

Von: info\_ak\_sued\_nord-bounces@ippnw.de [mailto:info\_ak\_sued\_nord-bounces@ippnw.de] Im Auftrag von Amir Mortasawi  
Gesendet: Sonntag, 3. Juli 2011 08:32  
An: AK Süd-Nord  
Betreff: [Info\_ak\_sued\_nord] Filmdokumentation über den zeitlichen Ablauf der Ereignisse, die zum offenen NATO-Krieg gegen Libyen führten

**Die folgende Videoaufnahme über die aktuellen Aktivitäten der amerikanischen Friedensbewegung gegen den NATO-Krieg in Afrika dauert ca. drei Stunden. Ab ca. 1:40:00 in dieser Videoaufnahme ist eine Filmdokumentation über den zeitlichen Ablauf der Ereignisse, die zum offenen NATO-Krieg gegen Libyen führten, zu sehen.**

<http://tv.globalresearch.ca/2011/06/eyewitness-libya-tour-harlem-usa>

**Eyewitness Libya Tour in Harlem, USA**  
by grtv

**Cynthia McKinney brings her national tour to Harlem on June 25, 2011 to discuss the results of her fact-finding mission to Libya earlier in the month.**

**Speakers include Don DeBar, Viola Plummer, Ramsey Clark, Brian Becker, Akbar Muhammed and Cynthia McKinney.**

\*\*\*\*\*

The War Against Libya

By Cynthia McKinney  
<http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=25450>

[Global Research](#), June 30, 2011

A hearty group of protesters representing several community organizations showed up today to protest the vote of civil rights icon and Member of Congress from Atlanta, John Lewis, to continue funding for the bombing of Libya. The Congressman interrupted his schedule and heard the frustrations of his constituents who are outraged at the quiescence of Congress, the Congressional Black Caucus, and the Progressive Caucus in light of President Obama's policy to bomb Africa. As we were meeting with the Congressman, President Obama was addressing the country on national television defending his actions in Libya. The Congressman reiterated his antipathy to war by saying that "war is obsolete." The group asked the Congressman to be unequivocal in future votes and deny funding for President Obama's current wars.

Meanwhile, while we were meeting with Congressman Lewis, President Obama was speaking to the nation. Incredibly, the President demeaned national and Congressional concern for his war policy as "fuss" by saying, "A lot of this fuss is politics." I think those of us who want our country to work for peace should let this President know what "fuss" really looks like.

Below are my remarks at our event today and video will soon be on its way. Below that, see what the President calls "fuss." Our concern is a matter of life and death for the people of Libya who deserve to be able to exercise their rights without the shock and awe of NATO bombs and missiles.

1.

Cynthia McKinney  
Remarks  
Press Conference on War Against Libya  
Atlanta, Georgia (in front of Congressman John Lewis's District Office)  
29 June 2011

At a time when the American people have been asked to tighten their belts, teachers are receiving pink slips, the vital statistics of the American people reveal a health care crisis in the making, and the U.S. government is in serious threat of default, our President and Congress have decided that a new war, this time against the people of Libya, is appropriate. This comes at a time when the U.S., by one estimate, spends approximately \$3 billion per week for war against Iraq and Afghanistan. The President and Congress continue to fund the war against Libya despite the fact that Secretary of Defense Robert Gates announced that the U.S. had no strategic interest in Libya; and despite the fact that the Senate Chairwoman of the Select Committee on Intelligence admits that the U.S. really does not know who the "rebels" are; while the rebels themselves, according to a Telegraph report of 25 March 2011, admit that Al Qaeda elements are among their ranks. So while the apparatus of our government has been used for over ten years to inform the American people and the global community that Al Qaeda is an enemy of freedom-loving people all over the world, our President chooses to ally our military with none other than Al Qaeda elements in Libya and other people whom U.S. intelligence say they do not know.

Additionally, U.S. Admiral Locklear admitted to a Member of Congress that one of NATO's missions was to assassinate Muammar Qaddafi. And, indeed, NATO bombs have killed Qaddafi's son and three grandchildren, just as US bombs in 1986 killed his daughter. NATO bombs just recently killed the grandchildren of one of Qaddafi's associates in a targeted assassination attempt. Targeted assassination is not within the scope of the United Nations Security Council Resolution and targeted assassination is against U.S. law, international law, international humanitarian law, and international human rights law. Targeted assassination is also a crime. We certainly cannot encourage others to abide by the law when we so openly break it.

