

Fidel Castro's Reflections on Libya and more



Produced by
TORONTO FORUM ON CUBA



July 1st, 2011

We have compiled the Reflections of Fidel Castro, the historical leader of the Cuban Revolution, on Libya. Our intention is to provide the resources to arm ourselves politically for exposing the criminal aggression of NATO against Libya, under the banner of "saving human lives".

The imperialists' assisted, led and organized forces in Libya, which are being referred to as "freedom fighters", "revolutionaries" and "democracy seekers", are working hand-in-glove with the NATO forces. Their goal is to bring death and destruction to Libya, so that it could become another "backyard" for the U.S. and its allies in North Africa, in which to plunder natural resources, labour and oil and to take advantage of its strategic positioning.

While the main imperialist countries such as the U.S., Great Britain, Spain, Portugal, etc. are in an ever-deepening economic crisis, working people have been fighting back against the austerity measures at home. In Canada, the government stripped postal workers of their democratic right to strike through the passing of back-to-work legislation albeit the glamour and festivities of the Canada Day celebration are in full swing. Meantime, the major media outlets abstain from mentioning the bombings carried out under the leadership of a Canadian military general against Libya, which have destroyed schools, hospitals and infrastructure, while causing many deaths and maiming.

HUMAN SOLIDARITY KNOWS NO BORDERS and we hope that this booklet (the third in a series published by Toronto Forum on Cuba), will draw attention to this message for many who are ready to organize against the ongoing fascist style bombing of a sovereign nation.

We invite you all to join the campaign in solidarity with the Cuban Five, who symbolize humanity's desire for peace and whose unjust imprisonment is the result of the Empire's indignation at the fact that they dared to defend the sovereignty of their nation against U.S.-based terrorism.

Please, sign the petition at the end of this publication.

Morteza Gorgzadeh for Toronto Forum on Cuba
torontoforumoncuba@rogers.com
torontoforumoncuba@ymail.com
<http://torontoforumoncuba.weebly.com>

The front-page photo reminds us of the true solidarity of nations, while the photo on the last page is a drawing by Antonio Guerrero, one of the Cuban Five imprisoned in the U.S., in solidarity with the people of Palestine.

Yes, another world is possible and we can do it too, if we learn anything from Fidel.

FEATURED REFLECTIONS

The NATO Plan Is to Occupy Libya

February 21st, 2011



The Cynical Dance

February 23rd, 2011



NATO's Inevitable War – Part I

March 2nd, 2011



NATO's Inevitable War – Part II

March 3rd, 2011



NATO, War, Lies and Business

March 9th, 2011



Two Earthquakes

March 11th, 2011



The Disasters Threatening the World

March 14th, 2011



Good Conduct Certificate

March 18th, 2011



Partnership of Equals

March 20th, 2011



My Shoes are too Tight

March 21st, 2011

The Real Intentions of the “Partnership of Equals

March 22nd, 2011



NATO's Fascist War

March 28th, 2011



The Best and Most Intelligent

March 31st, 2011



A Fire that Could Burn Everyone

April 27th, 2011



Understanding the war in Libya (I)

by Michel Collon - May 20th, 2011



Understanding the war in Libya (II)

by Michel Collon - May 25th, 2011



Understanding the war in Libya (III)

by Michel Collon - May 27th, 2011

The NATO Plan Is to Occupy Libya

Oil has become the principal wealth in the hands of the great Yankee transnationals; through this energy source they had an instrument that considerably expanded their political power in the world. It was their main weapon when they decided to easily liquidate the Cuban Revolution as soon as the first just and sovereign laws were passed in our Homeland: depriving it of oil.

Upon this energy source today's civilization was developed. Venezuela was the nation in this hemisphere that paid the highest price. The United States became the lord and master of the huge oil fields that Mother Nature had bestowed upon that sister country.

At the end of the last World War, it started to extract greater amounts of oil from the oil fields of Iran, as well as those in Saudi Arabia, Iraq and the Arab countries located around them. These became the main suppliers. World consumption progressively increased to the fabulous figure of approximately 80 million barrels a day, including those being extracted on United States territory, to which later gas, hydro and nuclear energies were added. Until the beginning of the twentieth century, coal had been the basic source of energy that made industrial development possible, before billions of automobiles and engines consuming the liquid fuel were produced.

The squandering of oil and gas is associated with one of the greatest tragedies, not in the least resolved, which is suffered by humankind: climate change.

When our Revolution arose, Algeria, Libya and Egypt were not yet oil producers and a great part of the abundant reserves of Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran and the United Arab Emirates were still to be discovered.

In December of 1951, Libya becomes the first African country to attain its independence after WW II, during which its territory was the stage for important battles between the troops of Germany and the United Kingdom, conferring fame and glory on Generals Erwin Rommel and Bernard L. Montgomery.

Ninety-five percent of its territory is completely made up of desert. Technology permitted the discovery of vital oilfields of excellent quality light oil that today reach one million 800 thousand barrels a day along with abundant deposits of natural gas. Such riches allowed it to reach life expectancy that is almost at 75 years of age and the highest per capita income in Africa. Its harsh desert is located over an enormous lake of fossil waters, equivalent to more than three times the land area of Cuba; this has made it possible to construct a broad network of pipelines of fresh water that stretch from one end of the country to the other.

Libya, which had a million inhabitants when it attained independence, today has somewhat more than 6 million.

The Libyan Revolution took place in the month of September of the year 1969. Its main leader was Muammar al-Gaddafi, a soldier of Bedouin origin who, in his early years, was inspired by the ideas of the Egyptian leader Gamal Abdel Nasser. Without any doubt, many of his decisions are associated with the changes that were produced when, as in Egypt, a weak and corrupt monarchy was overthrown in Libya.

The inhabitants of that country have age-old warrior traditions. It is said that ancient Libyans were a part of Hannibal's army when he was at the point of destroying Ancient Rome with the troops that crossed the Alps.

One can agree with Gaddafi or not. The world has been invaded with all kinds of news, especially using the mass media. One has to wait the necessary length of time in order to learn precisely what is the truth and what are lies, or a mixture of events of every kind that, in the midst of chaos, were produced in Libya. For me, what is absolutely clear is that the government of the United States is not

in the least worried about peace in Libya and it will not hesitate in giving NATO the order to invade that rich country, perhaps in a matter of hours or a few short days.

Those who with perfidious intentions invented the lie that Gaddafi was headed for Venezuela, just as they did yesterday afternoon on Sunday the 20th of February, today received an fitting response from Foreign Affairs Minister Nicolás Maduro when he literally stated that he was “wishing that the Libyan people would find, in the exercise of their sovereignty, a peaceful solution to their difficulties, that would preserve the integrity of the Libyan people and nation, without the interference of imperialism...”

As for me, I cannot imagine that the Libyan leader would abandon his country; escaping the responsibilities he is charged with, whether or not they are partially or totally false.

An honest person shall always be against any injustice being committed against any people in the world, and the worst of all, at this moment, would be to remain silent in the face of the crime that NATO is getting ready to commit against the Libyan people.

The leadership of that war-mongering organization has to do it. We must condemn it!

Fidel Castro Ruz
February 21, 2011
10:14 p.m.



The Cynical Dance

The policy of plundering imposed by the United States and their NATO allies in the Middle East has gone into a crisis. It has inevitably unravelled with the high cost of grains, the effects of which can be felt more forcefully in the Arab countries where, in spite of their huge resources of oil, the shortage of water, areas covered by desert and the generalized poverty of the people contrast with the enormous resources coming from the oil possessed by the privileged sectors.

While food prices triple, real estate fortunes and the treasures of the aristocratic minority reach millions of millions of dollars.

The Arab world, mainly Muslim in its culture and beliefs, has seen itself additionally humiliated by the imposition of blood and fire by a State that was not capable of fulfilling the basic obligations that were part of their origin, from the colonial order existing up to the end of WW II, by virtue of which the victorious powers created the United Nations Organization and imposed world trade and economy.

Thanks to the treason committed by Anwar El-Sadat at Camp David, the Palestinian State has not been able to exist, despite the UN treaties of November 1947, and Israel became a strong nuclear power, an ally of the United States and NATO.

The US Military Industrial Complex supplied Israel with tens of billions of dollars every year as well as to the very Arab States that were submitted and being humiliated by Israel.

The genie has escaped from the bottle and NATO doesn't know how to control it.

They are going to attempt to wrest the most benefits from the regrettable events in Libya. Nobody can know at this moment what is happening over there. All the figures and versions, even the most implausible ones, have been spread by the empire via the mass media, sowing chaos and disinformation.

It is obvious that inside Libya a civil war is brewing. Why and how did this happen? Who will pay the consequences? Reuters Agency, echoing the opinion of the well-known Nomura Bank of Japan, stated that oil prices could go beyond any limits:

“If Libya and Algeria suspend oil production, prices could reach a maximum of more than 220 dollars a barrel and OPEC’s inactive capacity would be reduced to 2.1 million barrels per day, similar to levels seen during the Gulf War and when values touched 147 dollars a barrel in 2008’, the bank asserted in an article.”

Who could pay that price these days? What would be the consequences in the midst of the food crisis?

The main NATO leaders are all worked up. British Prime Minister David Cameron, ANSA informed, “...admitted in a speech in Kuwait that the western nations made a mistake in backing non-democratic governments in the Arab world.” One has to congratulate him on his frankness.

His French colleague Nicolas Sarkozy stated: “The extended brutal and bloody repression of the Libyan civilian population is disgusting”.

Italian Chancellor Franco Frattini stated as “‘believable’ the figure of one thousand dead in Tripoli [...] ‘the tragic numbers shall be a bloodbath’.”

Hillary Clinton stated the following: “...the ‘bloodbath’ is ‘completely unacceptable’ and ‘it has to stop’...”

Ban Ki-moon spoke: “‘The use of violence in the country is absolutely unacceptable’.”

“...‘the Security Council will act according to whatever the international community decides’.”

“‘We are considering a series of options’.”

What Ban Ki-moon is really hoping is that Obama pronounces the last word.

The president of the United States spoke this Wednesday afternoon and stated that the Secretary of State would be leaving for Europe in order to agree with their NATO allies on the measures to be taken. On his face one could note the opportunity to spar with John McCain, the far-right-wing Republican senator, pro-Israel Senator Joseph Lieberman from Connecticut and the leaders of the Tea Party, in order to ensure the Democratic Party demands.

The empire’s mass media has prepared the terrain for action. There would be nothing strange about a military intervention in Libya; besides, with that, Europe would be guaranteed almost two million barrels of light oil per day, unless before that events would put an end to the leadership or the life of Gaddafi.

Anyway, Obama’s role is rather complicated. What will the reaction of the Arab and Muslim world be if blood should flow in abundance in that country as a result of that exploit? Would NATO intervention in Libya stem the revolutionary tidal wave surging in Egypt?

In Iraq, the innocent blood of more than a million Arab citizens was spilt when the country was invaded under false pretexts. Mission accomplished!: proclaimed George W. Bush.

Nobody in the world would ever agree with the deaths of defenceless civilians in Libya or anywhere else. And I wonder: will the US and NATO apply that principle on the defenceless civilians that the unmanned Yankee planes and the soldiers of that organization kill every day in Afghanistan and Pakistan?

It is a cynical danse macabre.

Fidel Castro Ruz
February 23, 2011.
7:42 p.m.



NATO'S INEVITABLE WAR – Part I

In contrast with what is happening in Egypt and Tunisia, Libya occupies the first spot on the Human Development Index for Africa and it has the highest life expectancy on the continent. Education and health receive special attention from the State. The cultural level of its population is without a doubt the highest. Its problems are of a different sort. The population wasn't lacking food and essential social services. The country needed an abundant foreign labour force to carry out ambitious plans for production and social development.

For that reason, it provided jobs for hundreds of thousands of workers from Egypt, Tunisia, China and other countries. It had enormous incomes and reserves in convertible currencies deposited in the banks of the wealthy countries from which they acquired consumer goods and even sophisticated weapons that were supplied exactly by the same countries that today want to invade it in the name of human rights.

The colossal campaign of lies, unleashed by the mass media, resulted in great confusion in world public opinion. Some time will go by before we can reconstruct what has really happened in Libya, and we can separate the true facts from the false ones that have been spread.

Serious and prestigious broadcasting companies such as Telesur, saw themselves with the obligation to send reporters and cameramen to the activities of one group and those on the opposing side, so that they could inform about what was really happening.

Communications were blocked, honest diplomatic officials were risking their lives going through neighbourhoods and observing activities, day and night, in order to inform about what was going on. The empire and its main allies used the most sophisticated media to divulge information about the events, among which one had to deduce the shreds of the truth.

Without any doubt, the faces of the young people who were protesting in Benghazi, men, and women wearing the veil or without the veil, were expressing genuine indignation.

One is able to see the influence that the tribal component still exercises on that Arab country, despite the Muslim faith that 95% of its population sincerely shares.

Imperialism and NATO – seriously concerned by the revolutionary wave unleashed in the Arab world, where a large part of the oil is generated that sustains the consumer economy of the developed and rich countries – could not help but take advantage of the internal conflict arising in Libya so that they could promote military intervention. The statements made by the United States administration right from the first instant were categorical in that sense.

The circumstances could not be more propitious. In the November elections, the Republican right-wing struck a resounding blow on President Obama, an expert in rhetoric.

The fascist "mission accomplished" group, now backed ideologically by the extremists of the Tea Party, reduced the possibilities of the current president to a merely decorative role in which even his

health program and the dubious economic recovery were in danger as a result of the budget deficit and the uncontrollable growth of the public debt which were breaking all historical records.

In spite of the flood of lies and the confusion that was created, the US could not drag China and the Russian Federation to the approval by the Security Council for a military intervention in Libya, even though it managed to obtain however, in the Human Rights Council, approval of the objectives it was seeking at that moment. In regards to a military intervention, the Secretary of State stated in words that admit not the slightest doubt: "no option is being ruled out".

The real fact is that Libya is now wrapped up in a civil war, as we had foreseen, and the United Nations could do nothing to avoid it, other than its own Secretary General sprinkling the fire with a goodly dose of fuel.

The problem that perhaps the actors were not imagining is that the very leaders of the rebellion were bursting into the complicated matter declaring that they were rejecting all foreign military intervention.

Various news agencies informed that Abdelhafiz Ghoga, spokesperson for the Committee of the Revolution stated on Monday the 28th that "The rest of Libya shall be liberated by the Libyan people".

"We are counting on the army to liberate Tripoli" assured Ghoga during the announcement of the formation of a 'National Council' to represent the cities of the country in the hands of the insurrection."

"What we want is intelligence information, but in no case that our sovereignty is affected in the air, on land or on the seas", he added during an encounter with journalists in this city located 1000 kilometres to the east of Tripoli."

"The intransigence of the people responsible for the opposition on national sovereignty was reflecting the opinion being spontaneously manifested by many Libyan citizens to the international press in Benghazi", informed a dispatch of the AFP agency this past Monday.

That same day, a political sciences professor at the University of Benghazi, Abeir Imneina, stated:

"There is very strong national feeling in Libya."

"Furthermore, the example of Iraq strikes fear in the Arab world as a whole", she underlined, in reference to the American invasion of 2003 that was supposed to bring democracy to that country and then, by contagion, to the region as a whole, a hypothesis totally belied by the facts."

The professor goes on:

"We know what happened in Iraq, it's that it is fully unstable and we really don't want to follow the same path. We don't want the Americans to come to have to go crying to Gaddafi", this expert continued."

"But according to Abeir Imneina, 'there also exists the feeling that this is our revolution, and that it is we who have to make it'."

A few hours after this dispatch was printed, two of the main press bodies of the United States, The New York Times and The Washington Post, hastened to offer new versions on the subject; the DPA agency informs on this on the following day, March the first: "The Libyan opposition could request that the West bomb from the air strategic positions of the forces loyal to President Muammar al Gaddafi, the US press informed today."

"The subject is being discussed inside the Libyan Revolutionary Council, 'The New York Times' and 'The Washington Post' specified in their online versions."

“The New York Times’ notes that these discussions reveal the growing frustration of the rebel leaders in the face of the possibility that Gaddafi should retake power”.

“In the event that air actions are carried out within the United Nations framework, these would not imply international intervention, explained the council’s spokesperson, quoted by The New York Times”.

“The council is made up of lawyers, academics, judges and prominent members of Libyan society.”

The dispatch states:

“The Washington Post’ quoted rebels acknowledging that, without Western backing, combat with the forces loyal to Gaddafi could last a long time and cost many human lives.”

It is noteworthy that in that regard, not one single worker, peasant or builder is mentioned, not anyone related to material production or any young student or combatant among those who take part in the demonstrations. Why the effort to present the rebels as prominent members of society demanding bombing by the US and NATO in order to kill Libyans?

Some day we shall know the truth, through persons such as the political sciences professor from the University of Benghazi who, with such eloquence, tells of the terrible experience that killed, destroyed homes, left millions of persons in Iraq without jobs or forced them to emigrate.

Today on Wednesday, the second of March, the EFE Agency presents the well-known rebel spokesperson making statements that, in my opinion, affirm and at the same time contradict those made on Monday: “Benghazi (Libya), March 2. The rebel Libyan leadership today asked the UN Security Council to launch an air attack ‘against the mercenaries’ of the Muamar el Gaddafi regime.”

“Our Army cannot launch attacks against the mercenaries, due to their defensive role’, stated the spokesperson for the rebels, Abdelhafiz Ghoga, at a press conference in Benghazi.”

“A strategic air attack is different from a foreign intervention which we reject’, emphasized the spokesperson for the opposition forces which at all times have shown themselves to be against a foreign military intervention in the Libyan conflict”.

Which one of the many imperialist wars would this look like?

The one in Spain in 1936? Mussolini’s against Ethiopia in 1935? George W. Bush’s against Iraq in the year 2003 or any other of the dozens of wars promoted by the United States against the peoples of the Americas, from the invasion of Mexico in 1846 to the invasion of the Falkland Islands in 1982?

Without excluding, of course, the mercenary invasion of the Bay of Pigs, the dirty war and the blockade of our Homeland throughout 50 years, that will have another anniversary next April 16th.

In all those wars, like that of Vietnam which cost millions of lives, the most cynical justifications and measures prevailed.

For anyone harbouring any doubts, about the inevitable military intervention that shall occur in Libya, the AP news agency, which I consider to be well-informed, headlined a cable printed today which stated: “The NATO countries are drawing up a contingency plan taking as its model the flight exclusion zones established over the Balkans in the 1990s, in the event that the international community decides to impose an air embargo over Libya, diplomats said”.

Further on it concludes: “Officials, who were not able to give their names due to the delicate nature of the matter, indicated that the opinions being observed start with the flight exclusion zone that the

western military alliance imposed over Bosnia in 1993 that had the mandate of the Security Council, and with the NATO bombing in Kosovo in 1999, THAT DID NOT HAVE IT”.

To be continued tomorrow.

Fidel Castro Ruz
March 2, 2011
8:19 p.m.



