

## Editorial

### *Obama's 1984*

The appropriate image for President Obama's speech in Oslo, when he received the Nobel Prize, has been cited by numerous authors: It's nothing less than George Orwell's *1984*, in which the dictator, known as Big Brother, declares that "war is peace." Except, with Obama, we are not dealing with a work of fiction, but a policy of the United States Administration that could lead to the destruction of civilization for centuries to come.

It is precisely because the President had the nerve to deliver this brazen defense of a war policy, while accepting a Nobel Peace Prize, that he has received kudos from neocons and Fabian liberals alike, from around the world.

President Obama could not present a cogent argument in defense of his expansion of the war in Afghanistan, of course. He called it a "just war" with the very same arguments that were advanced by George W. Bush when he launched this insanity to begin with. Afghanistan was never the source of the 9/11 attack, even though dupes from the Osama bin Laden network were involved. The problem lay with Britain, Saudi Arabia, and their mercenary accomplices, but the controllers of the President wanted war against the Muslim world—and they got it.

Obama's echoing of Bush didn't leave much to the imagination. He defined the U.S. as "the world's sole military superpower." He glorified the U.S. military role since World War II (in which U.S. soldiers were sent into one unnecessary war after another), and came close to Big Brother himself by saying, "the instruments of war do have a role to play in preserving the peace."

Even worse, the President proceeded to outline a theory of warfare which, if followed, would commit the United States to waging a slew of other wars as well. Specifically, he reiterated the argu-

ments of the author of the second Iraq War, Tony Blair, when he called for overthrowing the principle of the Treaty of Westphalia—national sovereignty—in favor of perpetual intervention and war.

"I believe that force can be justified on humanitarian grounds, as it was in the Balkans, or in other places that have been scarred by war," the President said. "It is also incumbent upon all of us to insist that nations like Iran and North Korea do not game the system. . . . The same principle applies to those who violate international laws by brutalizing their own people. When there is genocide in Darfur, systematic rape in Congo, repression in Burma—there must be consequences."

Here we go again. The President of the United States is both lying (about genocide in Darfur), and presuming to dictate standards of so-called human rights and democracy, to nations around the world—at the point of a gun. Once again, he is enunciating *British* policy—permanent crisis-management and war in a world where national sovereignty has been destroyed.

The *American* doctrine of war and peace was defined by leaders such as John Quincy Adams and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. They rejected the idea of policing the world, but sought to establish a community of principle through offering cooperation on mutual economic development. FDR couldn't have been clearer about his own thinking, when he declared that the key to world peace after 1945, would be the creation of a thriving world economy, that would lift all people out of the misery of colonialism and desperate poverty. Should FDR's policy have been adopted after his death, war could have been set aside—as it should be today as well.

How long are Americans going to tolerate a President who adopts British imperial policy instead?