While in Libya, I witnessed NATO's targeting of civilians: NATO bombs and missiles landed in residential neighborhoods, hit schools, exploded near hospitals, destroyed parts of the public broadcasting infrastructure, and narrowly missed killing students at Al Fateh University. When civilians are targeted in war, or "low kinetic" activities, crimes are committed.

NATO practices in Libya are exactly like Israel's practices in Gaza: fishermen are killed as they go about their fishing business, a naval blockade allows arms to flow to NATO's Libyan allies, but stops food, fuel, and medicine from entering non-NATO ally-held areas. The entire population suffers as a result. Collective punishment is illegal when Israel practices it against the people of Gaza and collective punishment is illegal when NATO practices it.

NATO and hyperbolic press accounts have introduced a kind of race hatred that the Libyan people have been trying hard to erase. Approximately 50% of Libya looks like me. Innocent darker skinned Libyans have been targeted, tortured, harassed, and killed.

The people of Libya have the right to self-determination. They have a right to "resource nationalism." They have a right to live in peace. They have a right to determine their future and they need not exercise their rights underneath the shock and awe of NATO bombs and missiles.

\*\*\*\*\*

Libya: The Latest Product in Canada's Ugly War Assembly Line

By Murray Dobbin

[Global Research](#), June 23, 2011

[Rabble.ca](#) - 2011-06-20

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=25378>

NATO members, including Canada, are continuing their massive bombing campaign against Libya in a war that may just break the record for the casual breaking of international law, and for lying about the motives for the war.

There is no mandate to engage in "regime change," yet everyone, including the Harper government, openly admits that that is, in fact, what they are doing. Canada has stated that only the removal of Gaddafi will satisfy NATO. Not the United Nations -- which gave a mandate to protect civilians from the

Libyan government's attacks -- but NATO, that alliance whose mandate is supposed to be the mutual self defence of nations of the north Atlantic.

No one refers to this war against Libya as a criminal conspiracy but the term would be perfectly appropriate. And I suppose we should not be surprised that an organization that constantly violates its own mandate can hardly be expected to wince at violating someone else's they have taken over. NATO, with almost no comment from anywhere, has become a military intervention agency aimed at protecting Western industrial nations -- not from military threat but from an economic one: the threat of higher oil prices and the gradual loss of its dominant access to Middle East oil and gas.

There seems to be so little public interest in this war that its perpetrators lie like six year olds next to a cookie jar because so far they have largely gotten away with it. As the war was quickly transformed from protecting civilians to getting "the evil G," all the western governments thought they had to do was show photos of Colonel Gaddafi looking demented or telling stories about his eccentric behaviour in order to pacify their populations.

Canadians actually oppose the extension of the war by a substantial margin (over 2:1 in an informal Globe and Mail poll) but so long as the media goes along with the lies (The CBC as recent as June 1 reported: "Canada is helping to enforce a no-fly zone as part of a multinational operation.") and opposition parties rubber-stamp the mayhem, the Harper war machine (some 650 troops and over a dozen fighter bombers) can continue its assaults politically unscathed.

There are so many things about this war that are farcical, dishonest, amateurish, and just plain morally wrong that Canada and the other warmongers have given up serious efforts at justifying it. They have just recognized a rag tag National Transition Council as the "legitimate representative" of the Libyan people despite that fact that it can demonstrate no unity of any kind except its own lust for power. It has no plans for democracy and no stated vision for the country post-Gadhafi. Behind the scenes the NATO geniuses running the show admit they have absolutely no idea what the country would look like if this disparate gang of unelected and unrepresentative opportunists ever got to exercise power.

The constant talk of "war crimes" and "crimes against humanity" seem equally opportunistic and just a bit too predictable -- NATO cover fire for its blatant violation of international law and the UN mandate and its own killing of civilians (inevitable in an air war). The charges of rape being used systematically as a weapon of war so far have no credible evidence that [the UN can agree on](#) and it reminds me of the gruesome tearing-babies-from- incubators story that was created by p.r. firm Hill and Knowlton [sell the first Iraq war to the U.S. public](#).

