

George w bush's  
protection of the iraqi  
people and caesar's  
protection of the  
gau...

[History](#), [Ancient History](#)



In 59BC, Julius Caesar declared he was so shocked by the incursions of the dangerous Helvetii tribe into Gaul, and the suffering of the Gaulish peoples, that he had himself appointed 'protector of the Gauls'. By the time he'd finished protecting them, a million Gauls were dead, another million enslaved and Julius Caesar owned most of Gaul. Now I'm not suggesting there is any similarity between George W Bush's protection of the Iraqi people and Caesar's protection of the Gauls.

For a start, Julius Caesar, as we all know, was bald, whereas George W Bush has a fine head of hair.

In any case, George W Bush is not personally making huge amounts of money out of it. The money-making is all left in the capable hands of companies like CACI International, Blackwater Security and Haliburton.

## Contents

It's true that Vice-President Dick Cheney's stock options in his old company, Haliburton, went up from \$241, 498 in 2004 to \$8m in 2005 - that's an increase of 3, 281 per cent.

But then Dick Cheney is bald.

The point I'm trying to make is that there is absolutely no comparison to be made between Julius Caesar's invasion of Gaul in 58-50BC and George Bush's invasion of Iraq.

I mean, Julius Caesar had the nerve to pretend that the Roman state was being threatened by what was going on in Gaul. He claimed he had to carry

out a pre-emptive strike against the Helvetii in the interests of homeland security. In reality, his motives were political. He desperately needed a military victory to boost his standing in Rome and give him the necessary popular base to seize power.

George W Bush, on the other hand, was already in power when he invaded Iraq and, in any case, he didn't need to boost his popularity, because the popular vote had nothing to do with his getting into power in the first place. Julius Caesar was also a very adroit propagandist who made damn sure that his version of events prevailed. He even wrote eight books about his wars in Gaul to make sure it did. George W Bush doesn't need to go to such lengths. He has Fox News.

When Julius Caesar claimed his glorious victory over the Helvetii, he made it sound as if he had destroyed a vast army of 'wild and savage men'. Julius Caesar reckoned he had slaughtered more than 250,000 'insurgents'. In fact, documents found in the remains of the Helvetii camp showed that out of 368,000 people, only 92,000 had been capable of bearing arms.

In other words, it wasn't an army that Julius Caesar massacred, but a whole population including women, children, old and sick, which, I suppose, is one thing that George W Bush and Julius Caesar do have in common: pretending civilians are armed insurgents.

But there the similarity ends. One of the most fundamental differences between Julius Caesar and George W Bush is that Julius Caesar counted his dead, whereas George W Bush can't be bothered. It seems that, as

commander-in-chief, George W Bush instructed his soldiers not to count the enemy dead. So the fact that he still sticks to an estimate of only 30, 000 dead Iraqis, even when a recently published study in the Lancet suggests he's slaughtered at least 655, 000, can only be the result of his extraordinary modesty.

Why else would he dismiss the study as pure guesswork or claim it had used a ' methodology [that] is pretty well discredited', even though the US government has been spending millions of dollars a year to train NGOs in this exact same methodology? Julius Caesar would have seized on the figures with alacrity.

And that is the biggest difference of all: Julius Caesar was an ambitious, vainglorious, would-be tyrant. George W Bush is a modest and self-deprecating one.

\$912, 743

contributed

\$1, 000, 000

our goal

In these critical times ...

... The Guardian's US editor John Mulholland urges you to show your support for independent journalism with a year-end gift to The Guardian. We are

asking our US readers to help us raise \$1 million dollars by early January to report on the most important stories in 2019.

In normal times we might not be making this appeal. But these are not normal times. Many of the values and beliefs we hold dear at The Guardian are under threat both here in the US and around the world. Facts, science, humanity, diversity and equality are being challenged daily. As is truth. Which is why we need your help.

Powerful public figures choose lies over truths, prefer supposition over science; and select hate over humanity. The US administration is foremost among them; whether in denying climate science or hating on immigrants; giving succor to racists or targeting journalists and the media. Many of these untruths and attacks find fertile ground on social media where tech platforms seem unable to cauterise lies. As a result, fake is in danger of overriding fact.

Almost 100 years ago, in 1921, the editor of The Guardian argued that the principal role of a newspaper was accurate reporting, insisting that “ facts are sacred.” We still hold that to be true. The need for a robust, independent press has never been greater, but the challenge is more intense than ever as digital disruption threatens traditional media’s business model. We pride ourselves on not having a paywall because we believe truth should not come at a price for anyone. Our journalism remains open and accessible to everyone and with your help we can keep it that way.