

افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نیاشد تن من مباد بدین بوم ویر زنده یک تن مباد
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

www.afgazad.com

afgazad@gmail.com

European Languages

زبان های اروپایی

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/is-kissing-a-state-sponsor-of-terrorism-a-terrorist-act/5332856?print=1>

Kissing a “State Sponsor of Terrorism” a “Terrorist Act”?

By Prof Michel Chossudovsky

April 25, 2013

In the immediate wake of the 9/11 attacks, George W. Bush stated in no uncertain terms that “State sponsors of terrorism” would be considered as “terrorists”.

“We will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them”.

But there is always an “Exception that the Proves the Rule” and that is George W. Bush himself.

When George W. Bush respectfully kisses King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia, does this mean that Dubya could –by some stretch of the imagination– be considered a “suspected terrorist”, who should never have been elected president of the United States of America?

The answer is negative: Kissing “State sponsors of terrorism” on the mouth is not defined by the FBI as “suspicious behavior”.



The Global War on Terrorism's "New Normal": "Good Guy" Terrorists

Establishing political ties with "State sponsors of terrorism" is now considered to be part of a "New Normal", a humanitarian endeavor intent upon spreading American democracy Worldwide.

NATO calls it "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P).

John Kerry concurs: financial aid to Syria's Al Nusra, an affiliate of Al Qaeda is part of an R2P mandate.

There are now "good guy terrorists" and "bad guy terrorists".

Financial aid is channeled to Al Qaeda "good guy terrorists" to protect Syrians against the terrorists (New York Times, April 20, 2013)



Al Nusra “Good Guy Terrorists” supported by John Kerry

The Bush and bin Laden Families

Now let us turn our attention to the Bin Laden Family.

The Bushes and bin Ladens are long-time friends.

We know that the late Osama bin Laden was a “bad guy”: “Enemy Number One”.

He is a disgrace to members of the bin Laden family, who reluctantly provided him with “pocket money”, which was used to develop Al Qaeda (The Base). He is referred to as a “Black Sheep”.

There is nothing wrong, therefore, in socializing and doing business with family members of terror mastermind Osama bin Laden, including the late Salem bin Laden and Shafiq bin Laden of the Carlyle Group.

Its all part of a “good guys project” of going after Osama, the “Black Sheep”, and waging the “Global War on Terrorism”.

Confirmed by the Washington Post, “fellow investors” of the Carlyle Group Osama’s brother Shafiq bin Laden and former President H.G.W. Bush met at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel one day before 9/11 (see image below):

It didn’t help that as the World Trade Center burned on Sept. 11, 2001, the news interrupted a Carlyle business conference at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel here attended by a brother of Osama bin Laden [Shafiq bin Laden]. Former president Bush [senior, see image above], a fellow investor, had been with him at the conference the previous day. (Greg Schneider, Pairing the Powerful With the Rich, Washington Post, March 16, 2003)



Shafiq bin Laden, Osama's brother and member of the Carlyle Group meets George H. W. Bush at Ritz Carlton on September 10, 2001 (Source: Michael Moore, Fahrenheit 911)

Launched on September 11, 2001, President George W. Bush is the political architect of the “Global War on Terrorism” commonly referred to as GWOT.

On the evening of September 11, 2001, president George W. Bush pronounced a historic speech in which he defined the relationship between “terrorists” and “state sponsors of terrorism”:

The search is underway for those who are behind these evil acts. I've directed the full resources of our intelligence and law enforcement communities to find those responsible and to bring them to justice. *We will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them.*

In a subsequent address to the joint session of the House of Representatives and the Senate on September 20, 2001:

“We will starve terrorists of funding, turn them one against another, drive them from place to place, until there is no refuge or no rest. And we will pursue nations that provide aid or safe haven to terrorism. Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. (Applause.) *From this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime [state sponsor of terrorism].*

“Every nation in every region now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.” - President George W. Bush, 20 September 2001

Now let us pause and reflect

Bush seems to be caught up in the contradictions of his own political rhetoric, the “either you are with us or you are with the terrorists” conundrum:

“I am with myself and I am also with the terrorists”

The House of Saud provides financial aid to the terrorists. And so does the bin Laden family. Worst Case scenario: There may be a “conflict of interest”.

According to The Washington based CATO Institute (November 2001) Saudi Arabia is a “prime sponsor of terrorism”

The U.S. government has warned that it will treat regimes that harbor or assist terrorist organizations the same way that it treats the organizations themselves. Yet if Washington is serious about that policy, **it ought to regard Saudi Arabia as a prime sponsor of international terrorism.** Indeed, that country should have been included for years on the U.S. State Department’s annual list of governments guilty of sponsoring terrorism.

The One Trillion Dollar Foreign Policy Question

What is ultimately involved is that the US government is the ultimate “state sponsor” of those who sponsor terrorism.

The US government supports the House of Saud. In turn, the Saudi monarchy supports Al Qaeda.

It follows *pari passu*: the US government is a “State sponsor of Terrorism”. QED.

“Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.”

Bear in mind Dubya is asking the question.

And now we are asking you, our readers, the question:

Is Dubya “with us”, or “with the terrorists.” either/or, both or neither?