There are big risks here for NATO and the U.S. (Canada is just an embarrassment, lap-dogging for the U.S. in a manner even more blatant than in Afghanistan). The U.S. knows it and was so terrified of the reaction on the Arab street to yet another war against a Muslim country that it had to pretend to be acting in a support role. Much of the EU knows it, too, which is why several have been reluctant partners in a war against a country that exports most of its oil to them. The coalition of the not-that-willing is getting more tenuous even as the "mission" gets extended.

So what is it that makes eliminating Gaddafi worth the risk of years of chaos in Libya -- and worth enduring the repeated accusations of hypocrisy as Syria and Bahrain went (and go) completely unpunished for what is actual murderous assaults on (unarmed) civilians?

It's not just oil but that seems to have been the tipping point as AsiaTimes.com columnist Pepe Escobar wrote back in March. [According to Escobar](#), Gaddafi declared on March 15 "We do not trust [Western oil] firms, they have conspired against us... Our oil contracts are going to Russian, Chinese and Indian firms." The bombing, led by Britain and France, began a few days later. Much has been made of the surging BRIC countries -- Brazil, Russia, Indian and China -- but the notion that these competitors with NATO economies might get their hands on Libyan oil may have been too much for the already vulnerable Europeans and their reluctant supporters in Washington.

The only certain outcome if Gaddafi falls will be that the country's oil, now nationalized, will end up in the hands of Western oil companies.

But it is not just the oil. Belying Gaddafi's image as nothing more than an eccentric or even insane, he has been responsible more than any other African leader for creating independent institutions that challenge those of the West -- including the IMF. For years, Africa was forced to pay exorbitant fees -- \$500 million a year -- to use European communications satellites for telephone, TV and radio service. The African countries could not raise the money for their own satellite until Gaddafi put up \$300 million of the \$400 million needed. African countries now pay a small fraction of what they used to pay. EU companies lost their privilege of plundering Africa.

No living Africa leader can take us much credit for giving direction to the African Union than Gaddafi and he get no thanks from Western countries and their institutions. The U.S. has illegally frozen \$30 billion belonging to the Libyan State Bank, assets that were, [according to African writer Jean-Paul Pougala](#) "...earmarked as the Libyan contribution to three key projects which would add the finishing touches to the African federation -- the African Investment Bank in Syrte, Libya, the establishment in

2011 of the African Monetary Fund to be based in Yaounde with a US\$42 billion capital fund, and the Abuja-based African Central Bank in Nigeria."

The African Monetary Fund is expected to completely eliminate the pernicious influence of the IMF and its enforced privatization agenda. Failed efforts by the West at scuttling African unity by setting up regional alliances are back on the table in anticipation of Gaddafi's fall.

Once again the simple rule of follow the money -- and the power -- applies if you want to discover the real reasons behind NATO and U.S. adventures. Gaddafi has been a thorn in the side of the West for a long time -- a much bigger thorn as a force for unity in Africa than he ever was when he supported terrorism.

I happened to watch the NDP members of Parliament voting in favour of the extension of the Libyan war on television as it was happening -- a depressing sight when you know that Jack Layton and his advisers are fully aware that this conflict has nothing to do with humanitarianism and everything to do with imperialism. The NDP tried to camouflage its loss of principle by making soft amendments that Harper had no problem with because they did nothing to alter the reality of our unjustifiable intervention in that country. How it now intends to oppose the purchase of \$30 billion worth of fighter bombers, designed for exactly this kind of adventure, is anyone's guess.

The 70 per cent of Canadians who say they opposed the three-and-a-half month extension can be thankful to the Green Party's Elizabeth May, who refused unanimous consent to the motion. She was the only principled MP in the House on that day.

Murray Dobbin is a guest senior contributing editor for [rabble.ca](http://rabble.ca), and has been a journalist, broadcaster, author and social activist for 40 years. He writes rabble's bi-weekly State of the Nation column, which is also found at [theyee.ca](http://theyee.ca).

