

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

Pravda.ru

Bastards! Another NATO precision terrorist strike

21.06.2011 20:17



New terrorist strike by NATO slaughters a further 19 civilians, three of them children, as the people of Libya take to the streets in support of Colonel Gaddafi. The NATO terrorist attack destroyed a family building in the suburb of Sorman on Monday night. More evidence of NATO cover-ups. Is Susan Rice a barefaced liar? Rape story a concoction.

One day after NATO admitted the terrorist strike which slaughtered nine civilians, after callously refusing to comment on the murder of Colonel Gaddafi's three grandchildren, NATO has perpetrated another terrorist strike, this one more successful: the death toll was 19, including another three children. As NATO gets more and more desperate, the bombing gets more and

more savage, there are reports of "boots on the ground" inside Libya (against the UNSC Resolutions), there are spiralling costs and NATO is once again using barefaced lies. They're losing it, ladies and gentlemen.

This time it was 19 civilians and three children murdered in yet another precision attack by NATO terrorists. The terrorists targeted a civilian house in Sorman, a western suburb of Tripoli, the home of El-Khweldi el-Hamedi, who holds a senior position in the Libyan Government working with human rights, for which Colonel Gaddafi was about to receive a United Nations Award when the armed terrorist groups started running amok (See the photos).

Terrorist strike after terrorist strike after terrorist strike, demonstrating a cold-blooded, callous streak of sheer unadulterated and pure evil which runs through every fibre of NATO and the murderers who run its policy. The demonology which goes hand in hand with NATO is chilling.



A civilian house becomes a "target", an armed marauding terrorist (see photos) becomes "an unarmed civilian", terrorist strikes against legitimate government forces protecting their country against terrorists are "legitimate" and "protecting unarmed civilians", non-existent air sorties are "bombing raids against civilians" (although there is no evidence whatsoever, certainly because they never existed). Allegations of air strikes on buildings were proved to be false upon inspection, the "highly unpopular regime" turns out to be a government which according to reports on the ground garners up to 90% of popularity among Libyans.

And now the barefaced lies. The "bombing attacks" turned out to be sheer nonsense, as the Russian satellite systems said no such thing occurred, bar a raid on an ammunition dump to stop the Islamist terrorists (who have fought against NATO in Iraq and Afghanistan) from getting their hands on it.

And what was Susan Rice referring to when she accused Colonel Gaddafi's forces of using rape against women? It reminds me of that TV shot of a boy in a hospital early on in the conflict, paraded as a bombing victim, hit by "Gaddafi" without a scar on his body and looking terrified of a vaccination against measles. It reminds me of the lies about attacks on unarmed civilians which

the western media churns out day after day when the evidence is (see the photos) the Libyan authorities are fighting gangs of marauding armed Islamist terrorists unleashed by NATO.



Susan Rice is the US Ambassador to the UN. So what evidence did she produce when she said that Colonel Gaddafi is using rape as a weapon? True, rape is used as a weapon in other theatres of war in Africa but why would the man who was set to receive a UN humanitarian award for his human rights record, for his stand on gay rights, women's rights and his opposition to Islamist sharia law, for his record on religious tolerance, ethnic tolerance and social inclusion, be suddenly targeting women?

It didn't add up, neither did the "evidence" which was hearsay and gossip about condoms and Viagra pills being found in mountains where rebels were holed up. Let us be honest here, when it comes to lying, NATO and its leaders are stupid.

If you want to rape someone you do not throw a condom on the ground and stamp on it and you do not tread a Viagra pill into the soil, you take it. And if you are going to commit mass rape, you don't use a condom.

Susan Rice has not produced a shred of hard evidence in her claim. There is evidence however of the terrorists (sorry, unarmed civilians, see the photos) raping young girls and impaling a boy with a metal rod.

The fact of the matter is that there is no evidence whatsoever to back up Susan Rice's claim. That would in this case make Susan Rice one barefaced liar.

NATO exit strategy

It is by now too apparent that NATO is too arrogant to consider that once again it got it wrong and has jumped the gun. Cameron and Sarkozy were desperate to create a second front to take public attention away from their unpopular domestic policies, Cameron performing so many U-turns in policy he has tied himself in a granny knot.

As for Obomber, sorry, Obama, well he will do what he is told. Never a greater lightweight occupied the White House and it is by now obvious that running the show in Washington is Hillary Clinton and AIPAC, the American Israeli Platform, as indeed it always was. Americans need to know the one spending billions of their dollars on these illegal acts of slaughter against children, getting Americans hated across the world (how many are too frightened to travel?) is



Tel Aviv, by proxy.

It is time for NATO to realise that this is already an impending disaster but one which can avoid a total catastrophe on condition they find a disengagement strategy now. Allow the African Union to mediate after admitting the no-fly zone was successfully imposed and therefore the terms of UNSC Resolutions 1970 and 1973 (2011) were fulfilled.

If not, removing Muammar al-Qathafi or not, here is what happens:

NATO manages to split Libya mortally and the country will be rent by a civil war lasting for years and escalating into other areas, which Al-Qaeda will move into. It is already there, as you know (Google up the leader Abdel-Hakim al-Hasidi);

The populations of NATO countries will revolt once they understand that each player is already hundreds of millions of dollars out of pocket (sorry Mr. Jones, but we will have to withdraw your pain management therapy and you will face an agonising last three months; Miss Kitt, we regret to inform you that the local health authority does not have the financing to provide the treatment you request for therapy for your lung cancer...do try not to cough blood all over the place, we can only afford cleaning once a week as it is; Mr. And Mrs. Keane, I am afraid your little Johnny will have to succumb to his leukaemia because we have spent 300 million pounds bombing Libya already with no end in sight, and your 6-year-old son is frankly unimportant to the Government; Mr. Hardy, do you know how much you are *costing* the National Health Service?);

You will be drawn further and further into a complex situation you know very little about (apparently) - you did not even take into consideration Colonel Gaddafi's immense popularity in his own country and across Africa, you did not take into consideration his telemedicine and e-

learning programmes which he provided for free while you were raping the continent of the money it did not have - and you will see it escalate at the gateway to Europe;

If you do not withdraw with whatever dignity you can retain, NOW, you will suffer a humiliating snivelling defeat which will certainly have enormous shockwaves for your Governments and the more countries you involve, the worse the shockwaves will become;

Finally, have you considered that by perpetrating terrorist strikes against civilians in other countries, you are giving the go-ahead for strikes in your own countries, not by Colonel Gaddafi's Libyans but by other Islamist fanatics who are itching for an excuse to meet an eye with an eye? And let's be honest what's the difference between a Libyan child murdered by a NATO terrorist and a British or French or American child murdered by a chap with a dodgy backpack?

Or does NATO operate along the lines of "The darker the skin, the worse the person"? Is that why NATO has said nothing of the slaughter of Negroes by the Islamist fanatics they are supporting? Has anyone considered, ladies and gentlemen, that NATO and the predominantly white upper-middle class politicians who run it are a bunch of racist bastards?