NATO's Inevitable War – Part II

When at just 27 years old Gaddafi, colonel in the Libyan army, inspired by his Egyptian colleague Abdel Nasser, overthrew King Idris I in 1969, he applied important revolutionary measures such as agrarian reform and the nationalization of oil. The growing incomes were dedicated to economic and social development, particularly education and health services for the reduced Libyan population living in the immense desert territory with very little available farm land.

Beneath that desert was an immense deep ocean of fossil waters. I had the impression, when I learned about an experimental farming area, that this would be more beneficial in the future than oil.

Religion, preached with the fervour that characterizes the Muslim peoples, was helping in part to balance the strong tribal tendency that still survives in that Arab country.

The Libyan revolutionaries drew up and applied their own ideas in regards to the legal and political institutions which Cuba, as a norm, respected.

We refrained completely from giving opinions about the conceptions of the Libyan leadership.

We see clearly that the basic concern of the United States and NATO is not Libya, but the revolutionary wave being unleashed in the Arab world, something they would like to prevent at any cost.

It is an irrefutable fact that relations between the US and its NATO allies with Libya in recent years were excellent, before the rebellions loomed up in Egypt and Tunisia.

At senior level meetings between Libya and the NATO leaders, nobody had any problems with Gaddafi. The country was a sure supply source of top-quality oil, gas and even potassium. The problems arising between them during the first decades had been overcome.

Strategic sectors such as oil production and distribution opened their doors to foreign investment.

Privatization reached many public corporations. The World Monetary Fund exercised its beatific role in the orchestration of these operations.

As logic would have it, Aznar piled lavish praise on Gaddafi and on the heels of Blair, Berlusconi, Sarkozy, Zapatero and even my friend the King of Spain, they paraded under the mocking gaze of the Libyan leader. They were happy.

Although it may appear that I am being facetious, that's not the case; I merely wonder why they now want to invade Libya and haul Gaddafi up in front of the International Criminal Court in The Hague.

They are accusing him, 24 hours a day, of shooting against unarmed demonstrating citizens. Why don't they explain to the world that the weapons, and especially all the sophisticated repressive equipment Libya possesses, were provided by the United States, Great Britain and the other illustrious hosts of Gaddafi?

I am against the cynicism and the lies that they are now using in an attempt to justify the invasion and occupation of Libya.

The last time I visited Gaddafi was in May of 2001, 15 years after Reagan attacked his rather modest residence where he took me to show me how it had been left. It received a direct air hit and was considerably destroyed; his little three-year-old daughter died in the attack: she was murdered by Ronald Reagan. There was no prior agreement by NATO, the Human Rights Council, not even the Security Council.

My earlier visit had taken place in 1977, eight years after the start of the Libyan revolutionary process. I visited Tripoli; I participated in the Libyan Peoples' Congress in Sebha; I toured the first experimental farms using the waters extracted from the immense sea of fossil water; I saw Benghazi and I received a warm reception. This was a legendary country that had been the stage for historic battles in the last world war. At the time the population barely reached six million, nor were they aware of the enormous volume of light oil and fossil water. By then the former Portuguese African colonies had been liberated.

In Angola, we had fought for 15 years against the mercenary gangs organized by the United States on tribal bases, the Mobutu government, and the well-armed and trained racist apartheid army. That army, following instructions of the United States, as we know today, invaded Angola to prevent its independence in 1975, reaching the outskirts of Luanda with their motorized troops. Several Cuban instructors died in that brutal invasion. With the utmost urgency we sent resources.

Ejected from the country by internationalist Cuban troops and the Angolans, right up to the border with Namibia that was occupied by South Africa, for 13 years the racists received the mission of liquidating the revolutionary process in Angola.

With the backing of the United States and Israel they developed nuclear weapons. They already had that weapon when Cuban and Angolan troops defeated their land and air forces in Cuito Cuanavale and, confronting the risks, using conventional tactics and weapons, advanced to the Namibian border where the apartheid troops wanted to put up resistance. Twice in their history our troops have been under the risk of being attacked by these kinds of weapons: in October 1962 and in southern Angola, but on that second occasion, not even using the weapons that South Africa possessed would they have been able to prevent the defeat that marked the end of the odious system. The events occurred under the Ronald Reagan government in the United States and that of Pieter Botha in South Africa.

No one speaks about that, and about the hundreds of thousands of lives that were the toll of the imperialist exploit.

I regret having to remember these facts when another great risk hovers over the Arab peoples, because they do not resign themselves to continue being the victims of pillage and oppression.

The revolution in the Arab world, so feared by the US and NATO, is the revolution of those who lack all their rights in the face of those who wield all the privileges, thus called the most profound revolution since the one which burst on Europe in 1789 with the storming of the Bastille.

Not even Louis XIV, when he proclaimed that he was the State, had the privileges that King Abdul of Saudi Arabia possesses, and much less than the immense wealth that lies beneath the surface of this practically desert-covered country where Yankee transnationals determine extraction and thus, the price of oil in the world.

Starting with the crisis in Libya, extractions in Saudi Arabia reached a million barrels a day, at a minimal cost and, as a result, for just this reason, the incomes of that country and those controlling it are reaching a billion dollars a day.

Nobody imagines, of course, that the Saudi people are swimming in money. It is heartrending to read about the living conditions of many of the construction workers and those in other sectors, who are forced to work 13 and 14 hour days for miserable salaries.

Alarmed by the revolutionary wave that is shaking the prevailing system of plunder, after what has happened in Egypt and Tunisia with the workers, but also because of the unemployed youth in Jordan, the occupied territories in Palestine, Yemen and even Bahrain and the Arab Emirates with their higher incomes, the Saudi upper hierarchy is under the impact of these events.

Unlike other times, today the Arab peoples receive almost instant information about what is happening, even if it is being extraordinarily manipulated.

The worst thing for the status quo of the privileged sectors is that the stubborn events are coinciding with a considerable increase in the price of foods and the devastating effect of climate change, while the US, the biggest producer of corn in the world, uses up 40 percent of that subsidized product and a large part of soy to produce biofuel to feed automobiles. Surely Lester Brown, the American ecologist who is the best-informed on agricultural products, can give us an idea about the current food situation.

Bolivarian President Hugo Chávez is making a brave attempt to seek a solution without NATO intervention in Libya. His possibilities of reaching his objective would be increased if he would attain the feat of creating a broad movement of opinion before and not after the intervention happens, and the peoples don't see a repetition in other countries of the atrocious Iraqi experience.

End of the Reflection.

Fidel Castro Ruz
March 3, 2011
10:32 p.m.



NATO, War, Lies and Business

As some may be aware, in September of 1969, Muammar al-Gaddafi, an Arab Bedouin soldier of a peculiar character and inspired by the ideas of the Egyptian leader Gamal Abdel Nasser, promoted in the heart of the armed forces a movement overthrowing King Idris I of Libya, a country almost completely covered by desert and having very little population, located in northern Africa between Tunisia and Egypt.

Libya's important valuable energy resources were progressively being discovered.

Born to a tribal Bedouin family of nomadic desert shepherds in the region of Tripoli, Gaddafi was profoundly anti-colonialist. It is affirmed that his paternal grandfather died fighting against the Italian invaders when Libya was invaded by them in 1911. The colonial regime and fascism changed everyone's lives. It is also said that his father was imprisoned rather than make his living as an industrial worker.

Even Gaddafi's adversaries assure us that he stood out for his intelligence as a student; he was expelled from high-school for his anti-monarchic activities. He managed to enrol in another high-school and later graduated in law at the University of Benghazi at the age of 21. Then he enrolled in

the Benghazi Military College where he created what was called the Secret Unionist Movement of Free Officers, concluding his education later on in a British military academy.

This background explains the notable influence he wielded afterwards in Libya and on other political leaders, whether today they are pro-Gaddafi or not.

He had begun his political life with events that were without question, revolutionary.

In March of 1970, after massive nationalist demonstrations, he managed to have British soldiers evacuated from the country and in June, the United States vacated the great air base near Tripoli, handing it over to military instructors from Egypt, a Libyan ally.

In 1970, several western oil companies and banking companies having the participation of foreign capital were affected by the Revolution. At the end of 1971, the famous British Petroleum had the same fate. In the agricultural sector, all Italian properties were confiscated, and the colonists and their descendents were expelled from Libya.

State intervention was directed to the control of the great companies. Production in that country came to enjoy one of the highest levels in the Arab world. Gambling and the drinking of alcohol were prohibited. The traditionally limited legal status of women was improved.

The Libyan leader got involved in extremist theories that were opposed both to communism and capitalism. It was a stage when Gaddafi dedicated himself to theorizing, something that doesn't have any place in this analysis, other than to point out that the first article of the Constitutional Proclamation of 1969 established the "Socialist" nature of the Great Socialist People's Libya Arab Jamahiriya.

What I wish to emphasize is that the United States and its allies were never interested in human rights.

The hornet's nest taking place in the Security Council, at the meeting of the Human Rights Council at the Geneva headquarters and in the UN General Assembly in New York was pure theatre.

I completely understand the reactions of the political leaders involved in so many contradictions and sterile debate, given the tangled web of interests and problems they must look after.

We all know very well that the character of permanent member, the power of veto, the possession of nuclear weapons and quite a few institutions are sources of privileges and interests imposed by force onto humankind. One can agree or not with many of them, but one can never accept them as fair or ethical measures.

The empire now wants to see events revolve around what Gaddafi may or may not have done, because it needs to intervene militarily in Libya and strike a blow at the revolutionary wave unleashed in the Arab world. Up to now, not one word was said; they kept their mouths shut and carried on with business.

With the latent Libyan rebellion being promoted by Yankee intelligence, or by Gaddafi's own errors, it is important that the people don't let themselves be deceived, since very soon world opinion shall have enough elements to know what to expect.

In my opinion, and that's what I said from the very first instant, we must denounce NATO's war-mongering plans.

Like many Third World countries, Libya is a member of NAM, the Group of 77 and other international organizations, through which relations are established separately from its economic and social system.

As an outline: the Revolution in Cuba, inspired by Marxist-Leninist principles and those of Marti, had triumphed in 1959, 90 miles away from the United States which imposed on us the Platt Amendment and owned the economy of our country.

Almost immediately, the empire promoted the dirty war against our people, counter-revolutionary gangs, the criminal economic blockade, the mercenary invasion of the Bay of Pigs, watched over by an aircraft carrier and their Marines ready to land if the mercenaries were to gain determinate objectives.

Just a year and a half later, they threatened us with their nuclear arsenal. A nuclear war was on the point of breaking out.

All the Latin American countries, with the exception of Mexico, took part in the criminal blockade which is still in place today, with our country never surrendering. It is important to be reminded of this, for those lacking historical memory.

In January of 1986, using the idea that Libya was behind the so-called revolutionary terrorism, Reagan ordered economic and commercial relations with that country to be broken.

In March, a force of aircraft carriers in the Gulf of Sidra, inside what is considered to be Libyan national waters, launched attacks that caused the destruction of several naval units armed with missile launchers and coastal radar systems that that country had acquired in the USSR.

On April 5th, a Berlin disco that US soldiers went to was the victim of plastic explosives; three persons died, two of them American soldiers, and many were wounded.

Reagan accused Gaddafi and ordered the Air Force to retaliate. Three squadrons took off from the Sixth Fleet aircraft carriers and bases in the United Kingdom, attacking seven military targets in Tripoli and Benghazi with missiles and bombs. Around 40 people died, 15 of them civilians. Warned of the bombers' advance, Gaddafi assembled his family and was abandoning his residence located at the Bab Al Aziziya military complex to the south of the capital. The evacuation was in progress when a missile made a direct hit on his residence; his daughter Hanna died and two other children were wounded. The occurrence was broadly condemned: the UN General Assembly passed a resolution condemning violation of the UN Charter and International law. So did NAM, the Arab League and the OAU, in energetic terms.

On December 21, 1988, a Pan Am Boeing 747 flying from London to New York disintegrated in mid-air after a bomb exploded; the remains of the plane fell over Lockerbie and the tragedy tolled 270 lives, of 21 nationalities.

At first the US government suspected Iran acting in retaliation for the death of 200 persons in the downing of an airbus from its state airline. According to the Yankees, investigations implicated two Libyan intelligence agents. Similar imputations against Libya were made for a French airliner on the Brazzaville-N'Djamena-Paris route, implicating Libyan officials that Gaddafi refused to extradite, for facts he categorically denied.

A sinister legend was fabricated against him with the participation of Reagan and Bush Sr.

From 1975 up to the final stage of the Reagan government, Cuba had devoted itself to its internationalist duties in Angola and other African countries. We were aware of the conflicts developing in Libya, or around it, because of reading material or eye-witness accounts written by people who were closely connected to that country and the Arab world, as well as because of the impressions we had about various personalities from different countries with whom we had been in touch during those years.

Many well-known African leaders with whom Gaddafi had close ties tried to seek solutions for the tense relations between Libya and the United Kingdom.

The Security Council had imposed sanctions on Libya that were starting to be overcome when Gaddafi accepted to put the two people accused for the plane downed over Scotland on trial, with certain conditions.

Libyan delegations began to be invited to inter-European meetings. In July of 1999, London initiated the re-establishing of full diplomatic relations with Libya, after some additional concessions.

In September of that year, the European Union ministers accepted withdrawing the restrictive measures on commerce that had been taken in 1992.

On December 2nd, Prime Minister Massimo D'Alema of Italy made the first visit of a European head of government to Libya.

With the USSR and the European Socialist bloc gone, Gaddafi decided to accept the demands of the United States and NATO.

When I visited Libya in May of 2001, he showed me the ruins caused by the traitorous attack with which Reagan had killed his daughter and had been on the point of exterminating his entire family.

At the beginning of 2002, the State Department informed that diplomatic talks were going on between the US and Libya.

In May, Libya had been included again on the list of states sponsoring terrorism even though, in January, President George W. Bush had not mentioned the African country in his famous speech on the members of the "axis of evil".

As 2003 began, because of the economic agreement on the compensations reached between Libya and the suing countries, the United Kingdom and France, the UN Security Council lifted the 1992 sanctions against Libya.

Before 2003 drew to a close, Bush and Tony Blair informed about an agreement with Libya, a country that had handed over to United Kingdom and Washington intelligence experts documentation on the non-conventional weapons programs such as ballistic missiles with a range of more than 300 kilometres. Officials from both countries had already visited various installations. It was the result of many months of talks between Tripoli and Washington as Bush himself revealed.

Gaddafi fulfilled his promises of disarmament. In a few months Libya handed over five units of Scud-C missiles with a range of 800 kilometres and the hundreds of Scud-Bs whose range surpassed the 300 kilometres for short-range defensive missiles.

From October of 2002, the marathon of visits to Tripoli began: Berlusconi in October of 2002; José María Aznar in September of 2003; Berlusconi again in February, August and October of 2004; Blair in March of 2004; Germany's Schröder in October of that year; Jacques Chirac in November of 2004. Everybody was happy. Mr. Money is a powerful gentleman.

Gaddafi triumphantly toured Europe. He was received in Brussels in April of 2004 by Romano Prodi, president of the European Commission; in August of that year the Libyan leader invited Bush to visit his country; Exxon Mobil, Chevron Texaco and Conoco Philips finalized the re-establishing of extracting crude by means of joint ventures.

In May of 2006, the United States announced the withdrawal of Libya from the list of terrorist countries and the establishment of full diplomatic relations.

In 2006 and 2007, France and the US signed agreements for nuclear cooperation for peaceful purposes; in May of 2007, Blair once again visited Gaddafi at Sidra. BP signed an "enormously important" agreement according to statements, in order to explore for gas fields.

In December of 2007, Gaddafi made two visits to France and signed contracts for military and civilian equipment for the total of 10 billion Euros; and a visit to Spain where he met with President José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero. Million-dollar contracts were signed with important NATO countries.

What is it that has now caused the precipitated withdrawal from the embassies of the United States and the other NATO members?

It's all extremely odd.

George W. Bush, father of the stupid anti-terrorism war, stated on September 20 of 2001 to the West point cadets that:

Our security will require [...] transforming the military you will lead, a military that must be ready to strike at a moment of notice in any dark corner of the world. And our security will require all Americans to be forward-looking and resolute, to be ready for preemptive action when necessary to defend our liberty and [...] our lives.

We must uncover terror cells in 60 or more countries[...] Along with our friends and allies, we must oppose proliferation and confront regimes that sponsor terror, as each case requires.

What will Obama think about that speech?

What sanctions will the Security Council impose on those who killed more than a million civilians in Iraq and on those who every day are killing men, women and children in Afghanistan, where in recent days the enflamed population thronged into the streets to protest the massacre of innocent children?

An AFP dispatch from Kabul, dated today on March 9th, reveals that: "Last year was the most deadly for civilians in nine years of war between the Taliban and international forces in Afghanistan, with almost 2,800 dead, 15% more than in 2009, a UN report indicated on Wednesday, underlining the human cost of the conflict for the population."

"...the Taliban insurrection intensified and gained ground these last few years, with guerrilla actions further from its traditions bastions to the south and east."

"With exactly 2,777 the number of civilian deaths in 2010 increased 15% as compared to 2009, indicates the annual joint report by the UN Assistance Mission in Afghanistan..."

"President Barack Obama stated on the 3rd of March his "profound condolences" to the Afghan people for the nine dead children; US General David Petraeus, commander in chief of the ISAF and Secretary of the Defence Robert Gates made similar statements."

"...the UNAMA report emphasizes that the number of civilian dead in 2010 is four times greater than the number of international forces soldiers killed in combat in that same year.

"The year 2010 has been by far the most deadly year for foreign soldiers in nine years of war, with 711 dead, confirming that the Taliban guerrilla has intensified despite the sending of 30,000 US reinforcements last year."

For 10 days, in Geneva and in the UN more than 150 speeches were made about violations on human rights that were repeated millions of times by TV, radio, Internet and the printed press.

Cuban Minister of Foreign Affairs Bruno Rodríguez, in his speech on March 1st before the Foreign Ministers meeting in Geneva, stated:

“Human conscience rejects the deaths of innocent people in any circumstance and in any place. Cuba fully shares world concern for the losses in civilian lives in Libya and wishes that their people attain a peaceful and sovereign solution to the civil war happening over there, without any foreign interference, and ensuring the integrity of that nation.”

Some of the final paragraphs of his speech were noteworthy:

“If essential human rights are a right of life, is the Council ready to suspend the membership of states that unleash war?”

“Will it suspend states that finance and supply military aid used by the receiving state in massive, flagrant and systematic violations on human rights and in attacks on civilian populations, such as what is happening in Palestine?”

“Will it apply that measure against powerful countries that carry out extra-judicial executions on the territory of other states, using high technology such as smart bombs and unmanned planes?”

“What would happen with states that accept on their territory illegal secret prisons, facilitate secret flights carrying kidnapped persons or participate in acts of torture?”

We fully share the courageous position of the Bolivarian leader Hugo Chávez and ALBA.

We are against the internal war in Libya, in favour of immediate peace and full respect for life and the rights of all citizens, with no foreign intervention that would only serve to prolong the conflict and NATO interests.