\*\*\*\*\*

Americans Shift to More Negative View of Libya Military Action  
Now more likely to disapprove than approve

By Jeffrey M. Jones

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=25403>

[Global Research](#), June 26, 2011

[Gallup](#)

PRINCETON, NJ -- Americans are more likely to say they disapprove than approve of the U.S. military action in Libya. That represents a shift from three months ago, just after the mission began, when approval exceeded disapproval.

The results are based on a Gallup poll conducted June 22. The House of Representatives is set to vote on resolutions that would limit the U.S. role in Libya, partly because of questions about whether the mission violates the War Powers Act since President Obama did not obtain congressional authorization for it. The U.S. sent forces to Libya in March as part of a multinational force to protect rebels in that country from attacks by Libyan President Moammar Gadhafi.

Democrats are the only political group to show more support for than opposition to the U.S. involvement. Independents are the most likely to show opposition, with a majority disapproving.

Republicans' opinions have changed the most since March, moving to 39% approval from 57%. This likely reflects increased criticism of the mission's legality and cost from some Republican congressional leaders and presidential candidates. Independents' views have become slightly more negative over the last three months, while Democrats' opinions have been largely stable.

Opposition Mainly Because of Substance, Rather Than Legality, of Military Operation

The poll sought to explore Americans' reasons for opposition to the operation by asking those who disapprove whether they disagree with the substance of the policy or with how it was executed. Most who disapprove, 64%, do so because they do not think the U.S. should be in Libya at all. Just under a third, 29%, disapprove because they do not think the president obtained the necessary approval from Congress to conduct the operation.

Republicans who disapprove divide about equally between saying the U.S. should not be in Libya (48%) and saying the president did not go through the proper procedures (46%).

Supporters View Gadhafi Removal as Ultimate Goal

The stated goal of the military operation was to protect Libyan citizens from attacks by the country's government, but the obvious question is whether the ultimate goal should be removal of the

government, namely, President Gadhafi, from power. The poll asked those who approve of the mission whether the U.S. action should continue until Gadhafi is removed from power, and the vast majority, 85%, agree.

#### Implications

Gallup found initial support for the U.S. mission in Libya low compared with other recent U.S. military engagements. As the operation continues into its fourth month, and with increased criticism of the effort from political leaders, it is not surprising that support for it has eroded. It is still unclear whether Congress will ultimately limit the mission in Libya or authorize it to continue. The president's Wednesday announcement of troop withdrawals from Afghanistan shows he is sensitive to pressure to scale down U.S. military operations abroad as the U.S. struggles to improve the economy and get the federal budget deficit under control.

#### Survey Methods

Results for this Gallup poll are based on telephone interviews conducted June 22, 2011, on the Gallup Daily tracking survey, with a random sample of 999 adults, aged 18 and older, living in all 50 U.S. states and the District of Columbia.

For results based on the total sample of national adults, one can say with 95% confidence that the maximum margin of sampling error is  $\pm 4$  percentage points.

Interviews are conducted with respondents on landline telephones and cellular phones, with interviews conducted in Spanish for respondents who are primarily Spanish-speaking. Each sample includes a minimum quota of 400 cell phone respondents and 600 landline respondents per 1,000 national adults, with additional minimum quotas among landline respondents for gender within region. Landline telephone numbers are chosen at random among listed telephone numbers. Cell phone numbers are selected using random-digit-dial methods. Landline respondents are chosen at random within each household on the basis of which member had the most recent birthday.

Samples are weighted by gender, age, race, Hispanic ethnicity, education, region, adults in the household, and phone status (cell phone only/landline only/both, cell phone mostly, and having an unlisted landline number). Demographic weighting targets are based on the March 2010 Current Population Survey figures for the aged 18 and older non-institutionalized population living in U.S. telephone households. All reported margins of sampling error include the computed design effects for weighting and sample design.

In addition to sampling error, question wording and practical difficulties in conducting surveys can introduce error or bias into the findings of public opinion polls.

Polls conducted entirely in one day, such as this one, are subject to additional error or bias not found in polls conducted over several days.

[View methodology, full question results, and trend data.](#)

For more details on Gallup's polling methodology, visit [www.gallup.com](http://www.gallup.com).