of libel.*