Fidel Castro Ruz
March 9, 2011
9:35 p.m.



Two Earthquakes

A strong 8.9 on the scale earthquake shook Japan today. The most worrying is that early news reports were talking about thousands dead and missing, figures really unheard of in a developed country where all constructions are quake-proof. They were even talking about a nuclear reactor that was out of control. Hours later, it was informed that four nuclear plants close to the most affected area were under control. There was also information about a tsunami 10 metres high that had the entire Pacific area on tidal wave alert.

The earthquake originated at a depth of 24.4 kilometres and 100 kilometres from the coast. Had it happened at a lesser depth and distance, the consequences would have been more serious.

There was a shift in the earth's axis. It was the third phenomenon of great intensity occurring in less than two years: Haiti, Chile and Japan. Man cannot be blamed for such tragedies. Every country, surely, will do everything it can to help the hard-working people who were the first to suffer an unnecessary and inhuman nuclear attack.

According to Spain's Official College of Geologists, the energy released by the earthquake is equivalent to 200 million tons of dynamite.

The most recent information, from AFP, states that the Japanese electric Company, Tokyo Electric Power, informed that according to government instructions, they had released some of the vapour containing radioactive substances...

“We are following the situation. Until the present there is no problem...”

“They also indicated that there were breakdowns related to the cooling of three reactors in a second nearby plant, Fukushima 2.

“The government ordered the evacuation of surrounding areas for a radius of 10 km in the case of the first plant and 3 km in the case of the second one.”

Another earthquake, a political one and potentially more serious, is the one taking place around Libya, and it affects every country, one way or the other.

The drama that country is living through is in full swing and its outcome is still uncertain.

A great hubbub broke out yesterday in the US Senate when James Clapper, Director of National Intelligence, stated before the Armed Services Committee that he didn't believe Gaddafi had any intention of leaving; because of evidence at their disposal, it seems that he is “in this for the long haul”.

He added that Gaddafi has two brigades that “are very loyal”.

He pointed out that the air attacks carried out by the army loyal to Gaddafi “mainly” caused damages on buildings and infrastructure rather than civilian casualties.

Lt. Gen. Ronald Burgess, Director of the Defence Intelligence Agency, at the same hearing before the Senate, said that it seemed Gaddafi had staying power unless some other dynamic changes at this time.

“The opportunity the rebels had at the start of the popular uprising has ‘begun to change’, he assured.

I have no doubt whatsoever that Gaddafi and the Libyan leaders committed an error in trusting Bush and NATO, as it can be inferred from what I wrote in my Reflection on the 9th.

Nor do I doubt the intentions of the United States and NATO to intervene militarily in Libya and abort the revolutionary wave shaking the Arab world.

Countries that are opposing NATO intervention and defending the idea of a political solution without foreign intervention harbour the conviction that the Libyan patriots shall defend their Homeland until their dying breath.

Fidel Castro Ruz
March 11, 2011
10:12 p.m.



The Disasters Threatening the World

If the speed of light would not exist; if the star closest to our sun would not be four light years from the Earth, the only inhabited planet in our system; if ETs really existed; the imaginary visitors to the planet would continue their voyage without understanding all that our humankind is suffering.

Just a few centuries ago in the millennial history of Man, nobody knew what was happening on the other side of the globe. Today, we can find out what's happening right away and sometimes they are hugely transcendental events that affect all the peoples of the world.

Without more preamble, I shall limit myself to the most important news during the last two days.

“TeleSUR, March 13, 2011

“Volcano eruption in Japan triggers new alarm

“The Japanese Meteorological Agency informs that the volcano Shimoedake, located on the island of Kyushu to the south-east of Japan, spewed ash and stones this Sunday to a height of four thousand metres, after two weeks of relative calm and two days after the devastating earthquake and tsunami that lashed the country.”

“...it became active last January for the first time in 52 years...”

“According to a BBC report, buildings in a radius of 4 kilometres were damaged and hundreds of persons fled from the vicinity, panic-stricken.”

“The [...] seismic movement with a magnitude of 9.0 on the Richter Scale, according to the Meteorological Agency of Japan, has already had repercussions on other volcanoes...”

“Japan crushed by the quake, tsunami and explosions at nuclear plants

“SENDAI, Japan, Mar. 14, 2011 (AFP) – A double explosion on Monday in Reactor No. 3 at the Fukushima 1 nuclear plant fed the rumour of an atomic disaster in Japan, a country already overwhelmed by a quake and a tsunami that may have left more than 10,000 dead.

“Tokyo Electric Power (TEPCO), operator of Fukushima 1 (250 km to the north-east of Tokyo), also admitted the possibility that the fuel of Reactor 2 had entered into fusion because of damage to the cooling circuit. The government, for its part, minimized the possibility that an important explosion should be produced in that reactor.

“Rescue teams found approximately 2,000 corpses on the coast of Miyagi Prefecture (north-east), while millions of Japanese were attempting to survive without water, electricity, fuel or sufficient food and hundreds of thousands were forced to take shelter at emergency centres because of the tsunami that destroyed their homes.”

Aid workers from around the world arrived in the archipelago to collaborate with more than 100,000 soldiers that are trying to give aid in a country that continues to be shaken by earthquake after-shocks and lives in permanent fear of false alarms about new tsunamis.”

“Fear of a nuclear disaster was being added to the agony caused by the devastation. The quake, the tsunami and the explosions at the plants place the country into its “most serious crisis (...) since the end of WW II”, stated Prime Minister Naoto Kan.”

“An explosion had occurred on Saturday in Reactor No. 1, taking the life of one technician and injuring eleven.

“Fusion is produced on account of the reheating of the bars of fuel that start to melt just like candles.”

“Authorities declared a state of emergency at a second nuclear plant, the Onagawa Plant in the north-east...”

“Another nuclear plant, Tokai, suffered damages to its cooling system...”

“An 8.9-magnitude earthquake, and the following tsunami with a height of 10 metres, ripped through the north-eastern coast of the Japanese archipelago on Friday.”

“More than 10,000 persons may have lost their lives in the coastal prefecture of Miyagi (north-eastern Japan)...”

“At least 5.6 million homes are still without electrical power...”

“DATA- What’s happening in the Japanese nuclear reactors?”

“March 14 (Reuters) – A second explosion shook the Japanese nuclear plant damaged by an earthquake, where authorities are working desperately to prevent nuclear fusion in the reactors.”

“The nucleus of a reactor consists of a series of tubes or metal zircon bars that contain pellets of uranium fuel stored in what the engineers call the fuel equipment.”

“Back-up refrigeration had problems several times during the last three days in Reactors 1, 2 and 3 at the Fukushima plant.”

“However, natural degradation of radioactive materials in the reactor’s nucleus continues to produce heat, called residual heat, falling to a quarter of its original level during the first hour and then disappearing more slowly.”

“Usually that heat is eliminated by refrigeration pumps that, in the Fukushima Plant, lost its emergency energy supply due to the earthquake, tsunami or both.”

“It was that hydrogen gas that caused the two explosions in the Fukushima Plant, in Unit 1 on Saturday and in Reactor 3 on Monday, according to experts and officials.”

“If a steel dome should break inside a reactor, the radiation levels will rise. But at this point now the heat is not enough to destroy them, experts say.”

“The risk is still there that the nucleus could melt and that could make removal of the fuel really difficult, or even impossible; that’s what happened on Three Mile Island in Pennsylvania in 1979.”

“EFE March 14th

“US moves its vessels further from the Japanese coast after detecting radioactivity in 17 soldiers”

“The Pentagon informed today that 17 soldiers who are participating in assistance work in Japan registered “low levels” of radioactivity and it ordered its Seventh Fleet vessels based in the Japanese city of Yokosuka to be temporarily repositioned.”

“The USS Ronald Reagan aircraft carrier was 160 kilometres to the north-east of the plant at the time of the escape after the tsunami following the quake with a magnitude of nine points on the Richter Scale that shook Japan.”

“Fighting to cool down Fukushima Reactors 2 and 3 and number of dead grows”

“International News, Mar 14 (EFE).- Those in charge of Reactor 2 at the Fukushima Plant in Japan are trying to cool it down, after it may have suffered partial fusion as a result of over-heating; they are also cooling down Reactor 3 where there was an explosion that did not cause any radioactivity to escape.”

“While authorities struggle to control the nuclear risk, the number of dead increases as a result of the earthquake that has caused the worst tragedy in Japan since WW II.”

“The tremor could be felt powerfully in Tokyo, the largest city in the world with more than 30 million inhabitants, where the mood is one of sadness and citizens are using alternate transportation such as bicycles in the face of fuel shortages.”

“The country’s Meteorological Agency has warned the Japanese about a week of after-shocks and of a 70 percent possibility of a 7-point earthquake in Japan by this Wednesday.”

“Germany cancels plans for nuclear extension for three months”

“Berlin, Mar 14 (dpa)”

“The accident recorded this weekend at the Japanese Fukushima Plant as a result of the earthquake and later tsunami that devastated the Asian country on Friday ‘has completely changed the global situation’, Merkel stated.”

“‘Accidents in Japan show that what we thought impossible is possible and the risks we thought were improbable are not so improbable’, she went on to specify...”

“AFP. Yemen: Three demonstrators dead, among them a 12-year-old boy”

03/12/11

“SANAH (AFP) – Three demonstrators died, among them a 12-year-old boy and hundreds were injured on Saturday in Yemen where the protesters accused the police of having used toxic gases to disperse them.”

“A demonstrator died and approximately 300 were injured or intoxicated by the gases...”

“According to the UN, 37 demonstrators and at least six police died since the unrest began in Yemen.”

“ABU DHABI, March 14 (Reuters)”

“The price increase for crude and the recent and sudden reduction of the existence of cereals in the world could indicate a supply crisis, FAO Director Jacques Diouf told Reuters...”

“‘The high prices are worrying and we have a huge decrease in their existence’...”

“LONDON (AP) — British-based defense contractor BAE Systems PLC bribed Saudi officials in return for lucrative arms deals in Saudi Arabia, according to a newly released secret U.S. diplomatic cable.”

“...BAE, Europe's largest defense contractor, paid more than 70 million pounds (\$113 million) to a Saudi prince.”

“EFE. Ashton does not dismiss the possibility of imposing a no-fly zone over Libya

“In Cairo today, Catherine Ashton, in charge of EU Foreign Policy, does not dismiss the possibility of imposing a no-fly zone over Libya after meeting with Arab League Secretary General Amro Musa.”

“TRIPOLI, 14 (ANSA) – The forces of Muammar Kadafi today attacked Ajdabiya, in eastern Libya, and Zuwarah in the north-east, while the opposition National Council assured it would recover positions and said that it has international commitment to establish a no-fly zone.”

“The Council assured today that it obtained the commitment of the United States, Great Britain and France to set up a no-fly zone.”

“General Abd al Fattah Yunis, member of the rebel military council, assured that they would recover positions on the coast and in the country’s Eastern region...”

“We shall recover those cities and you will soon hear that our army advances towards Sidra and Tripoli’.”

“100 THOUSAND VOLUNTEERS HAVE JOINED GADDAFI FORCES

“TRIPOLI, 14 (ANSA) – Some 100 thousand volunteers have joined Libyan armed forces since the start of combat between troops backing Muammar Gaddafi and the rebel groups, government sources stated today.”

“Bahrain: opposition denounces “occupation” after the arrival of Saudi soldiers

“MANAMA, March 14, 2011 (AFP)”

“The people of Bahrain is facing a real danger: that of a war against the citizens of Bahrain with no declaration of war’, seven opposition members emphasized, including Wefaq chiita, in a report.

“We consider the entry of any soldier, any military vehicle, into the land, air or sea space of the Kingdom of Bahrain to be a flagrant occupation of the unarmed people of Bahrain and a violation of international treaties and agreements’, the opposition added.”

“MORE PROTESTS YEMEN, BAHRAIN AND MOROCCO

“MANAMA and ADEN, 13 (ANSA) – Protest demonstrations continue today in Yemen, where three people died, and in Bahrain and Morocco, against the governments of those countries, local sources informed today.”

“...in Saudi Arabia, dozens of persons met today in the vicinity of the Ministry of the Interior headquarters in Riyadh to demand the liberation of a group of activists being held by police.”

“MANAMA, Bahrain (AP) — Tens of thousands of Bahraini protesters encircled one of the royal family's palaces Saturday, shouting calls for political freedom and the king's ouster a day after a similar march triggered a violent response from security forces.”

“Protests in Bahrain modeled on the uprisings in Egypt and Tunisia.”

“Bahrain holds particular importance to Washington as the host of the U.S. Navy's 5th Fleet...”

“United Arab Emirates to send troops to Bahrain

“DUBAI, March 14 2011 (AFP) – The United Arab Emirates announced on Monday they are going to send troops to Bahrain to contribute to “preserve order and stability” in that neighbouring country where the Saudis have already arrived with the same military purpose.”

“MANAMA, March 14 2011 (AFP) – The opposition in Bahrain stated on Monday that ‘any foreign military presence’ shall be considered to be ‘an occupation’, in their reaction to the arrival of Saudi troops in the Kingdom.”

“More than a thousand Saudi soldiers, part of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) common forces, arrived in Bahrain, swept by a wave of demonstrations, according to statements to AFP by a Saudi in charge.”

“MEXICO (AFP) – The so-called US ‘Operation Fast and Furious’ that presumably allowed the deliberate entry into Mexico of almost 2,000 weapons, placed relations between the two countries into a delicate position, according to experts, and caused the unanimous irritation of Mexican legislators.”

“‘If the US acted without including any Mexican authority, we are dealing with totally unacceptable interference and a clear show of non-confidence’ by Washington in the Mexican police, former Ambassador to the US Jorge Montaño commented to AFP.”

“Mexico is facing unprecedented spiralling violence that has left almost 35,000 dead since December of 2006 in confrontations between drug traffickers and anti-drug police, as well as around a hundred victims caught in the cross-fire.”

“The Mexican senate described ‘Fast and Furious’ as an ‘aggressive and unilateral’ operation and an ‘insult to the sovereignty’ of Mexico.”

“IPS March 14 15:04”

“Tonight we were informed that Reactor No. 2 at the Fukushima 1 Plant was melting after emergency cooling systems failed, and this aggravated fears of radioactive contamination. On Saturday and this Monday there were explosions in Reactors 1 and 3.”

“Reactor No. 2 is functioning with a fuel known as Oxide Mix (MOX fuel) that contains plutonium, a particularly harmful substance for health.”

“ROME, 14 (ANSA) – There is a total of 442 active nuclear reactors in the world, concentrated in 29 countries and constructed by no more than ten companies.

“Europe, [...] where governments today began to review their policy in the sector, has 148 active reactors in 16 countries.

“To those [...] already active, we can add 65 that are under construction...”

“The world record for the number of functioning nuclear reactors is held by the United States with 104, followed by France with 58, Japan with 54...”

Last minute news just heard in Cuba informs that there was a third explosion at Fukushima:

“EFE March 15 20:13

“There is fear of radioactive leaks due to the nuclear fusion of a reactor at Fukushima

“Tokyo, March 15 (EFE).- The company operating the Fukushima Nuclear Plant (north-eastern Japan) today acknowledged that it fears radioactive leaks due to a possible fusion in the nucleus of Reactor No. 2 which this morning suffered an explosion.

“Tokyo Electric Power (TEPCO) admitted that radiation may have been released after the structure enclosing Reactor No. 2 was damaged while radioactive levels in the area registered 8.217 microsieverts per hour, as opposed to the allowed 500.”

We can observe the complex situation prevailing in the Arab world where a revolutionary wave has been unleashed by its peoples.

The Saudi King supports the NATO war in Libya; while in Bahrain, NATO supports the Saudi invasion. The blood of the Arab peoples will be spilt to benefit the great trans-nationals of the United States while oil prices reach unpredictable heights as wars are unleashed in the areas producing the most oil and nuclear disasters in Japan multiply the resistance of peoples to the proliferation of nuclear plants.

Wastage and the capitalist consumer societies in their neo-liberal and imperialist phase are taking the world into a blind alley, where climatic change and the growing cost of foods lead billions of people towards more acute poverty levels.

Fidel Castro Ruz
March 14, 2011
9:35 p.m.



Good Conduct Certificate

In these bitter days we have seen pictures of an earthquake that reached 9 on the Richter Scale with hundreds of strong after-shocks, and a tsunami 10 metres high whose waves of dark waters dragged tens of thousands of people between cars and trucks over homes and 3 and 4 storey buildings.

Sophisticated mass media has been saturating our minds with the news of civil wars, arms trade associated with drugs that in just five years have killed more than 35,000 people in Mexico, climatic changes in various countries, asphyxiating heat waves, mountains of ice melting at the poles, torrential rains, shortages and growing prices for foods. We really need some consolation and this has just reached us via that life-saving angel of our species, the United Nations Security Council and its colossal invention: good conduct certificates.

Of course we already know, through the Europa Press Agency, that the number of persons who died as a result of the earthquake and the tsunami were 6,539, and 10,259 were missing, “according to the latest toll”.

Although we still do not know “the exact whereabouts of thousands of people”, the governor of a prefecture has suggested that the survivors ought to move to another part of Japan.

“Damaged airports, ports and highways are being gradually repaired”, a Japanese news agency states.

The British agency Reuters was less optimistic when it stated that “a ‘Chernobyl solution’ could be the last resort” but authorities say that “it is still too soon to talk about long-range measures and that first we have to try to cool the plant’s six reactors and the fuel-storage pools.”

Professor Murray Jennex at San Diego State University in California said: “They (reactors) are kind of like a coffee maker. If you leave it on the heat, they boil dry and then they crack, ...”

“Putting concrete on that wouldn’t help keep your coffee maker safe. But eventually, yes, you could build a concrete shield and be done with it.”

Another dispatch from the European agency stated:

“We launched a ‘race against the clock’ to cool down the reactors, declared General Director of the International Atomic Energy Agency Yukiya Amano.”

“‘We are dealing with a very serious accident’, said Amano after meeting with Japanese Prime Minister Naoto Kan, in reference to the Fukushima nuclear plant.”

Without a doubt, the world had been jolted by the unexpected accident in Japan, that moved even the foundations of the planet’s energy development; 442 nuclear plants were functioning, great need for

repairs; the Chernobyl accident in 1986 had paralyzed construction programmes of new facilities which were about to resume and be extended.

Wouldn't our concerns over NATO's war actions in northern Africa to occupy the rich Libyan fields of light oil and ensure the enormous energy resources in the Middle East after the revolutionary eruption in Arab nations be exaggerated?

Serious threats of a new economic crisis were upsetting economists.

Bad news on the political front keeps on coming.

AFP states that thousands of Shiite demonstrators were shouting anti-government slogans near Manama after Friday prayers, even though Bahraini authorities have prohibited crowds from gathering.

"Repression [...] this week caused at least eight deaths: four demonstrators and four police."

"We are ready to sacrifice our blood and our souls for Bahrain', shouted the demonstrators."

