

Projecting Power by Fomenting Anarchy: The Latest George Orwell Bush "Newspeak" Speech

A Blog Entry in Comments From Left Field and GordonTalk

June 29, 2005

To people of conscience the world over, the situation in Iraq is a humanitarian disaster.

But to others, **fomenting anarchy**—in predictable response to a foreign policy carefully constructed with lies upon lies and irresistibly enforced by the greatest military power the world has ever seen—**has achieved precisely the goals long stated.**

The Mission has indeed been Accomplished for the Neo-Conservatives: Their long-held dream of "projecting power" from the heart of the Middle East for the foreseeable future is now a reality, the cost in lives and treasure—to others—be damned.

In that light, consider the president's speech last evening: Was he a desperate blunderer appealing to a restive public for continued patience in an overly idealistic crusade, or a warlord savoring his spoils and declaring his will as unassailable to an effectively "captive audience" (and I refer not only to the military personnel ordered to attend and goaded, by presidential skills, to applaud).

[With the carnage in Iraq continuing, spasmodically worsening, and showing no signs of abating.](#)

[With Offense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld admitting that the fighting could last for a dozen years or more.](#)

[With Iraq now "Irek",](#)



[With most Americans now saying that Bush intentionally misled us into a war that they think was a mistake to begin with and in which they think we are now bogged down for years.](#)

[With the President's approval ratings dropping to historic lows, even in Red States,](#)

[George Orwell Bush has apparently grasped at the last straw he has left—his storied reputation for handling terrorism \(and even his poll numbers for that are dropping dramatically\)—](#)

[And yet again re-written history:](#) We aren't in Iraq to eliminate those non-existent WMDs (which the Downing Street Memos reveal the administration knew were not an imminent threat, despite what they impeachably testified to the U.S. Congress, and the American people); we aren't in Iraq to eliminate Saddam Hussein (who never attacked America, despite the administration's goading him with dramatically increased airstrikes well before going to Congress for the Constitutionally required authorization to initiate hostilities, and who was boxed in by the U.N., which the administration systematically misled and whose inspections it manipulated, in a failed attempt to goad Hussein into non-compliance, another trumped-up and unsuccessful *casus belli*); and although we may still be in Iraq to establish a "beacon" of democracy to shine throughout the region (whose people could, of course, use a lot more liberty—particularly from autocratic regimes that we support—but who are being predictably incited to the very opposite effect by our open-ended occupation in the heart of the Middle East), we are now in Iraq—we are told—to prevent another 9/11-style attack on our Homeland by all those evil-doers being drawn to Iraq, like moths to flame, by our very presence in Iraq.

Talk about your self-fulfilling prophecies!

By piling lies upon lies, George Orwell Bush has finally arrived at something approaching the truth: Just as we had to invade Afghanistan to root out the Al Qaeda terrorists who did attack us on 9/11—a job that we never did complete, as we threw the bulk of our resources into Iraq (and threw away most our international good will in the process)—we now find ourselves facing a maniacally religiously frenzied, well-funded new breeding grounds for Al Qaeda terrorists, primarily in the region of Iraq home to Sunnis (a minority in Iraq, a majority in the Muslim world at large), which our policies have predictably fomented but which we truly do ignore at our peril.

With a tiger by the tail (We're not just in a quagmire, as in Vietnam; the Viet Cong never flew jetliners into our skyscrapers), the polls indicate that no one—not Bush, not his supporters in Congress, not the Democrats (predictably divided into hawks and doves), not the public at large or overseas—no one really knows how to get us out of this deathtrap. And that's the scariest part of all ... to most of us.

To most of us, this arrival at a point of no good options may seem like the unintended consequence of a bungled policy based upon deception, even self-deception.

However, there is another, even more influential perspective to consider.

To the NeoCons, the situation in Iraq has turned out pretty much as they have planned it all along, from the bowels of Right Wing think tanks to the halls of the White House (They sold that "We'll be welcomed as liberators" line of B.S., but I doubt they bought it). They have achieved the very goal that they have publicly and privately lusted after since well before the tragedy of 9/11 gave them [the pretext they had long awaited](#) for invading any country deemed a terrorist state, in particular Iraq: the establishment of a massive American military force, ultimately in permanent bases, in the strategic heart of the Middle East.

And it's not just about sitting atop the world's second-largest known petroleum reserves—which makes Cheney and Halliburton salivate and rich—there is something even more fundamental at play here: The ability to "project power" in that vital region—or anywhere, for that matter—allows you to take whatever you want, whenever you want it, for whatever reason you want it.

The NeoCons—"imperialists," to be studious about it; bullies, to be blunt—have finally gotten their way ... at the cost of tens of thousands of lives and limbs and hundreds of billions of dollars, all paid by someone else.

Just as the Right has insidiously ["starved the beast"](#)—given us precious few options for public spending on vital public programs, such as Social Security, by amassing huge public debt—**the Right has now "created a beast"**—predictably drawn so many terrorists to Iraq that

we now must maintain a massive military presence in that country indefinitely.

[And isn't that exactly what the NeoCons wanted all along?](#)

Postscript: How to Make a Lie the "Truth"

Remember that all this started—and was promoted—with lies.

Take note, all prevaricators-to-be: To make a (bald-faced) lie the (accepted) "truth," first throw it out there as an aside, a "given," in another discussion—don't make a big deal out of it; and chances are, no one else will either.

Discreetly plant the seed of a lie, nurture it by repetition, and it will grow into a great tree of "truth" called the "conventional wisdom."

In this instance, [as I first noted last month in GordonTalk](#), a senior U.S. military official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity, said almost off-handedly:

If we fail [in Iraq], the different groups would be at each other's throats and warfare would continue for some time. ... If we take our foot off their throats, this country could be back into civil war and chaos.

To which your humble rabble-rouser replied:

WHOA!!! **"Back** into civil war and chaos"?

Say what you will about ol' Saddam; but
like Marshall Tito, whose "iron fist"
suppressed ethnic and religious warfare
in Yugoslavia for decades, Saddam
Hussein ruthlessly, yet effectively
suppressed ethnic and religious warfare
in Iraq. ...

Sorry, kids; if Iraq continues to descend
into civil war and chaos—happily helped
along by the likes of that murderous
bastard al-Zarqawi—it's not a return to
the "good ol' bad ol' days" of Saddam.

Nope.

It'll be George Dubya's little gift to the
Middle East. Tied up in a ribbon as red
as all the blood that's been shed.

No matter how the story is written, or
re-written.

And now that the newest reason for war, first
thrown out there by an unnamed source, has
become the official policy pronounced by the
president in his latest speech, it becomes even
more evident that in re-writing history—in order
to manipulate history—the Bush administration
would put [Big Brother](#) to shame.

And that puts all of us to shame.