"Bahraini authorities decreed the exclusion state this week [...] within this small kingdom where the US has a base for its Fifth Fleet."

AFP, March 18, 2011

"More than 30 died and around a hundred were injured on Friday after demonstrators were shot at as they demanded the resignation of Yemeni President Ali Abdallah Saleh in Sanah, according to a new toll reported by medical sources."

"Most of those injured were hit by bullets to the head, neck and chest area', a doctor told AFP."

This is a close United States ally that also has the support of Saudi forces.

AP, March 18, 2011

"King Abdullah (of Saudi Arabia) spoke after Muslim prayers on Friday. He thanked residents and security forces for being 'the hands' of national stability."

"Islamabad, March 18, (AFP) – thousands demonstrated on Friday in the streets of several Pakistani cities to protest against the American unmanned plane attack that killed 35 people this week and the liberation of a CIA employee who was being held for murder." He had been set free after two million dollars had been paid to the relatives of the two men he killed in a Lahore street.

Why do we have the Security Council, the veto, the anti-veto, the majority, the minority, abstention, speeches, demagoguery and the solemn declarations of Ban Ki-moon?

Above all, why do we have NATO, its 5.5 million soldiers (according to highly qualified specialists) and its 19,845 tanks, 57,938 armoured vehicles, 6,492 fighter jets, 2,482 helicopters, 19 aircraft carriers, 156 submarines, 303 surface vessels, 5,728 nuclear missiles, tens of thousands of atomic bombs with the destructive power equivalent to hundreds of thousand times the capacity of those dropped over Hiroshima and Nagasaki?

There is more than enough of such stupid power, it wouldn't be used, nor can it be used; we would need dozens of planet such as Earth. Its only purpose is to demonstrate the waste and the chaos generated by capitalism.

We can dedicate our time to other things, less sinister and more ludicrous.

For example, the DPA agency informs us:

“Port-au-Prince, March 18, 2011. The arrival of Jean-Bertrand Aristide in Port-au-Prince this Friday cannot have taken anyone by surprise.”

“January 19: From South Africa, Aristide published an ‘open letter’ where he says he is ‘ready’ to return to Haiti’ at any time to ‘contribute as a simple citizen in the field of education’...”

“January 20: The American State Department is opposed to the return of Aristide before at least the end of the electoral process...”.

The State Department has gotten mixed up even in this: it was the US that gave birth to Papa Doc, and it had overthrown and expelled President Aristide to Africa 7 years ago.

A Notimex dispatch, dated in Panama today, March 18th, informed that WikiLeaks revealed the entry of US warships to Panama:

“The covenant was signed on April 15, 2009 so that military vessels could enter Panamanian waters between May 3rd and the end of Torrijos’ term on June 30th this year, when the president was succeeded by the right-wing Ricardo Martinelli.

““Until now, the Panamanian government has always refused to do this requirement arguing that operations with the United States Army were a sensitive matter for Panamanians’...”

Another interesting tale about the trickery of US foreign policy is told today by AP:

“Chile and the United States signed a nuclear energy treaty on Friday, despite the fears of the spread of radiation in Japan”.

“The fear arises after a devastating earthquake and subsequent tidal wave severely affected the nuclear reactors in a plant on the north-eastern coast of Japan”.

“The treaty was signed on Friday morning by US Ambassador Alejandro Wolff and Chilean Minister of Foreign Affairs Alfredo Moreno.”

“...White House officials were not able to confirm the highly awaited signing which one supposes would be a notable event during the visit to Chile on Monday of President Barack Obama.”

But no matter, appearances can always be life-saving and public opinion can be manipulated by appearances; White House officials emphasized “that the treaty focuses on training nuclear engineers and not on the construction of reactors.”

Since Japanese nuclear technology is basically Yankee, their technicians surely would acquire more experience studying what happened in that beleaguered country whose population was victim of a cruel and unscrupulous predecessor of the current president of the United States.

Who are Obama, NATO and Ban Ki-moon going to fool with good conduct certificates?

Fidel Castro Ruz
March 18, 2011
8:54 p.m.



Partnership of Equals

Saturday evening, the 19th, after a sumptuous banquet, NATO leaders ordered the attack on Libya.

Of course, nothing could occur without the United States claiming its irrefutable role as supreme leader. From its command post of that institution in Europe, a senior official declared that “Odyssey Dawn” was about to begin.

World public opinion was deeply touched by the tragedy in Japan. The number of victims of the earthquake, the tsunami and the nuclear accident has kept on growing. By now there are thousands of dead, missing and radiation contaminated. Resistance to the use of nuclear energy will also grow considerably.

The world is suffering, at the same time, the consequences of climatic changes; shortages and prices of foods, military spending and the squandering of natural and human resources are increasing. War was the timeliest event that could happen at this time.

Obama’s trip through Latin America moved into the background, people were hardly paying any attention to it. In Brazil, the contradictory interests between the United States and this sister nation have become evident.

We cannot forget that Rio de Janeiro competed with Chicago to host the 2016 Olympic Games.

Obama wanted to win over the South American giant. He spoke of the “extraordinary rise of Brazil” that has impressed the international scene and he praised its economy as one of the economies with the fastest growth rate in the world, but he showed not even the least commitment in supporting Brazil as a permanent member of the privileged Security Council.

The Brazilian president did not hesitate in expressing her disagreement with the protectionist measures the US is applying on Brazil with the tariffs and subsidies that have constituted a mighty obstacle for the economy of that country.

Argentine writer Atilio Boron states that “[...] what interests [Obama] most as administrator of the empire is advancing control of Amazonia. The main requisite of this plan is to slow down, since it is something he cannot stop, the growing political and economic coordination and integration that is happening in the region: this had been very important in sinking ALCA in 2005 and frustrating the secessionist conspiracy and coups in Bolivia in 2008 and Ecuador in 2010. He also has to try to sow the seeds of discord between the most radical governments in the region (Cuba, Venezuela, Bolivia and Ecuador) and the “progressive” governments, mainly Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay...”

“For the boldest US strategists, the Amazon river basin, just as the Antarctic, is a free-access area where national sovereignties are not recognized...”

Tomorrow Obama moves over to Chile. His arrival is preceded by an interview he gave to the newspaper El Mercurio that was printed today, on Sunday, in which he confesses that the “Debate in the Americas”, as he calls it, is based on a “partnership of equals” with Latin America that practically leaves us breathless as we recall the Alliance for Progress that preceded the mercenary Bay of Pigs expedition.

Obama literally confesses that the US vision for the hemisphere [...] is based on the concept of a partnership of equals that he has pursued ever since becoming President of the United States.

Obama stated that he shall also focus on specific areas where they can work together, such as economic growth, energy, security and human rights’...

That vision, he emphasized, has the aim of 'improving common security, expanding economic opportunities, ensuring a clean energy future and supporting the democratic values we share'.

...promoting a safe, stable and prosperous Hemisphere where the United States and their partners share responsibilities on key regional and global issues...

As we can see, everything is marvellously beautiful, worthy of being buried just like Reagan's secrets, to be published within 200 years.

The problem is, as informed by the DPA Agency, according to a survey carried out by the newspaper La Tercera, "...in 2006, 43 percent of the Chilean population was rejecting nuclear plants".

"Two years later the rejection rate rose to 52 percent and in 2010 is reached 74 percent." Today, after what happened in Japan it has reached "...86 percent of Chileans..."

We only have to ask Obama one question. Taking into account that one of his illustrious predecessors, Richard Nixon promoted the coup and the heroic death of Salvador Allende, the torture and murder of thousands of persons, would Mr. Obama be asking forgiveness of the Chilean people?

Fidel Castro Ruz
March 20, 2011
8:14 p.m.



My Shoes are too Tight

While the damaged reactors spew radioactive smoke over Japan and monstrous-looking planes and nuclear submarines launch deadly charges tele-directed onto Libya, a North African Third World country with barely six million inhabitants, Barack Obama was spinning a tale for the Chileans that sounded like one I used to hear when I was 4 years old: "My shoes are too tight, my socks are too warm; and I carry in my heart the little kiss you gave me".

Some of his audience was taken aback in that Cultural Centre in Santiago de Chile.

When the president looked anxiously over his audience after mentioning perfidious Cuba, expecting an explosion of applause, there was icy silence. Behind him, oh, yes! felicitous coincidence! among all the other Latin American flags, there precisely was Cuba's.

If he were to turn for a second, over his right shoulder he would have seen, like a shadow, the symbol of the Revolution on the rebel Island that his mighty country wanted to destroy, but could not.

Anybody would be, without a doubt, extraordinarily optimistic if they were expecting the peoples of Our America to applaud the 50th anniversary of the mercenary Bay of Pigs invasion, 50 years of cruel economic blockade of a sister country, 50 years of threats and terrorist attacks that cost thousands of lives, 50 years of plans to assassinate the leaders of the historic process.

I heard myself being mentioned in his words.

In truth, I gave my services to the Revolution for a long time, but I never eluded risks nor violated constitutional, ideological or ethical principles; I regret not having better health so that I could carry on serving the Revolution.

I resigned, without hesitation, all my state and political positions, including that of First Secretary of the Party, when I became ill and I never tried to exercise them after the Proclamation of July 31, 2006, even when I partially recovered my health more than a year later, although everyone continued to affectionately address me in that manner.

But I am and shall continue to be as I promised: a soldier of ideas, as long as I can think or breathe.

When they asked Obama about the coup against heroic President Salvador Allende, promoted as many others by the United States, and about the mysterious death of Eduardo Frei Montalva, murdered by agents of DINA, a creation of the American government, he lost his composure and began to stammer.

The commentary on Chilean television at the end of his speech was, without a doubt, accurate when it stated that Obama had nothing to offer the Hemisphere.

As for me, I don't want to give the impression that I felt any hatred for his person, much less for the people of the United States; I acknowledge the contributions many of its sons and daughters have made to culture and science.

Obama now has before him a trip to El Salvador tomorrow, on Tuesday. There he is going to have to be quite inventive because, in that sister nation in Central America, the weapons and training received from the governments of his country spilt much blood.

I wish him bon voyage and a bit more good sense.

Fidel Castro Ruz
March 21, 2011
9:32 p.m.



The Real Intentions of the "Partnership of Equals"

Yesterday was a long day. I was paying attention to the ups and downs of Obama in Chile since noon, as I had done the day before with his adventures in the city of Rio de Janeiro. That city, in a brilliant challenge, had defeated Chicago in its aspirations to be the home of the 2016 Olympic Games when the new president of the United States and Nobel Peace Prize laureate was looking like a rival of Martin Luther King.

Nobody knew when he would arrive to Santiago de Chile and what a president of the United States would do there when one of his predecessors had committed the painful crime of promoting the overthrow and physical death of their heroic president, horrible tortures and the murders of thousands of Chileans.

I for one was trying to follow the news that was coming in about the tragedy in Japan and the brutal war unleashed against Libya while the illustrious visitor was proclaiming the "Partnership of Equals" in the region of the world where wealth is distributed in the worst way.

Among so many things, I lost track a bit and saw nothing of the lavish banquet for hundreds of people being served the delicacies nature offered from the sea. The banquet had been served in a Tokyo restaurant, the city where one can pay up to 300,000 dollars for a fresh blue-fin tuna, they had collected up to 10 million dollars.

That was too much work for a young man of my age. I wrote a brief Reflection and then went to bed for a long sleep.

This morning I was refreshed. My friend wouldn't be arriving to El Salvador until after mid-day. I requested the cable dispatches, Internet articles and other recently arrived material.

I saw in the first place that, because of my reflections, the cables had given importance to what I had said about my position as First Party Secretary and I shall explain as briefly as possible. Concentrating on Barack Obama's "Partnership of Equals", a matter of so much historical importance – I say that seriously – I didn't even remember that next month the Party Congress would be taking place.

My position on the subject was basically logical. Once I understood the seriousness of my state of health, I did what I thought, in my opinion, wasn't necessary when I had that painful accident in Santa Clara; after the fall, treatment was tough, but my life was not in danger.

On the other hand, when I wrote the Proclamation on the 31st of July it was clear to me that the state of my health was extremely critical.

I immediately set aside all my public duties, adding to the proclamation some instructions to provide security and tranquility for the population.

It wasn't necessary to specifically step down from each one of my duties.

For me, my most important duty was that of First Party Secretary. Because of ideology and on principle, in a revolutionary stage, that political position carries the highest authority. The other position I held was that of President of the Council of State and Government, elected by the National Assembly. Both posts had replacements, and not by virtue of some family connection, something I have never considered to be the source of right, but due to experience and merit.

The rank of Commander in Chief had been granted me by the struggle itself, a matter of chance more than because of any personal merit. The Revolution itself, in a subsequent stage, correctly designated headship of all armed institutions to the president, a function that in my opinion, ought to fall to the First Party Secretary. I consider that that's how a country such as Cuba should be, having had to face an obstacle as considerable as the empire created by the United States.

Almost 14 years went by since the previous Party Congress; it coincided with the disappearance of the USSR, the socialist bloc, the Special Period and my own illness.

When gradually and partially my health was recovered, the idea didn't even cross my mind about the need to proceed formally in order to expressly resign from any position. At that time, I accepted the honour of being elected as Deputy to the National Assembly, something that did not demand my physical presence and with which I might share my ideas.

Since I have more time than ever now to observe, to inform myself and to lay out certain points of view, I shall modestly fulfil my duty to fight for the ideas I have defended throughout my modest life.

I beg readers to forgive the time I have spent in this explanation that above-mentioned circumstances have forced me to undertake.

The most important matter, which I cannot forget, is that rare partnership between millionaires and starving people as proposed by the illustrious President of the United States.

Those who are well-informed, those who know for example, the history of this hemisphere, its battles, or even the history of the Cuban people defending their Revolution against the empire that, as Obama

himself acknowledges, “now lasted for longer than I’ve been alive”, will surely be amazed by his proposal.

It is well-known that the current president is a good wordsmith, circumstances that, together with the economical crisis, growing unemployment, losses of homes, and deaths of American soldiers in the stupid wars of Bush, helped him to obtain his victory.

After observing him well, I wouldn’t be surprised that he was the author of the ridiculous name with which the massacre in Libya was baptized – “Odyssey Dawn” – that unsettled the dust of the mortal remains of Homer and those who contributed to the forging of the legend in the famous Greek poems, even though I admit, perhaps, the name was created by the military chiefs who are managing the thousands of nuclear weapons with which a mere command from the Nobel Peace Prize laureate can determine the end of our species.

His speech to whites, blacks, native peoples, mestizos and non-mestizos, religious or non-religious peoples of the Americas delivered in the Palacio de la Moneda Cultural Centre was distributed in a true copy by United States embassies everywhere, and it was translated and spread by Chile TV, CNN, and other broadcasting stations in other languages as I would imagine.

It was in the style of the speech he gave in the first year of his term in Cairo, the capital of his friend and ally Hosni Mubarak, whose tens of billions of dollars taken from the people were supposedly known to a president of the United States.

“...Chile shows that we need not be divided by race [...] or ethnic conflict”, he assures us, and thus the American problem was erased from the map.

He obsessively insists almost immediately that “...our marvelous surroundings today, just steps from where Chile lost its democracy decades ago, ...” Everything other than saying coup d’état, the murder of the honourable General Schneider, or the glorious name of Salvador Allende, as if the government of the United States had absolutely nothing to do with it.

The great poet Pablo Neruda, whose death was prompted by the treacherous coup, was quoted more than once, in this case to affirm our beautifully poetic “guiding stars” which are “struggle” and “hope”. Has Obama forgotten that Neruda was a Communist, a friend of the Cuban Revolution, a great admirer of Simon Bolivar who is reborn every hundred years, and inspiration for the Heroic Guerrilla Ernesto Guevara?

I was admiring Barack Obama’s profound knowledge of history almost from the very beginning of his message. Some irresponsible advisor forgot to explain to him that Neruda was a member of the Chilean Communist Party. After a few other insignificant paragraphs, he recognizes that “Now, I know I’m not the first president from the United States to pledge a new spirit of partnership with our Latin American neighbors. Words are easy, and I know that there have been times where perhaps the United States took this region for granted.”

“...Latin America is not the old stereotype of a region - in perpetual conflict or trapped in endless cycles of poverty.”

“In Colombia, great sacrifices by citizens and security forces have restored a level of security not seen in decades.” Over there, there was never any drug trafficking, paramilitary or secret cemeteries.

In his speech, the working class does not exist, nor do landless peasants, or the illiterate, or infant and maternal mortality, people becoming blind, or victims of parasites such as Chaga or bacterial diseases such as cholera.

“From Guadalajara to Santiago to Sao Paolo, a new MIDDLE CLASS is demanding more of themselves and more of their governments”, he states.

“When a coup in Honduras threatened democratic progress, the nations of the hemisphere unanimously invoked the Inter-American Democratic Charter, helping to lay the foundation for the return to the rule of law.”

The real reason for Obama’s marvellous speech is explained in inarguable fashion in the middle of his message and in his own words: “Latin America is only going to become more important to the United States, especially to our economy [...] We buy more of your products, more of your goods than any other country, and we invest more in this region than any other country. [...] we export more than three times as much to Latin America as we do to China. Our exports to this region -- which are growing faster than our exports to the rest of the world -- ...”. One can perhaps assume from this that “when Latin America is more prosperous, the United States is more prosperous.”

Further on, he dedicates insipid words to real facts:

“But if we’re honest, we’ll also admit that [...] progress in the Americas has not come fast enough. Not for the millions who endure the injustice of extreme poverty. Not for the children in shantytowns and the favelas who just want the same chance as everybody else.”

“...political and economic power that is too often concentrated in the hands of the few, instead of serving the many”, he said verbatim.

“...we are not the first generation to face these challenges. Fifty years ago this month, President John F. Kennedy proposed an ambitious Alliance for Progress.”

“President Kennedy’s challenge endures – ‘to build a hemisphere where all people can hope for a sustainable, suitable standard of living, and all can live out their lives in dignity and in freedom.’”

It is incredible that he now comes up with such an awkward story, an insult to human intelligence.

He has nothing left other than to mention, among the great calamities, a problem that originates in the colossal US market of lethal weapons: “Criminal gangs and narco-traffickers are not only a threat to the security of our citizens. They’re a threat to development, because they scare away investment that economies need to prosper. And they are a direct threat to democracy, because they fuel the corruption that rots institutions from within.”

Further on he reluctantly adds: “But we’ll never break the grip of the cartels and the gangs unless we also address the social and economic forces that fuel criminality. We need to reach at-risk youth before they turn to drugs and crime.”

“...as President I’ve made it clear that the United States shares and accepts our share of responsibility for drug violence. After all, the demand for drugs, including in the United States, drives this crisis. And that’s why we’ve developed a new drug control strategy that focused on reducing the demand for drugs through education and prevention and treatment.”

What he doesn’t say is that in Honduras 76 per every 100,000 inhabitants are dying as a result of violence, 19 times higher than in Cuba where practically, despite proximity to the United States, that problem hardly exists.

After a bunch of similar bits of foolishness, about weapons headed for Mexico that are being seized, a Trans-Pacific Partnership, the Inter-American Development bank, with which he says they are increasing the Microfinance Growth Fund for the Americas and promises to create new “Pathways to Prosperity” and other highfalutin terms that he pronounces in English and Spanish, he returns to his outlandish promises of hemispheric unity and he tries to impress his audience with the dangers of climatic changes.

Obama adds: "And if anybody doubts the urgency of climate change, they look -- they should look no further than the Americas -- from the stronger storms in the Caribbean, to glacier melt in the Andes, to the loss of forests and farmland across the region." Without the guts to acknowledge that his country is the one most responsible for that tragedy.

He explains that he is proud to announce that "...the United States will work with partners in this region, including the private sector, to increase the number of U.S. students studying in Latin America to 100,000, and the number of Latin America students studying in the United States to 100,000." We already know how much it costs to study medicine or any other profession in that country, and the shameless brain drain being practiced in the United States.

All his empty words ends with praise for the OAS that Roa described as the Ministry of Yankee Colonies when our Homeland unforgettably made an accusation in the United Nations, informing that the government of the United States had attacked our territory on April 15th of 1961 with B-26s painted with Cuban flags; a shameless event that in 23 days will be 50 years old.

Thus he believed that everything was completely ready to proclaim the right to subvert law and order in our country.

He openly confesses that they are "allowing Americans to send remittances that bring some economic hope for people across Cuba, as well as more independence from Cuban authorities."

"...we'll continue to seek ways to increase the independence of the Cuban people, who I believe are entitled to the same freedom and liberty as everyone else in this hemisphere."

Later he recognizes that the blockade is damaging Cuba, depriving the economy of resources. Why does he not recognize the intentions of Eisenhower, and the declared United States aim when he applied it was bringing the Cuban people to their knees by hunger?

Why is it still in place? How many billions of dollars does the compensation the US must pay our country come to? Why are they keeping the 5 Cuban anti-terrorist heroes imprisoned? Why aren't they applying the Adjustment Law to all Latin Americans instead of allowing thousands of them to die or get injured on the border imposed on that country after having stolen more than half of its territory?

I ask the President of the United States to pardon my frankness.

I harbour no hard feelings against him or his people.

I fulfill the duty of laying out all that I think about his "Partnership of Equals".

The United States will get nothing from creating and stimulating the mercenary profession. I can assure him that the best and most well-educated young people in our country, graduates from the University of Informatics Sciences, know much more about the Internet and computer science than the Nobel laureate and President of the United States.

Fidel Castro Ruz
March 22, 2011
9:17 p.m.



NATO's Fascist War

You didn't have to be clairvoyant to foresee what I wrote with great detail in three Reflection Articles I published on the CubaDebate website between February 21 and March 3: "The NATO Plan Is to Occupy Libya," "The Cynical Danse Macabre," and "NATO's Inevitable War."

Not even the fascist leaders of Germany and Italy were so blatantly shameless regarding the Spanish Civil War unleashed in 1936, an event that maybe a lot of people have been recalling over these past days.

Almost 75 years to the day have passed since then, but nothing that has happened over the last 75 centuries, or even 75 millenniums of human life on our planet can compare.

Sometimes it seems that those of us who serenely voice our opinions on these issues are exaggerating. I dare say that we have actually been naive to assume that we all should be aware of the deception or colossal ignorance that humanity has been dragged into.

In 1936 there was an intense clash between two systems and ideologies of more or less equal military power.

The arms back then seemed more like toys compared with today's weapons. Humanity's survival was not threatened despite the destructive power and the locally lethal force deployed. Entire cities and even nations could have been virtually destroyed. But never was the human race, in its totality, at risk of being exterminated several times over for the stupid and suicidal power developed by modern science and technology.

With these current realities in mind, it is embarrassing to read the continuous news reports on the use of powerful laser-guided rockets with 100% accuracy, fighter-bombers that go twice the speed of light, potent explosives that blow apart uranium-hardened metals that have an everlasting effect on the inhabitants and their descendants.

Cuba stated its position regarding the internal situation in Libya at the meeting in Geneva. Without hesitating, Cuba defended the idea of a political solution to the conflict in Libya and was categorically opposed to any foreign military intervention.

In a world where the alliance between the United States and the developed capitalist powers of Europe increasingly take hold of the people's resources and fruits of their labor, any honest citizen, whatever their standpoint to the government, would be opposed to a foreign military intervention in their country.

But most absurd about the current situation is the fact that before the brutal war broke out in Northern Africa, in another region of the world, nearly 10 000 kilometers away, a nuclear accident had occurred in one of the most populated areas of the world following a tsunami caused by a 9.0 earthquake, which has already cost a hard-working nation like Japan nearly 30 000 lives. Such accident would have not occurred 75 years before.

In Haiti, a poor and underdeveloped country, a nearly 7.0 quake according to the Richter scale, caused over 300 000 deaths, countless people wounded and hundreds of thousands harmed.

However, what was terribly tragic in Japan was the accident at the Fukushima nuclear plant, whose consequences are still to be assessed.

I will only recall some of the main stories published by the news agencies:

ANSA.- Fukushima 1 nuclear plant is releasing “extremely high and potentially lethal radiations,” said Gregory Jaczko, chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), the US nuclear entity.

EFE.- The nuclear threat stemming from the serious situation at a Japanese plant, following the earthquake, has triggered security revisions in atomic plants around the world and has made some countries paralyze their plans.

Reuters.- Japan's devastating earthquake and deepening nuclear crisis could result in losses of up to \$200 billion for Japanese economy, but the global impact remains hard to gauge.

EFE.- The deterioration of one reactor after another at Japan's Fukushima nuclear center continued to feed fears of a pending nuclear disaster as desperate attempts to control a radioactive leak did nothing to provide even a glimmer of hope.

AFP.- Japan's Emperor Akihito expressed concern about the unpredictable character of the nuclear crisis hitting Japan following the quake and tsunami that killed thousands of people and left 500 000 homeless. New quake reported in the Tokyo area.
There are reports talking about even more concerning issues.

Some refer to the presence of toxic radioactive iodine in Tokyo's drinking water, which doubles the tolerable amount that can be consumed by the smallest children in the Japanese capital. One of these reports says that the stocks of bottled water are shrinking in Tokyo, a city located in a prefecture at more than 200 kilometers from Fukushima.

This series of circumstances poses a dramatic situation on our world.
I can express freely my views on the war in Libya.

I do not share political or religious views with the leader of that country. I am a Marxist-Leninist and a follower of Marti, as I have already said.

I see Libya as a member of the Non-Aligned Movement and a sovereign State of the nearly 200 members of the United Nations.

Never, a large or small country, in this case with only 5 million inhabitants, was the victim of such a brutal attack by the air force of a militaristic organization with thousands of fighter-bombers, more than 100 submarines, nuclear aircraft carriers, and sufficient arsenal to destroy the planet many times over. Our species had never encountered this situation and there had been nothing similar 75 years ago, when the Nazi bombers attacked targets in Spain.

Now, however, the criminal and discredited NATO will write a "beautiful" little story about its "humanitarian" bombing.

If Gaddafi honors the traditions of his people and decides to fight to the last breath, as he has promised, together with the Libyans who are facing the worst bombing a country has ever suffered, NATO and its criminal projects will sink into the mire of shame.

The people respect and believe in men who fulfill their duty.

More than 50 years ago, when the United States killed more than a hundred Cubans with the explosion of merchant ship "La Coubre" our people proclaimed "Patria o Muerte." (Homeland or Death). They have fulfilled this, and have always been determined to keep their word.

"Anyone who tries to seize Cuba," said the most glorious fighter in our history-"will only gather the dust of her soil soaked in blood."

I beg you to excuse the frankness with which I address the issue.

Fidel Castro Ruz
28 March 2011
8:14 p.m.



The Best and Most Intelligent

Yesterday, because of a lack of time and space, I did not write one word about Barack Obama's speech on the Libyan war that he gave on Monday, March 28. I had a copy of the official version that the US administration had provided to the press. I underlined some of his statements. I went through it again and concluded that it was not worth wasting too much paper on.

I recalled what Carter had told me about the US forestry industry when he visited Cuba in 2002, since he owns a family-run tree farm in Georgia. During his recent visit I asked him about his farm and once again he explained how he plants 3 pine trees per every 2 meters, equaling 1,700 trees per hectare that are harvested 25 years later.

Many years ago, I read in a Sunday issue of The New York Times that this publication used the equivalent of 40 hectares of forest to produce its printed edition. So, this explains my concern about saving paper.

Of course, Obama is an expert articulator of words and phrases. He could make a living out of writing children's short stories. I am familiar with his style because, long before he took office, I read and underlined his book entitled *Dreams from My Father*, which was the first thing I read of his. I did so with respect and recognized that the author knew how to select the precise words and correct phrases to win over the readers' sympathies.

I confess that I did not like the way he used suspense, concealing his political ideas until the end. I made a special effort not to jump to the last chapter to read his opinions on various issues that, in my opinion, were crucial at this stage of human history. I was sure that the severe economic crisis, the colossal military expenditures, and the young blood that was shed during the times of his republican predecessor would help him defeat his electoral adversary, despite the enormous racial prejudices of US society. He was aware about the risk of being physically eliminated.

For obvious reasons of traditional politicking, prior to the elections, he went after the votes of the Miami-based anti-Cuban factions, most of them led by reactionary people who had supported Batista. These people turned the United States into a banana republic, where electoral fraud decided no less than Bush W's electoral victory in 2000, throwing a future Nobel laureate into the garbage: Al Gore, vice-president under Clinton and a presidential candidate.

A basic sense of justice would have led President Obama to rectify the outcome of the infamous trial that led to the inhumane, cruel and particularly unfair imprisonment of five Cuban patriots.

His Union Addresses; his speeches in Brazil, Chile and El Salvador; and his address on NATO's war on Libya forced me to underline the aforementioned speech more than his own autobiography.

What are the worst parts of his statement and how can one explain the approximately 2,500 words in the official version?

From a domestic standpoint, the speech's complete lack of realism places its happy author in the hands of his worst adversaries, those who want to humiliate him and take revenge for his November 2008 electoral victory. The beating they gave him in late 2010 is still not enough for them.

From an external standpoint, the world gained more awareness of what the UN Security Council, NATO and Yankee Imperialism really represents to many nations.

To be as brief as I have promised, I'll tell you that Obama began his speech by saying that he has played his role in "stopping the Taliban's momentum in Afghanistan, and going after al Qaeda all across the globe."

He immediately added that: "For generations, the United States of America has played a unique role as an anchor of global security and as an advocate for human freedom."

This is something that —as our readers know— Cubans, Latin Americans, Vietnamese and many others, can bear witness to.

After this solemn declaration of faith, Obama invested a lot of time to speaking about Qaddafi, about his horrors and the reasons for which the United States and their closest allies: "—United Kingdom, France, Canada, Denmark, Norway, Italy, Spain, Greece, and Turkey— all of whom have fought by our sides for decades [...] have chosen to meet their responsibilities to defend the Libyan people."

Further on he added: "...NATO, has taken command of the enforcement of the arms embargo and the no-fly zone."

He confirmed the objectives of this decision "Because of this transition to a broader, NATO-based coalition, the risk and cost of this operation —to our military and to American taxpayers— will be reduced significantly."

"So for those who doubted our capacity to carry out this operation, I want to be clear: The United States of America has done what we said we would do."

He then went back to obsessing on Qaddafi and to the contradictions that assail his mind: "Qaddafi has not yet stepped down from power, and until he does, Libya will remain dangerous."

"It's true that America cannot use our military wherever repression occurs. And given the costs and risks of intervention, we must always measure our interests against the need for action."

"The task that I assigned our forces —to protect the Libyan people [...] — carries with it a UN mandate and international support."

He returned to his obsessions over and over again: "If we tried to overthrow Qaddafi by force, our coalition would splinter. We would [...] have to put US troops on the ground to accomplish that mission, or risk killing many civilians from the air."

"...we are hopeful about Iraq's future. But regime change there took eight years, thousands of American and Iraqi lives, and nearly a trillion dollars."

A few days after the NATO bombings began, a few reports started to appear about a US fighter-bomber that had been shot down. A source later confirmed the reports. Upon seeing a falling parachutist, some of the country folk did what people traditionally do in Latin America: they went to go see, and if someone needed it, they would provide help. No one can know what they were thinking. They were most definitely Muslims working the earth who would not be in favor of the bombings. A helicopter, which suddenly arrived on the scene to rescue the pilot, opened fire against the rural farmers, seriously injuring one of them. It was a miracle that they didn't kill them all. As the world knows, Arabs are traditionally hospitable towards their enemies, they invite them to stay in their own houses and turn their back to not see which way they take. Even a coward or a traitor could never represent the spirit of a social class.

The strange theory, that he included in his speech, could only occur to Obama, as shown in the following passage:

“There will be times, though, when our safety is not directly threatened, but our interests and our values are. [...] And in these circumstances, we know that the United States, as the world’s most powerful nation, will often be called upon to help.”

“In such cases, we should not be afraid to act -- but the burden of action should not be America’s alone. As we have in Libya, our task is instead to mobilize the international community for collective action.”

“That’s the kind of leadership we’ve shown in Libya. Of course, even when we act as part of a coalition, the risks of any military action will be high. Those risks were realized when one of our planes malfunctioned over Libya. Yet when one of our airmen parachuted to the ground, in a country whose leader has so often demonized the United States -- in a region that has such a difficult history with our country -- this American did not find enemies. Instead, he was met by people who embraced him. One young Libyan who came to his aid said, “We are your friends. We are so grateful to those men who are protecting the skies.”

“This voice is just one of many in a region where a new generation is refusing to be denied their rights and opportunities any longer.”

“Yes, this change will make the world more complicated for a time. Progress will be uneven, and change will come differently to different countries. There are places, like Egypt, where this change will inspire us and raise our hopes.”

Everyone knows that Mubarak was an ally of the U.S., and when Obama visited the University of Cairo, in June 2009, he could not ignore the tens of billions of dollars stolen by him in Egypt. He continued with the emotional story:

“...we welcome the fact that history is on the move in the Middle East and North Africa, and that young people are leading the way. Because wherever people long to be free, they will find a friend in the United States. Ultimately, it is that faith -- those ideals -- that are the true measure of American leadership.”

“...our strength abroad is anchored in our strength here at home. That must always be our North Star -- the ability of our people to reach their potential, to make wise choices with our resources, to enlarge the prosperity that serves as a wellspring for our power, and to live the values that we hold so dear.”

“And let us look to the future with confidence and hope not only for our own country, but for all those yearning for freedom around the world.”

The spectacular story reminded me of the Tea Party, Senator Bob Menendez and the illustrious Ileana Ros, the fierce wolf that defied the law to keep the Cuban boy Elian Gonzalez kidnapped. She is now nothing less than Head of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Gaddafi never tires of repeating that Al-Qaeda is making the war on him and sends fighters against the government of Libya, because he supported Bush’s war on terror.

That organization once had excellent relations with the American intelligence services in the fight against the Soviets in Afghanistan, and has plenty of experience on the working methods of the CIA.

What if the allegations of Gaddafi were true? How would Obama explain to the American people that part of those ground combat weapons fell into the hands of the men of Bin Laden? Would it not have been better and more intelligent to have struggled to promote peace and not war in Libya?

Fidel Castro Ruz

March 31, 2011
7:58 p.m.



A Fire that Could Burn Everyone

You may agree or not with Gaddafi's political ideas, but no one has the right to question the existence of Libya as an independent state and member of the United Nations.

The world has not yet reached the point which, in my view, is an essential condition for the survival of our human species: access by all the peoples to the material resources of this planet. There is no other in the Solar System that we know that has the most elemental conditions for life.

The United States itself always tried to be a melting pot of all races, all beliefs and all nations: white, black, yellow, the Indians and mixed races, with no other differences than those between the masters and slaves, the rich and poor; but all within its borders: To its North was Canada; to the South, Mexico; to the East, the Atlantic Ocean and to the West, the Pacific Ocean. Alaska, Puerto Rico and Hawaii were simple historical accidents.

What makes the issue complicated is that it does not imply the noble wish of those fighting for a better world, which deserves as much respect as the peoples' religious beliefs do. It would only take some kind of radioactive isotopes that stemmed from the enriched uranium used by thermonuclear plants in relatively small amounts—since they do not exist in nature—to put an end to the fragile existence of our species. Keeping those wastes in increasing volumes, under reinforced concrete and steel coffins, is one of the major challenges for technology.

Events like the Chernobyl accident or the earthquake in Japan have revealed those mortal risks.

This is not the issue I'd like to address today, but how amazed I was yesterday to see, on Walter Martinez's show "Dossier" on Venezuelan television, the filmed images of the meeting between the chief of the US Department of Defense Robert Gates and the U.K. Defense Minister, Liam Fox, who visited the United States to discuss the criminal war unleashed by NATO against Libya. It was something difficult to believe, the British minister won an "Oscar"; he was a bundle of nerves, he was tense and spoke like crazy; and he gave the impression that he was just spitting out the words.

Of course, he first got to the entrance of the Pentagon, where Gates was awaiting him with a smile. The flags of both countries, the one of the ancient British colonial empire and that of its stepson, the United States Empire, flew high on both sides as the two national anthems were played. Right hand on chest, the rigorous and solemn military salute of the ceremony given by the host country. This was the initial act. Later, the two ministers stepped into the US Defense building. They are supposed to have spoken for a long time, given the images I saw, as each of them returned with a speech in hand, undoubtedly prepared in advance.

The context of this entire scenario was made up by personnel in uniform. On the left I could see a tall, slim young soldier, who seemed to have a shaved redhead, wearing a cap with the black peak pulled nearly down to his throat, presenting his bayoneted rifle. He did not blink nor seem to breathe, like the figure of a soldier ready to shoot a rifle bullet or a nuclear rocket with a destructive capacity of 100 thousand tons of TNT. Gates spoke showing the smile and natural manners of a host. The British man, however, did so in the way I explained.

I have not often seen anything more horrifying than this; he was releasing hatred, frustration, fury and using threatening language against the Libyan leader and urging his unconditional surrender. He

looked indignant because the powerful NATO warplanes had not been able to crush the Libyan resistance in 72 hours.

He was only missing the exclamation: "blood, sweat and tears," just like Winston Churchill when he calculated the price to be paid by his country in the fight against the Nazi warplanes. But in this case, the Nazi-fascist role is being played by NATO with its thousands of bombing missions by the most modern aircraft ever known by the world.

To cap it all came the decision by the US administration to authorize the use of drones to kill Libyan men, women and children, like in Afghanistan, thousands of kilometers from Western Europe, but this time against an Arab and African country, before the eyes of hundreds of millions of Europeans and no less than in the name of the United Nations Organization.

Russia's Prime Minister Vladimir Putin yesterday said that these acts of war were illegal and they are outside the framework of the accords adopted by the UN Security Council.

The crude attacks against the Libyan people, which have taken on a Nazi-fascist character, may be used against any Third World nation.

I am really amazed at the resistance posed by Libya.

The belligerent organization now depends on Gaddafi. If he resists and does not yield to their demands, he will enter history as one of the great figures of the Arab nations.

NATO is poking a fire that could burn everyone!

Fidel Castro Ruz
April 27, 2011
7: 34 p.m.



Understanding the war in Libya (I)

*Michel Collon **

Part 1: Questions to be asked in every war

27 times. The United States has bombed another country 27 times since 1945. And each time, we were told that these acts of war were "fair" and "humanitarian." Today, we are told that this war is different from previous ones. But this was also said last time, and the time before. It was said every time. Isn't it time to write down the questions we should ask in every war in order to avoid being manipulated?

Is money always available for war?

In the most powerful country of the world, forty-five million people live below the poverty line. United States schools and public services are crumbling because the state has "no money". In Europe too, "no money" for pensions or for creating jobs. But when the greed of bankers causes a financial crisis, it takes only a few days, they manage to find billions to save them. This has allowed these same bankers to distribute \$140 USD billion last year as rewards and bonuses to their shareholders, traders and speculators. For war too, it seems easy to find billions. However, it is our taxes that pay for these weapons and this destruction. Is it wise to burn hundreds of thousands of dollars for each missile, or wasting fifty thousand euros per hour with an aircraft carrier? Or is war a good deal for some?

Meanwhile, a child dies of hunger every five seconds and the number of poor is growing on our planet despite so many promises.

What is the difference between a Libyan, a Bahraini and a Palestinian? Presidents, ministers and generals solemnly swear that their objective is only to save the Libyans. But at the same time, the Sultan of Bahrain is massacring unarmed demonstrators with the help of the two thousand Saudi soldiers sent by the United States! Meanwhile, in Yemen, the troops of dictator Saleh, a U.S. ally, are killing 52 demonstrators with machine guns. These facts are disputed by no one, but at the same time, the Defense Secretary Robert Gates, has just declared, "I do not think it's my role to intervene in the internal affairs of Yemen [1].

Why this "double standard"? Because Saleh hosts obediently the Fifth Fleet U.S. the Fifth U.S. fleet and says yes to everything Washington commissions of him? Because the barbaric regime of Saudi Arabia is an accomplice of multinational oil companies? There would be "good dictators" and "bad dictators? How can the U.S. and France claim to be humanitarian? When Israel killed two thousand civilians by bombing Gaza, did they establish a no fly zone? No. Did they impose any sanctions? None. Worse: Javier Solana, then in charge of Foreign Affairs for the EU said to Jerusalem, "Israel is a member of the European Union without being a member of its institutions. Israel is part of all EU research and technology programs." Adding, "No country outside the continent has the kind of relationship that Israel enjoys with the European Union."

On this point, Solana told the truth. Europe and its arms manufacturers work closely with Israel for the production of drones, missiles and other weapons that cause death in Gaza. We should remember that Israel, which expelled 700,000 Palestinians from their villages in 1948, still refuses to honor their rights and continues to commit multiple war crimes. Under the occupation, 20% of the current Palestinian population is, or has been, held in Israel's prisons. Pregnant women are forced to give birth tied to their beds and immediately returned to their cells with their babies! But these crimes are committed with the active complicity of the U.S. and the EU. The life of a Palestinian or a Bahraini is not worth that of a Libyan? There would be "good Arabs" and "bad Arabs"?

For those who still believe in the humanitarian war ...

In a televised debate I had with Louis Michel, former Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs and European Commissioner for Development Cooperation, the latter swore – hand on heart – that this war was intended to assuage the conscience of Europe. He was supported by Isabelle Durant, Belgian leader of the Greens and European. Thus, "peace and love" environmentalists have mutated.

The problem is that every time we speak of humanitarian war, and every single time these "leftists" like Durant get caught up. Wouldn't it be better for them to read what the U.S. leaders really think instead of just listening to them on television?

Listen for example, about the bombing against Iraq, to the famous Alan Greenspan, who was the long-time director of the U.S. Federal Reserve. He wrote in his memoirs: 'I am saddened that it is politically incorrect to acknowledge what everyone knows: the Iraq war was mainly for oil.' [2] Adding, "Officials from the White House told me, 'Well, unfortunately we can not talk about oil'." [3]

Listen to these comments about the bombing of Yugoslavia, by John Norris, director of communication for Strobe Talbott who was then U.S. Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs, in charge of the Balkans. Norris wrote in his memoirs, "What best explains NATO's war is that Yugoslavia resisted the broad trends in political and economic reforms (refusing to give up socialism) ...not our duty to the Kosovo Albanians. [4]

Listen to what the former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger said about the bombing of Afghanistan, "There are efforts underway, supported by China and Japan, to create a free trade area in Asia. An Asian bloc opposed combining the most populous nations in the world with great resources and some of the most important industrial countries would be inconsistent with American national

interest. For these reasons, America must maintain a presence in Asia ... " [5]

This confirmed the strategy put forward by Zbigniew Brzezinski, who was in charge of foreign policy under Carter and was the inspiration for Obama concerning "Eurasia (Europe + Asia) remains the chessboard on which the battle takes place for global primacy. (...) The way the United States 'manages' Eurasia is critical. The largest continent on the globe is also the geopolitical axis. Any power that controls it, thus controlling two of the three most developed and productive regions. 75% of world population, the majority of natural wealth in the form of companies or deposits of raw materials, some 60% of the world. " [6]

The left, didn't learn anything from the media lies of previous humanitarian wars ?

When Obama says it himself, wouldn't you believe him either? On March 28, Obama justified the war against Libya, "Aware of the risks and costs of military action, we are naturally reluctant to use force to resolve the many challenges facing the world. But when our interests and values are at stake, we have a responsibility to act. Given the costs and risks of the intervention, we must measure our interests whenever faced with the need for action. America has an important strategic interest in preventing Qaddafi from defeating those who oppose him." Isn't it clear? So, some say, "Yes, yes, the U.S. acts as if it is in their interest, too. Failing to intervene everywhere, at least they will be saving these people. "False. We will show that only their interests will be protected. No values. First, every U.S. war claimed more victims than there were before (in Iraq, one million direct and indirect victims!). Then, the intervention in Libya is preparing other victims too...

Who refused to negotiate?

As soon as you express doubts about this war against Libya, immediately, you are blamed, "You refuse then to save the Libyans from the massacre?" Badly posed question. Let's suppose that everything we've been told really happened. First, should we stop a massacre with another massacre? We know that by bombing, our armies will kill many innocent civilians. Even if, as in every war, the generals promise that it will be "clean", we're used to this propaganda. Secondly, there was a much simpler and more effective way to save lives immediately. Latin American countries have offered to immediately send a mediation mission headed by Lula. The Arab League and African Union supported this approach and Gaddafi had agreed (also offering to send international observers to verify the cease-fire). But the insurgents and the Western Libyan refused mediation. Why? "Because Gaddafi is not acting in good faith," they say. Possibly, whereas, the insurgents and their Western protectors have always acted in good faith? About the United States, it is useful to recall how they behaved in all previous wars every time a cease-fire was possible. In 1991, when Bush attacked Iraq because it invaded Kuwait, Saddam Hussein offered to withdraw and that Israel must also evacuate from the illegally occupied territories in Palestine. But the U.S. and European countries have refused six negotiating proposals. [7] In 1999, when Clinton bombed Yugoslavia, Milosevic accepted the conditions imposed in Rambouillet, but the U.S. and NATO had added one more condition, one that was unacceptable: the total occupation of Serbia. [8] In 2001, when Bush attacked Afghanistan, the Taliban offered to hand bin Laden over to an international tribunal if they provided evidence of his involvement, but Bush refused to negotiate. In 2003, when Bush attacked Iraq under the pretext of weapons of mass destruction, Saddam Hussein had offered to allow inspectors, but Bush refused because he knew that the inspectors would find nothing. This was confirmed by the disclosure of the memo of a meeting between the British government and leaders of British secret services in July 2002: "British officials hope the ultimatum is drafted in unacceptable terms so that Saddam Hussein rejects it immediately. But they were far from certain that this would work. So, there was a Plan B: the aircraft patrolling the "no fly zone" dropping many more bombs in the hope that this would cause a reaction which would serve as a pretext for a broad bombing campaign. [9]

So, before asserting that "we" always tell the truth while "they" always lie, and also that "we" are always looking for a peaceful solution, while "they" do not want to compromise, we should be more careful ... Sooner or later, the public will learn what really happened during backroom negotiations, and will realize once again that we were manipulated. But it will be too late, and we cannot raise the

dead.

Is Libya the same as Tunisia and Egypt?

In his excellent interview published a few days ago by Investig'Action, Mohamed Hassan asked the right question: "Is Libya's a popular revolt, civil war or military aggression?" In light of recent research, it is actually possible to answer, "It is all three." A spontaneous revolt, quickly recovered and transformed into a civil war (which had been prepared), served as a pretext for military aggression, which also had been prepared. Nothing falls from the sky in politics. Let me explain. In Tunisia and in Egypt, the popular revolt grew rapidly over a few weeks, organizing itself gradually and uniting around clear demands, which helped to expel the tyrants. But when analyzing the ultra-fast sequence of events in Benghazi, one is intrigued. February 15, demonstration by relatives of political prisoners arrested during the rebellion of 2006. Event severely repressed, as has always been the case in Libya and other Arab countries. And just two days later, another demonstration, but this time the demonstrators are armed and events moved directly to the escalation against the regime of Gaddafi. Within two days, a popular revolt becomes a civil war! Quite spontaneously? To find out, we must examine what lies under the vague term "Libyan opposition". In our opinion, four components with very different interests – a democratic opposition, former leaders under Gaddafi "returned" by the West, clans dissatisfied with the distribution of wealth and Islamist rebels.

Who is the "Libyan opposition"? In this tangle, it is important to know we who are dealing with. And most importantly, which faction was integrated in the strategies of the major powers.

1. Democratic Opposition. It is legitimate to have claims against the Gaddafi regime, a dictatorial and corrupt one like other Arab regimes. The people have the right to replace an authoritarian regime with a more democratic system. However, these claims are not well organized and lack a specific program. Abroad, there are Libyan revolutionary movements, also quite disparate, but all opposed to foreign interference. For various reasons we will clarify later, it is not these democratic elements which will have much say today under the banner of the USA and France,

2. "Returned" leaders. In Benghazi, a "provisional government" was established and is led by Jalil Mustafa Abud. This man was, until February 21, Gaddafi's Minister of Justice. Two months earlier, Amnesty International had placed him on the list of the most appalling parties responsible for violations of human rights in North Africa." It is this individual who, according to the Bulgarian authorities, had organized the torture of Bulgarian nurses and a Palestinian doctor detained by the regime. Another "strong man" of this opposition is General Abdul Fatah Younis, Gaddafi's former Minister of the Interior and Chief of the political police.

Understandably, Massimo Introvigne, representing the OSCE (Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe) for the fight against racism, xenophobia and discrimination, says that these characters "are not the 'sincere democrats' of Obama's speech, but among the worst instruments of the regime of Gaddafi, who aspire to drive Colonel to take his place."

3. Unhappy clans. As indicated by Mohamed Hassan, the structure of Libya remains highly tribal. During the colonial period, under the regime of King Idris, the clans of the east dominated and took advantage of the oil wealth. Since the 1969 revolution, Gadhafi has relied on the tribes of the west and the east has been disadvantaged. It is regrettable, and a democratic government must ensure parity and resist discrimination between regions. One can also wonder whether the former colonial powers did not encourage dissatisfied tribes to undermine national unity. This is not the first time. Today, France and USA rely on the clans of the east to take control of the country. Divide and rule, the old classic of colonialism.

4. Elements of Al Qaeda. Cables released by Wikileaks warned that eastern Libya was proportionally the largest supplier in the world of "fighter - martyrs" in Iraq. Reports from the Pentagon described an "alarming scenario" among the Libyan rebels of Benghazi and Derna. Derna, a town of barely 80,000 inhabitants would be the primary source of jihadists in Iraq. Similarly, Vicent Cannistraro, former CIA

chief in Libya, reports among the rebels a lot of "Islamic extremists who can create problems" and that "odds [are] high that the most dangerous individuals can have an influence if Gaddafi is expected to fall." [10]

Obviously, all this was written when Gaddafi was still "a friend". But it shows the complete lack of principles on the part of the CIA leader and allies. When Gaddafi repressed the Islamist revolt in Benghazi in 2006, it was with the West's weapons and support that he did so. Sometime they're against the "bin laden" style fighters. And, sometime, they use them. One must know.

Among these various "opposition" forces, which element will prevail? It may also be a goal of the military intervention by Washington, Paris and London to ensure that "good" prevails? Good from their point of view of course. Later, they'll use the "Islamic threat" as the pretext to settle permanently. Any way, one thing is certain, the Libyan scenario is different from the Tunisian and Egyptian scenarios. Over there, there were "united people against a tyrant". Here, with part of the population supporting Qaddafi, we are in a civil war. And in this civil war, the role played by U.S. and French secret services is no longer a secret.

What role have the secret services played?

In fact, the Libyan situation didn't start in February in Benghazi, but in Paris, October 21st, 2010. According to the revelations of Italian journalist Franco Bechis (Liberio, March 24), that day the French secret service had prepared the revolt of Benghazi. They then (or perhaps even before) "returned" Nuri Mesmari, Gaddafi's Chief of Protocol, who was almost his right hand against him. He was the only one who enters the residence of the Libyan leader without knocking. Coming to Paris with his family for a surgery, Mesmari didn't meet any doctor there, but on the other side, he would talk to several officials of the French secret services and Sarkozy's close aides, according to the latest web Maghreb Confidential. On November 16th, at the Hotel Concorde Lafayette, he prepared a large delegation that would go two days later to Benghazi.

Officially, this delegation included officials of the Ministry of Agriculture and leaders of the following firms: France Export Céréales, Agrimer France, Louis Dreyfus, Glencore, Cargill and Conagra. But according to the Italian services, the delegation also included several French soldiers disguised as businessmen. In Benghazi, they would meet Gehan Abdallah, a Libyan colonel who is ready to desert, according to Mesmari. In mid-December, Gaddafi, suspicious, sent an emissary to Paris to try to contact Mesmari, but France arrests him. Other Libyans visited Paris on December 23rd, and it is they who will lead the revolt in Benghazi with the militia of Colonel Gehan. Especially as Mesmari provided many secrets to the French about the Libyan defense. From all this, it is clear that the revolt in the east is not as spontaneous as we've been told. But that's not all. It's not just the French...

Who now runs the military operations of the anti-Gaddafi Libyan National Council? A man who just arrived from the US on the 14th of March, according to Al Jazeera. Described as one of the two "stars" of the Libyan uprising by the right oriented British newspaper Daily Mail, hift Khalifa is a former colonel in the Libyan army, who was in the United States. He was among the main military commanders in Libya until the disastrous expedition in Chad in the late 1980's. He emigrated after that to the US and lived in Virginia for the last twenty years, without any known source of income, but at a short distance from the offices of... the CIA. [10] The world is small. How a top Libyan military can enter the United States in peace, a few years after the Lockerbie terrorist attack, for which Libya has been condemned, and live peacefully for twenty years next to the CIA? He necessarily had to offer something in exchange. Published in 2001, the book Manipulations Africaines by Pierre Péan retraces the connections of Hitler with the CIA and the creation, with the support of the latter, the Libyan National Liberation Front. The only achievement of said Front will be the organization in 2007, in the US, of a "National Convention" funded by the National Endowment for Democracy [11], traditional intermediary of the CIA, often used to reward organizations who serve the United States...

In March this year, on a date not disclosed, Obama signed a secret order authorizing the CIA to conduct operations in Libya to overthrow Gaddafi. The Wall Street Journal, which recounts this March

31, adds, "The CIA officials acknowledge that they have been active in Libya for several weeks, like other Western services." All this is no longer top secret, it appeared a while ago on the Internet, and what is surprising is that the mainstream media didn't even mention it. However, we have already seen many examples of "freedom fighters" as well armed and financed by the CIA. For example, in the 80's, the terrorist militia contras, set up by Reagan to destabilize and overthrow Nicaragua's progressive government. Didn't we learn anything from history? Doesn't this "left" European who is applauding the bombing use the Internet? Is it any wonder that the Italian services denounce the exploits of their French colleagues and that they denounce then their U.S. colleagues?

Only if one believes the stories about the friendship between "western allies." We'll talk about it... (To be continued)

- 1) Reuters, 22/3.
- 2) Sunday Times, 16 septembre 2007.
- 3) Washington Post, 17 septembre 2007.
- 4) Collision Course, Praeger, 2005, p.xiii.
- 5) Does America need a foreign policy, Simon and Schuster, 2001, p. 111.
- 6) Le Grand Echiquier, Paris 1997, p. 59-61
- 7) Michel Collon, Attention, médias Bruxelles, 1992, p. 92.
- 8) Michel Collon, Monopoly, - L'Otan à la conquête du monde, Bruxelles 2000, page 38.
- 9) Michael Smith, La véritable information des mémos de Downing Street, Los Angeles Times, 23 jun 2005.
- 10) McClatchy Newspapers (USA), 27 mars.
- 11) Eva Golinger, Code Chavez, CIA contra Venezuela, Liège, 2006.

(*) Belgian journalist, writer and historian



Understanding the war in Libya (II)

The true objectives of the United States go far beyond oil

We have already pointed out several clues so that, finally, at this stage of our reflection, we can dismiss the possibility of a humanitarian war and say that it was not an impulsive response to the recent events either. If Washington and Paris deliberately denied any attempts to negotiate, if they have worked on Libyan opinion for a good while and worked out detailed scenarios for the intervention, if aircraft carriers have been ready to intervene for a long time (as it was confirmed by U.S. Navy admiral Gary Roughead, the Chief of the U.S. Navy : "Our forces had already taken up their position against Libya," (Washington, March 23), it certainly does not mean that the war was decided at the last minute in reaction to unexpected events, but that it was planned. It is directed toward major objectives which go well beyond the person of Gaddafi.

WHAT OTHER OBJECTIVES?

In this war against Libya, Washington is pursuing several objectives at the same time: 1. Taking control of oil. 2. Ensuring the safety of Israel. 3. Preventing the liberation of the Arab world. 4. Hindering the African unity. 5. Setting up NATO as the watchdog of Africa.

It does involve many objectives. This was also the case for the wars in Iraq, Yugoslavia, and in Afghanistan. Indeed, such a war costs a lot and entails major risks for the image of the United States, especially when it does not win. If Obama triggers a war of this kind, it means he expects major advantages from it.

First goal: taking control of all oil reserves

Some say that this time, the war is not for oil, because apparently, the quantities of Libyan oil are minor in the global oil production and that anyway, Gaddafi was already selling his oil to Europeans. Yet they do not understand what the world oil war consists of.

With the worsening of the general crisis of capitalism, the world's leading economic powers engage in fiercer and fiercer competition. The seats are precious in this game of musical chairs. To secure a chair for their multinationals, each superpower must fight on all fronts: capturing markets and areas with profitable work forces, acquiring big public and private contracts, securing commercial monopolies, controlling states which will grant it favors, and first and foremost ensuring domination over coveted raw materials - particularly oil.

In 2000, as we analyzed the wars to come in our book entitled Monopoly, we wrote, "He who wants to rule the world, must take control of oil. All of it. Wherever it may be." If you are a superpower, securing your own oil supplies is not enough. You yearn for more oil, you want mileage out of it. Not only for the huge profits, but particularly as you ensure yourself a monopoly, you will be able to deprive your too inconvenient rivals of it, or subject them to your own conditions. You will hold the perfect weapon. Blackmail? Yes indeed.

Since 1945, the United States has done anything to secure this monopoly on oil. For instance, a rival country such as Japan was dependent upon the U.S.A. for 95% of its supplying with energy. Enough to guarantee its obedience.

However, balances of power in international relations change, the world is becoming multipolar and the United States faces the rise of China, Russia's recovery, and the emergence of Brazil and of other southern countries. It becomes more and more difficult to maintain the monopoly position.

Libya's oil represents only about 1% or 2% of the global oil production. Fair enough! But it is of higher quality, easier to extract, it is thus a very profitable business. And above all, it is situated near Italy, France and Germany. It would be more expensive to import oil from the Middle-East, Black Africa, or Latin America. There is definitely a battle for Libya's black gold. Especially for a country such as France, which embarked on a nuclear program that has become very hazardous.

In this context, we need to recall two facts. 1. Gaddafi wanted to increase Libya's contribution to oil supply from 30% to 51%. 2. Last March, 2, Gaddafi had complained that Libya's oil production was at its lowest. He had threatened to replace the western firms which had left the country with Chinese, Russian, and Indian ones. Is it a coincidence? Every time an African country becomes interested in China, it gets itself into trouble.

Here is another clue: Ali Zeidan, the man who put out the figure of 6,000 civilian casualties - supposedly the victims of Gaddafi's bombings - is also the spokesman for the NTC (National Transition Council), that opposition government which is recognized by France. Well, as such, Zeidan has declared that Libya will "honor the contracts that had been signed with oil companies," however the future government "will be grateful to the nations which helped us." This is definitely another war for oil. Yet, Libya is not the sole target.

Why this rivalry between the United states, France and Germany?

If the war against Libya is just a humanitarian one, we do not understand why those who fight it argue with each other. Why Sarkozy rushed to be the first to bomb the country? Why was he vexed when NATO offered to take command of all the operations in Libya? He argued, "NATO is unpopular in the Arab countries." This does not make sense. As if he were so popular there after providing Israel and Ben Ali with such protection!

Why were Germany and Italy so doubtful about the war? Why did Italian secretary Frattini first declare that "Libya's sovereignty and territorial integrity must be protected" and that "Europe should not export democracy to Libya." (1) Are these merely diverging points of view regarding humanitarian

effectiveness? I think not, it is all about economic interests. As Europe is confronted with the crisis, rivalries are consequently growing stronger and stronger. Just a few months ago, European leaders came one after the other to Tripoli, embracing Gaddafi and pocketing big Libyan contracts. Those who acquired them would do very well not to overthrow him. Those who have none would better do so. Which country was Libya's top oil customer? Italy. Which was the second? Germany. Now let us have a look at European superpowers' investments and exports. Which country has the most contracts in Libya? Italy. Which is second? Germany.

It was the German firm BASF which had become the main oil producing company in Libya, with its two billion euros of investment. It was the German firm DEA, a subsidiary company of water giant RWE, which acquired access to more than 41,000 square kilometers of oil and gas fields. It was the German firm Siemens which was instrumental in the huge investments in the gigantic project entitled the Great Man-made River: the biggest irrigation project in the world, a network of pipelines which draw water from the Nubian aquifers to the Sahara desert. More than 1,300 oil wells, which are often more than five hundred meters deep, and once all alterations have been completed, will supply 6.5 millions cubic meters of water everyday in Tripoli, Benghazi, Sirte and other cities. (2) 25 billion dollars that attracted the envy of some countries! Besides, with these petrodollars, Gaddafi had embarked on a very ambitious program to renew infrastructure, build schools and hospitals and industrialize the country.

Taking advantage of its economic strength, Germany formed special economic partnerships with Libya, Saudi Arabia and countries of the Arabian Gulf. It thus does not want to spoil its image in the Arab world. As far as Italy is concerned, we have to remember that it colonized Libya with incredible roughness, playing on divisions between western and eastern tribes. Today, with Berlusconi, Italian companies got some nice contracts. They have thus a lot at stake. On the other hand, France and Great Britain, which did not get the tastiest pieces of the cake, go on the offensive in order to revise the sharing of the cake. And the war in Libya is just an extension of the economic struggle by other means. The capitalist world is not so nice. Economic rivalry is transposed to the military field. In a period when Europe is in crisis and dominated by an ultra successful Germany (particularly thanks to its policy of low salaries), France breaks off its alliances and now turns towards Great Britain in order to restore the balance. Paris and London are greater military powers than Berlin, and try to play this card in order to make up for their weakness on the economic level.

Second goal: Ensure the safety of Israel

In the Middle-East, everything links up. As Noam Chomsky (3) explained to us in an interview, "From 1967 onwards, the government of the United States has considered Israel as a key investment. It was one of the community police stations in charge of the protection of the oil producing Arab dictatorships." Israel is the cop of the Middle-East.

However, Washington faces a new problem: because of the many crimes Israel has committed (Lebanon, Gaza, the humanitarian flotilla), the latter becomes more and more isolated. Arab peoples demand the end of this colonialism. As a result, now the cop needs protection. Israel cannot survive without being surrounded by Arab dictatorships which could not care less about their peoples' will to support the Palestinians. That is why Washington protected Mubarak and Ben Ali, and will do the same for the other dictators.

The United States is worried about 'losing' Tunisia and Egypt in the years to come. It would indeed change the balance of power in the region. After the war against Iraq in 2003 - which also served as a warning and a means of intimidation directed at all the other Arab leaders - Gaddafi had felt the threat. As a consequence, he had multiplied concessions - which were sometimes excessive ones - to the Western powers and their neoliberalism. It had weakened him at the internal level of social revolts.

When you give in to the IMF, you do harm to your people. But if tomorrow Tunisia and Egypt become leftist, Gaddafi will undoubtedly be able to reconsider these concessions.

A resistance axis between Cairo-Tripoli-Tunis, standing up to the United States and determined to make Israel give in would be a nightmare for Washington. Overthrowing Gaddafi is thus prevention.

Third goal: prevent the liberation of the Arab world

Today, who rules the whole Arab world, its economy, its resources, and its oil? We know it is not the Arab peoples. It is not the dictators in power either. They certainly are in the forefront but the true rulers are behind the scenes.

American and European multinational companies are the ones which decide what those countries will produce or not, determine salary scales, who will make the most of oil revenues and which ruler will be imposed there. Those multinationals are the ones which make their shareholders grow richer at the Arab peoples' expense.

Imposing tyrants in the whole Arab world leads to serious consequences: only multinational companies benefit from oil and other natural resources, they are not used to diversify the local economy and create jobs. Moreover, multinational companies impose low salaries on the tourist industry, on the small industries and on the subcontracting services.

As a result, these economies remain dependent, imbalanced and do not meet peoples' needs. In the years to come, unemployment will increase, for 35% of the Arabs are under the age of 15. Dictators are multinationals' employees, in charge of securing their profits and crushing protest movements. Their role is to hinder social Justice.

Three hundred million Arabs spread over twenty countries, yet rightly seeing themselves as a single nation, face a decisive choice : either accepting the maintenance of colonialism or becoming independent by taking a new path ? All around, the world is changing fast : China, Brazil and other countries are liberating themselves politically, so much so that their economy is making progress. Will the Arab world remain behind? Will subordination to the United States and Europe continue, a weapon used against the other nations in this great global economic and political battle? Or will the hour of liberation eventually strike?

This possibility terrorizes strategists in Washington. If the Arab world and oil slip out of their hands, that is the end of their domination over the world. Because the United States, a superpower which is in economic and political decline, is more and more questioned: by Germany, Russia, Latin America, and China. Moreover, a lot of southern countries long to develop South-South relations, which are more profitable than the subordination to the United States. The latter is finding it more and more difficult to maintain itself as the greatest global power, capable of plundering whole nations and waging war wherever it pleases. Let's say it again: If tomorrow the Arab world unites and frees itself, if the United States loses the oil weapon, it will simply become a second-rate power within a multipolar world. However, it will be a big step forward for humanity: international relations will usher in a new course and peoples of the South will eventually be able to decide their own fate and be done with poverty.

Those for whom democracy is a threat

Former colonial or neocolonial powers swear that they have changed. After having financed, armed, advised and protected Ben Ali, now the United States, France and other countries are flooding us with moving statements. For instance, Hillary Clinton said, "We support Arab peoples' desire for democracy."

This is an utter lie. Certainly the United States and its allies certainly do not want democracy in the Arab world, nor do they want the Arabs to be able to decide on their oil or on any other wealth of theirs. So they did whatever they could to slow down the democracy process and keep the former leaders in power. And, when this plan fails, they impose their own chosen leaders whose task will be to crush peoples' resistance. For instance, the Egyptian government has recently taken tough anti-

strike action.

Justifying the war against Libya with the idea that after the events that happened in Tunisia and Egypt, Washington and Paris supposedly have understood and want to ease their conscience or at least restore their reputation, is thus just a big lie. Actually, the western policy with regard to the Arab world forms a whole that applies under three various forms: 1. Keeping repressive dictatorships in power. 2. Replacing Ben Ali and Mubarak with pawns under the control of the West. 3. Overthrowing the regimes in Tripoli, Damascus and Tehran in order to again colonize those 'lost' countries. Three approaches to achieve a single goal: keeping the Arab world under western domination to continue its exploitation.

Democracy becomes a threat when only the interests of a tiny social minority are represented. What frightens the United States is the fact that social discontent practically broke out in all the dictatorships in the Arab world. In Iraq - the Western media did not mention it by the way - many strikes broke up in several industries. Among them: the oil, textile and electricity supply industries, and other ones. In Kut, U.S. troops even surrounded a textile plant on strike. People demonstrated in sixteen of the eighteen provinces, irrespective of which community they belong to, against the corrupt government which abandons its people in poverty. In Bahrain, under the people's pressure, the king finally promised a financial aid to the value of \$2,650 for every family. In Oman, sultan Qaboos bin Said replaced half of the government members and increased the minimum salary by 40%, and ordered that 50,000 jobs be created. Even Saudi King Fahd released 36 million dollars to help low and medium income families!

Obviously one question immediately occurs to everyday people: but if they had all that money, why were they hiding it in their coffers? The next question is: How many more billions have they stolen from their peoples in complicity with the United States? And the last one: How can we put an end to this theft?

Facebook revolutions, an American plot or authentic?

A misinterpretation spread over the Internet: revolutions in the Arab world had been triggered and manipulated by the United States. It had pulled strings in order to carry out well-controlled changes in order to attack Libya, Syria and Iran. Everything had been made-up. The argument which supports this is that quasi-official organizations had invited to the U.S. and trained Arab cyber-activists who were instrumental in the spreading of news and symbolized a brand new type of revolution, the Facebook revolution.

The conspiracy argument does not hold water. Actually, the United States did anything it could to keep Mubarak - a very useful dictator - in power as long as possible. However, it knew that he was suffering from poor health and 'finished'. Of course it always draws up a Plan B, and even a Plan C. Plan B consisted of replacing Mubarak with one of his deputies. But, given the deep anger of the Egyptian people, there was little chance that it would work.

So, it had also prepared one, even several Plan C's, as it does by the way for basically every country it wants to control. What does it consist of? It bribes beforehand a few rebels and intellectuals - with or without them realizing it - and thus 'invest' in the future. When the time comes, they are brought to the forefront. How long this will work is another issue, as long as people are mobilized and a government, even a face-lifted one, cannot resolve the demands of the people, if its objective is to keep these people in a state of exploitation.

Talking about the Arab revolution movement as being a Facebook revolution is a myth that is convenient for the U.S. We pointed out, a long time ago, the critical importance of new means of information and mobilization on the internet, however it would be absurd to think that Facebook would replace social struggles and revolutions. This idea is convenient for big capitalists - whose representative was Mubarak - but in fact, what they fear most, is a workers' opposition movement, because it directly endangers their source of profit.

The role of the workers

Facebook is a means of struggle, not the essence of revolution. Presenting things in this way is a means to hide the role of the laboring class - in a broad sense - which would be replaced with internet. Actually, a revolution is an act through which those at the bottom dismiss those at the top, through a radical change not only of the members of the government but particularly of social exploitation relations.

Oops! According to our official great thinkers, we cannot use the phrase 'class struggle' any longer, which is supposedly out of date and even improper. Too bad for you, stockbroker Warren Buffet, the second richest man in the world, said some time ago, "There is class warfare in the U.S. all right, but it is my class, the rich class that is making war, and we are winning." (4) Well, Mr. Buffet, you should never swear to it before the end of the show! He who laughs last...

But the events in Tunisia and Egypt strengthen the idea of class struggle, in agreement with Mr. Buffet...When did Ben Ali pack up his bags and leave? On January 14, when Tunisian workers were involved in a general strike. When did Mubarak leave the throne? When a great strike of Egyptian workers halted textile firms, post offices, and even official media. Joel Beinin, professor in Stanford University and former head of the American University in Cairo, explains, "These last ten years, a big wave of social revolts had touched more than two million workers who participated in more than three thousand strikes, sit-ins, and other forms of protest. This was the background of the revolutionary uprising of the last few weeks...However, these past few days we saw tens of thousands of workers link their economic demands to the demand that Mubarak's regime be abolished..." (5)

The Arab revolution has just begun. After the first victories of the people, the ruling class, which is still in power, tries to appease the people by making tiny concessions. Obama wanted the people to calm down as quickly as possible, and everything to go back to square one. It can work for a while, but the Arab revolution is under way. It may take years, but it will be difficult to stop.

Fourth goal: hindering African unity

The richest continent on Earth, with a profusion of natural resources, Africa is also the poorest. 57% of the population lives below the poverty line, on less than \$1.25 a day.

The key to this mystery? Multinationals do not actually pay for these raw materials, they steal them. In Africa, they plunder resources, impose low salaries, unfavorable agreements and detrimental privatizations, blackmail and put any form of pressure to the weak states and cripple them with an unjust debt, put subservient dictators in power, trigger civil wars in the coveted regions.

Africa is strategically important for multinationals, because their prosperity depends on the plundering of these resources. If gold, copper, platinum, coltan, phosphate, diamonds and agricultural produce were paid a fair price, multinationals would be much less richer yet the local populations would be done with poverty. For American and European multinationals, it is absolutely vital to prevent Africa from uniting and being free. It must remain dependent. Here is a well stated example showed by Jean-Paul Pougala, an African author, "The story begins in 1992, when 45 African countries created RASCOM in order to have an African satellite and drop the call costs on the continent. The calling rate from and to Africa was then the highest one in the world, because each year Europe collected a five hundred million dollars tax on phone conversations, even on those within the same African country, for voice transit on European satellites such as Intelsat.

An African satellite cost only 400 million dollars payable for in one go, so there would be no need to pay 500 million dollars per year anymore. Would any banker not finance such a project? The most difficult equation to solve was: how can a slave free himself from servile exploitation by his master if he is asking for the latter's help in order to achieve this goal? So, the World Bank, the IMF, the U.S. and the European Union needlessly dangled these countries for fourteen years. In 2006, Gaddafi had

put an end to the needless begging from so-called Western benefactors who practice usurious loans; so the Libyan guide put 300 million dollars on the table. The African Development Bank offered 50 million, and the West African Development Bank gave 27 million. As a result of this, for the first time in its history, Africa has its very first communication satellite since December 26, 2007. Next, China and Russia followed suit, this time selling their technology and new satellites were launched: a South African one, a Nigerian one, an Angolan one, an Algerian one, and even a second African satellite was launched in July 2010. And now, we are expecting in 2020 the very first satellite 100% technologically African and built on the African soil, particularly in Algeria. This satellite has been made to compete with the best ones in the world, but costing ten times less, a real challenge.

This is how a simple token gesture of a measly 300 million dollars can change the life of a whole continent. Gaddafi's Libya made the West lose not only 500 million dollars per year but also billions of dollars of debts and interests that the debt itself could generate indefinitely and exponentially, thus contributing to the maintaining of the secret system which goal is to despoil Africa...It is Gaddafi's Libya which offers Africa its first true modern-day revolution : providing universal coverage of the whole continent for telephony, television, broadcasting and many other uses such as telemedicine and distance learning ; for the first time, a low-cost connection becomes available on the whole continent, even in rural areas thanks to the radio bridge system called WMAX." (6)

Well, here is something we have not been told about nasty Gaddafi! That he was helping African people to free themselves from the stifling tutelage of the West. Might there still be other secrets of this kind that remain unmentioned?

Gaddafi challenges the IMF and Obama plays the pickpocket

Yes, he did. By supporting the development of the African Monetary Fund (AMF), Gaddafi committed the crime of challenging the International Monetary Fund (IMF). We know that the IMF, which is controlled by the United States and Europe and whose president is Dominique Strauss-Kahn, purely and simply blackmails the developing countries. It provides loans only if countries accept getting rid of their companies in favor of multinationals, place unprofitable orders and cut their health and education budgets. In short, the IMF is very harmful. Well, just as Latin Americans launched their Banco Sur in order to counter the IMF and its arrogant blackmail and finance projects that are truly beneficial for them, now the AMF might start offering a freer path for Africans. What countries can finance the AMF? Algeria gave 16 billion, and Libya gave 10 billion. Together they supplied 62% of its capital.

But, Obama just robbed the Libyans of 30 billion, an act that went unnoticed to the media. How did that happen? On March 1, - long before the UN resolution was passed - he ordered the U.S. Department of Treasury to freeze Libyan deposits to the U.S. Then, on March 17, he managed to insert into the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1973 a little sentence which would allow the freezing of the deposits of the Libyan Central Bank but also of the Libyan National Oil Corporation. We know Gaddafi amassed riches that allowed him to invest in big European companies, in big development plans in Africa - and maybe in some European election campaigns too, but this does not seem to constitute any efficient form of life assurance! -... In brief, Libya is quite rich (with its cash reserves of 200 billion dollars) and it attracted the covetousness of one superpower which is heavily in debt: the United States. So, to embezzle the dozens of billions of dollars of the Libyan National Bank, in other words to go through the pockets of the Libyan people, Obama simply called all this a potential financing source for Gaddafi's regime. There you had it! A real pickpocket.

However hard he tried to coax the West by making concessions to neoliberalism, Gaddafi still worried the leaders of the United States. The American embassy in Tripoli deplored the resistance movements in a wire dating back to November 2007, "Those who run Libya politically and economically are more and more pursuing nationalist policies as regards the energy industry." Does anyone rejecting privatization anywhere deserve bombings? War is definitely the continuation of economy by different means.

Fifth goal: NATO as the watchdog of Africa

At first, NATO was supposed to protect Europe from the Soviet military threat. Then, once the USSR collapsed, NATO should have disappeared. But it was the very opposite that happened...

After having bombed Bosnia in 1995, Javier Solana, NATO's general secretary, said, "The experience acquired in Bosnia may act as a model for NATO's operations in the future." At that time, I wrote, "Actually, NATO is asking for a limitless sphere of action. Yugoslavia was the testing ground for the preparation of the next wars. Where will they take place?" (7) Then I suggested this answer: First axis: Eastern Europe. Second axis: The Mediterranean and the Middle East. Third axis: The third world in general." Here we are, this very program is underway now.

As early as 1999, NATO bombed Yugoslavia. A war to subject the country to neoliberalism, as we saw it. As I was studying the comments of American strategists, I pointed out a sentence from one of them, whose name is Stephen Blank, "NATO's operations will increasingly take place 'out of area'. Its main function would consist of being the vehicle for the integration of a steadily increasing number of regions into the western economic, security, political, cultural community." (8)

Subjecting an ever more increasing number of regions to the West! Then I wrote, "NATO is an army which serves globalization, it is the multinationals' army. Step by step, NATO is definitely turning into a watchdog of the world." (9) And I named the countries that would probably be the next targets of NATO forces: Afghanistan, the Caucasus, and a return to Iraq... just for a start.

Now that all of this really did happen, some people are asking, "Did you have a crystal ball?"

There is no need for a crystal ball, you only have to analyze the documents - which are not even classified - from the Pentagon and from the big offices where plans of action are elaborated and understand their logic.

In fact, this logic of the Empire is very simple: 1. The world is a source of profits. 2. If you want to win an economic war, you have to be the leading superpower. 3. And for that, you have to control raw materials and also be in control of the strategic regions and routes. 4. Any opposition to that control must be crushed through corruption, blackmail, or war, whatever the means. 5. In order to remain the leading superpower, it is absolutely necessary to prevent rivals from allying themselves against the master.

NATO expansion: already on three continents

In order to defend its economic interests and become the watchdog of the world, NATO leaders spread panic, "Our sophisticated, industrialized, and complex world had been assailed with a good many of fatal threats: climate change, drought, famine, cyber safety, and energy issues." (10) non military matters, but social and environmental ones are used as excuses for increasing armament and military interventions.

Actually, NATO's goal is to substitute itself for the UN With the militarization of the world, our future becomes increasingly dangerous. And of course this has a terrible cost: the United States allows, for the year 2011, a record military budget of 708 billion dollars. That is to say 2,320 dollars per inhabitant! That is twice as much as Bush during the first days of his mandate. Moreover, U.S. secretary of Defense Robert Gates constantly urges Europeans to spend more, "The demilitarization of Europe is an obstacle to security and to a lasting peace in the 21st century." (11) European countries had to promise Washington not to decrease their military spending. It is a great deal for arms factories. The world-wide expansion of NATO has nothing to do with Gaddafi, Saddam Hussein or Milosevic. It has to do with a global strategy to maintain the domination on the planet and its resources, maintain the profits of the multinationals, and prevent peoples to choose their own path. NATO protected Ben Ali, Mubarak and the tyrants in Saudi Arabia, it will protect those who will succeed them, and it will only crush those who oppose the Empire.

In order to become the watchdog of the world, NATO is indeed moving forward step by step. A war in

Europe against Yugoslavia, a war in Asia against Afghanistan, and now a war in Africa against Libya. That comes to three continents! It had been tempted to intervene in Latin America too, by organizing operations against Venezuela two years ago. But then it was too risky, because Latin America is more and more united and refuses U.S. 'watchdogs'.

Why does Washington absolutely want to settle NATO as the watchdog of Africa? Because of the new balance of power in international relations that we studied earlier: the decline of the United States, which are being questioned by Germany, Russia, Latin America, China, and even by small and medium sized Third World countries.

What about Africom?

What worries Washington the most is China's growing power. Proposing more egalitarian relations with Asian, African and Latin American countries, buying raw materials at better prices and without using colonialist blackmail, proposing more attractive loans, and developing infrastructure projects useful for development, China offers an alternative to subordination to Washington, London or Paris. So what can be done to block China's rise?

The trouble is that a power in economic decline has less means of applying financial pressure, even on African countries, the United States thus decided to play its best card: the military card. We have to bear in mind that its defense expenditure are higher than those of all the other countries in the world put together. For many years, it has been moving forward its pawns on the African continent. On October 1, 2008, the U.S.A. set up AFRICOM (Africa command). All of Africa (except Egypt) was placed under the unified command of the U.S., including the U.S. Army, the U.S. Navy, the U.S. Air Force, the U.S. Marine Corps Forces and the U.S. Special Operation Command (landings, coups, clandestine operations...). The aim being to repeat the same process with NATO in order to support the U.S. forces. Washington, which sees terrorists everywhere, found some in Africa too. And they just happened to be around Nigerian oil and other coveted natural resources. So, if you want to know where the next episodes of the famous « war on terror » will take place, just find oil, uranium and coltan on the map, that's all. Besides, as Islam is spread among many of those countries, including Nigeria, now you already know the next scenario for intervention.

The true objective of Africom: stabilizing Africa's subordination to the U.S., prevent Africa from liberating itself and becoming a dependent force that might ally itself with China and Latin America. Africom is an essential weapon in the United States' project of global domination. The U.S. wants to be able to lean on Africa and its natural resources which would be under its exclusive control in this great battle to be in control of Asia and its sea routes. Indeed, the decisive economic battle of the 21st century is already taking place in Asia. But it is a big job, with opponents such as a very strong China and a group of emerging economies that would be well advised to join forces. So Washington wants to be in control of all of Africa and close the door on China.

The war against Libya is thus a first step to impose Africom on the whole African continent. It ushers in an era of new wars, not an era of pacification. In Africa, in the Middle-East, but also all round the Indian Ocean, between Africa and China.

Why the Indian Ocean? Because if you look it up on a map, you can see it is the gate to China and the whole Asia. So, in order to be in control of this ocean, Washington tries to subject several strategic regions: 1. The Middle-East and the Persian Gulf, hence its tension towards countries such as Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Bahrain, and Iran. 2. The horn of Africa, hence its aggressiveness towards Somalia and Eritrea. We will come back on these geo-strategies in our forthcoming book entitled Understanding the Muslim world - interviews with Mohamed Hassan.

Gaddafi's GREAT crime

Let us go back to Libya. Within the context of the battle to control the continent, North Africa is a major objective. By developing about ten army bases in Tunisia, Morocco, Algeria, as well as in other

countries in Africa, Washington would lead the way for itself to establish a complete network of army bases over the whole continent.

But Africom met with strong opposition from African countries. In a highly symbolical way, none of them was willing to host Africom's headquarters. So Washington had to headquarter it in...Stuttgart in Germany, which is very humiliating. From this viewpoint, the war to overthrow Gaddafi is basically a very clear warning to the leaders in Africa, who might be tempted to follow a too independent path.

Here is Gaddafi's big crime: Libya had accepted to be linked neither with Africom nor with NATO. The United States used to have an important army base in Libya. But Gaddafi shut it down in 1969. Obviously, the aim of this current war is to reoccupy Libya in particular. It would be a strategic outpost to intervene militarily in Egypt if the latter escapes from U.S. control.

Which countries in Africa are targeted next?

So, the next question is: after Libya, who's next? Which other African countries might be attacked by the United States? This is simple. If Yugoslavia was attacked because it refused to join NATO, one only has to check the list of countries which refused to join Africom, under U.S. military command. There are five of them: Libya, Sudan, Ivory Coast, Zimbabwe, and Eritrea. Here are the next targets.

Sudan has been divided and put under the pressure of international sanctions. Zimbabwe is also under international sanctions. Ivory Coast has been handed a civil war fomented by the West. Eritrea has been imposed a terrible war by Ethiopia - an instrument of the U.S. in that region - and is also under sanctions.

All these countries were or will be the subject of propaganda or disinformation campaigns. It does not matter either they are ruled by virtuous and democratic leaders or not. Eritrea is trying an autonomous social and economic development experience, refusing the financial assistance that the World Bank and the IMF, which are under the control of Washington, wish to impose. This small country is achieving the first successes in its development, but it is under international threat. If other countries go bad, the United States will also have its eye on them. Especially Algeria. In fact, following one's chosen path is quite risky.

And for those who would still think that all this is just a conspiracy theory, that the U.S. does not so much plan wars but improvises in reaction to current events, let us remind them of what ex-general Wesley Clark declared (supreme commander of NATO forces in Europe between 1997 and 2001, who supervised the bombings in Yugoslavia), "In 2001, at the Pentagon, a general told me: I just received a classified memo from the Secretary of Defense; we will take seven countries in five years, starting with Iraq, then Syria, Lebanon, Somalia, Sudan and finally, Iran." (12) There is a difference between dreams and reality, but the plans are already worked out. They are just delayed.

[1] Marianna Lepore, *The war in Libya and Italian interests*, *inaltreparole.net*, Feb. 22.

[2] Ron Fraser, *Libya accelerates German-Arabian peninsula alliance*, *Trumpet.com*, March 21.

[3] Michel Collon, *Israël, parlons-en*, *Bruxelles 2010*, p. 172.

[4] *New York Times Magazine*, Nov. 2006.

[5] *Radio interview Democracy Now*, Feb. 10.

[6] J-P Pougaldas, *Les mensonges de la guerre contre la Libye*, *palestine-solidarite.org*, March 31.

[7] Michel Collon, *Poker menteur*, *Bruxelles*, 1998, p 160-168.

[8] *NATO after enlargement*, *US Army War College*, 1998, p. 97.

[9] Michel Collon, *Monopoly – L'Otan à la conquête du monde*, *Bruxelles 2000*, pp. 90 et 102).

[10] *Assemblée commune Otan – Lloyd's à Londres*, Oct.1 2009.

[11] *NATO Strategic Concept seminar*, *Washington*, Feb. 23, 2010.

[12] *Radio interview Democracy Now*, March2, 2007.



Understanding the war in Libya (III)

*Michel Collon **

IN every war it is. At first, it is almost impossible to oppose. The media hype is such that one is immediately branded as an accomplice to a monster. After a while, when will the "mistakes", the dead civilians, the military failures and revelations about "our friends", the debate will eventually open. But initially it is very hard.

To unlock this debate, the battle of information is key, as we have said. And this battle can be fought by us all, wherever he is, according to people we met, listening to what influences them, verifying information with them, patiently ... To effectively conduct this debate, it is very important to study the experience of misinformation in previous wars.

The 5 principles of war propaganda applied to Libya

This experience, we have summarized in the "five principles of war propaganda", as outlined in our book *Israel*, talk about in every war, the media wants to convince us that our governments are well and why they apply these five principles: 1. Obscure economic interests. 2. Invert the victim and the aggressor. 3. Hide history. 4. Demonize. 5. Monopolize the news.

These five principles were applied again against Libya; it will be reported in the previous pages. Finally, draw attention to the fourth: the demonization of the opponent. The going-in-war must still persuade the public that they do not act to obtain economic or strategic, but to eliminate a serious threat. In every war for decades opposing the ruler was always presented as cruel, immoral and dangerous, with the worst atrocity stories. Afterwards, many of these stories – and sometimes all – were deflated, but regardless, they had served their purpose: to manipulate the emotions of the public to stop analyzing the interests really at stake is no going back.

We did not have the means to go to Libya. By cons, we were in Yugoslavia, under the NATO bombings, and we found, and proved that NATO had systematically lied. [1] We have seen also in Iraq. As for Libya, it looks great, but so far we have not had the means to carry out test-media information presented. Investig'Action our team still lacks the necessary resources. But several commentators have already identified strong indications of misinformation. For example, "6,000 victims of Qadhafi's bombing on civilians". Where are the pictures? There were no cameras, no cell phone there as there were in Gaza, Tahrir Square, in Tunis or in Bahrain? No evidence, no reliable evidence, denials by Russian satellites or observers of the EU, yet the news has turned loop endlessly and no one dares to contradict the fear of being accused of "complicity".

A civil war is never lace, but this is true on both sides. A partial info will always try to make us believe that atrocities were committed on one side and therefore need to support each other. But we must be very careful about such stories.

Who informs us? What you should be able to show us around is that the demonization does not fall from the sky. It is broadcast by the media that take advantage, often without saying so. And it's still always the first question to ask in a war: was I heard the other side?

Why Europe and the United States, the media they are thoroughly against Gadhafi? And why in Latin America, Africa, Asia, Russia, denounces. Does it instead a new imperialist crusade? They all are wrong? Westerners always know everything better? Or is it all influenced by its media? So, should we blindly follow our media or challenge.

We were thoroughly watered on the negative sides of Gaddafi. But we pointed out the positive aspects? We talked about his support for African development projects? Who said we knew that Libya, as international institutions, the highest "human development index" throughout Africa, ahead

of the darlings of the West such as Egypt or Tunisia? Life expectancy: 74 years, reduced to 5% illiteracy, the education budget to 2.7% of GDP and that of Defence to 1.1%.

Distinguish two different issues

There are a lot of intimidations in the intellectual debate on Libya. If you denounce the war against Libya, they accuse you of supporting anything done by Gaddafi. Not at all. There are two very different problems.

On the one hand, the Libyans have every right to choose their leaders, and change through whatever means they deem necessary. The Libyans! Not Obama or Sarkozy. While sorting through the charges against Gaddafi, between what is really established and what is propaganda concerned, a liberal may well wish that the Libyans have a better leader.

On the other hand, when Libya is under attack because hackers want to get its hands on its oil, its reserves and its strategic position, then it must be said that the Libyan people will suffer even more under the power of the pirates and their puppets. Libya loses its oil, its companies, its national bank reserves, social services and dignity. Neoliberalism will apply its recipes which have plunged other peoples into poverty.

But a good leader, it never happens in the suitcases of the invaders and bombs. What the U.S. has brought to Iraq is an Al-Maliki and a small group of corrupt officials who sold their country to the multinationals. In Iraq, there is still no democracy, but also, we lost the oil, electricity, water, schools and everything that makes life a little dignity. What the United States led in Afghanistan, Karzai is one that reigns over nothing but a district of Kabul, while U.S. bombs hit villagers, wedding parties, schools and the drug trade has never been so good.

Leaders who are imposed on Libya by Western bombs would be worse than Gaddafi. So, we must support the legal government of Libya when he resists what is really a neo-colonial aggression. Because all solutions prepared by Washington and its allies are bad: whether the overthrow or assassination of Gaddafi, either splitting the country into two or whether the "Somaliaization", ie ie a low intensity civil war and long duration. All these solutions will bring suffering to the people.

The only solution in the interest of the Libyans is negotiating with international mediators who are not disinterested party to the conflict, as Lula. A good agreement implies respect for Libyan sovereignty, maintaining the unity of the country, preparing for democratic reforms and an end to regional discrimination.

Enforcing the law is not the right to intervene

We are told that the United States today is much more respectful of international law at the time of the cowboy Bush, and there was this time a UN resolution. This is not the place to discuss whether the UN really represents the democratic will of the people or if the votes of many states are the subject of buying and pressures. But we will simply note that the resolution 1973 violates international law and, first of all, the Magna Carta ... the UN itself.

Indeed, Article 2 § 7 states: "Nothing in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially the domestic jurisdiction of any State. ". Suppress an armed insurrection is the responsibility of a State even if one can regret the consequences. Anyway, if armed rebels bomb is considered an intolerable crime, then there is an urgent need to judge Bush and Obama for what they have done in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Similarly, Article 39 limits the cases where the constraint member is authorized: "The threat against the peace, breach of peace or act of aggression" (cons another country). Libya did not match any of these three cases, and this war is therefore also illegal. A note, just for laughs, even the NATO treaty states as Article 1: "The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle

by peaceful means all international disputes in which they may be involved.

We present this "right of humanitarian intervention" as a novelty and a great step forward. In reality, the right of interference has been practiced for centuries by colonial powers against countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America - by the strong against the weak. And it is precisely to stop this gunboat diplomacy have been enacted in 1945, new rules of international law. The United Nations Charter specifically prohibits a strong country to invade weak countries and the principle of state sovereignty is progress in history. Cancel this conquest of 1945 and return to the right of intervention is going back to colonial times.

So for us to approve a war still very interested, we play a chord: the right of intervention would be needed to save people in danger. Such excuses were also used in time by France, Great Britain or Belgium colonial. And all the imperial wars of the United States have made with this kind of justification.

With the United States and its allies in the police world, the right of interference obviously always belong to the strong against the weak, and never the reverse. Iran has the right to intervene to save the Palestinians? Venezuela has the right to intervene to end the bloody coup in Honduras? Russia has the right to intervene to protect Bahrainis.

In reality, the war against Libya is a precedent that paves the way for armed intervention of the United States or its allies in any Arab country, African or Latin American. Today, we will kill thousands of Libyan civilians "to protect them," and tomorrow they will kill civilians Syrian or Iranian or Venezuelan or Eritrean "to protect them" while the Palestinians and all other victims of 'Strong' continue to suffer dictatorship and massacre. ...

Show that Western intervention violates the law and brings us back to colonial times seems to put a theme central to the debate.

What to do? The United States has called "Dawn of the Odyssey the war against Libya. However, their code names always contain a message to our unconscious. The Odyssey, a classic ancient Greek literature, recounts the journey undertaken by Ulysses twenty years across the universe. A half-words, we are told here that Libya is the first act of the long journey from the United States to (re) conquer Africa.

They thus attempt to halt their decline. But ultimately, this will be in vain; the U.S. will inevitably lose their throne. Because this decline is not due to chance or special circumstances, it is due to their very mode of operation. The famous theorist of liberal capitalism, Adam Smith has warned a long time ago, "The economy of any country that practices slavery of blacks is in the process of initiating a descent into hell that will be tough the day when other nations will wake up."

But in fact the U.S. has replaced slavery with another. In the twentieth century, they built their prosperity on domination and pillage of entire countries, they lived like parasites and they have thereby weakened their internal economic capacities. Mankind has an interest in this system permanently terminated. Even the population of the United States there is interest. For one stops to close its factory, destroy jobs and confiscating their houses to pay the bonuses of bankers and war spending. Europe's population also has an interest in an economy rather than serving multinationals and their wars, but to serve people.

We're at a turning point, what "Dawn" will we choose? That announced by the United States, and that will lead to twenty or thirty years of incessant warfare on all continents? Or a true dawn: another system of international relations, where no one will impose its interests by force and where each people freely choose its path?

As in every war the last twenty years, much confusion in the European left. The pseudo-humanitarian discourse relayed by the media blinds us and we forget to listen to other versions, to study previous

wars, to challenge the information.

[1] Kosovo, NATO and the media, debate between Michel Collon, Jamie Shea (NATO Spokesman) and Olivier Corten (Professor of International Law), June 23, 2000, Investig'Action DVD.

* **Belgian writer and historian**



"Bridges Against Walls" by Antonio Guerrero, one of the Cuban Five imprisoned in the U.S.