



What are illegal wars? Dr. Daniele Ganser 01.11.2016 "Conversations in ...



It is often said that the peace movement is no good or that is extreme right-wing biased and they are just idiots. In any case, don't let this convince you. (Make sure that you won't be talked into it.?) The peace movement is still important.

It is often said that the peace movement is no good or that is extreme right-wing biased and they are just idiots. In any case, don't let this convince you. (Make sure that you won't be talked into it.?) The peace movement is still important.

Respect for life is central everyone of us. I have children myself, eight and ten years old. And of course when I think a bit ahead, assuming they have a life expectancy of 80 years, they will live approximately until 2090, right?

This means... I am not only interested in 2017 or 2020 or 2025, but I'm interested in the whole 21st century. And for many of you, I think it is quite the same ... right?

It's particularly the younger people in this room who must think about the 21st century because it's their century. The older people here in the room think about it quite often, because their children or their grandchildren are living in this century and therefore I am very committed to the principle that the peoples live together in peace and that people meet each other with respect.

At the moment it is very, very important that Germany and Russia are not driven into a war against each other. Just now, this is very, very important.

When I published this book – how long ago was it, let me think – maybe a month, I just chose this title "Illegal wars" and people immediately asked: "Are there also legal wars?".

Many journalists have asked this and I replied: "Actually there are only two types of legal wars. Most wars are illegal – except if you are attacked, then you are allowed to defend yourself. This is a legal war. Or when the UN Security Council issues a mandate, then it is also a legal war."

However, most of what you have seen in recent years, in recent decades, are illegal wars. Not that people would not understand them.

The typical case of an illegal war is the attack on Iraq in 2003 by George Bush and Toni Blair.

At that time both the Americans and the British had no mandate from the UN-Security Council. Whatever they said were lies.

So this is what it is: an illegal war of aggression.

This means that George Bush and Toni Blair are war criminals. Of course they should be arrested and brought to justice before the International Criminal Court in The Hague.

I also wrote this in my book. For the younger among you, let me explain, that this is not

possible at the moment, because the balance of power is as it is.

It is quite difficult to arrest the most powerful and, so to speak, bring them to trial. This is simply not possible at the moment, but if citizens keep thinking and talking about it – yes, we must dare to speak out about these things, then perhaps (maybe?) one day it will be feasible that one can no longer attack another country without being punished.

Now I am going to highlight some elements of my book. I am giving lectures in a lot of different cities in Germany.

Yesterday I was in Bautzen. I liked it also very much I really enjoyed it there. I spoke mainly about the war in Syria.

The war in Syria is a complex issue and I spoke about Syria at length.

It was recorded. You can find it on the Internet, you can watch it there.

Today I will set the focus on a slightly different issue, since there are 13 chapters in the book and I don't want to present the same story at every place. Today, I am going to tell you a few things about the war in Afghanistan, because Afghanistan, Syria and Serbia are the three wars that Germany has been involved in. And that's why there is a great interest in Germany to know: "What's going on there?"

Why did we bomb Serbia? Why do we have troops in Afghanistan? Why do we have aircraft in the Syrian airspace?

Now, you need to know that from 1945 to 1995 the German Peace Movement did a really good job insofar that Germany did not wage war for 50 years, not a single one!

And this principle "Never again war!" is deeply anchored in the culture of Germany. This is very precious and I can only encourage you to preserve this cultural principle.

Our job as historians actually consists in investigating how it came to be that Germany – as a first fall of man, if you like – in 1941 bombed Serbia ... then attacked Afghanistan in 2001, again together with the Americans ... and now in Syria, Germany is back again as one of the aggressors.

How can it be that it has happened already three times? In fact the answer is: The people are not asked.

Yes, this is actually the answer. Because generally speaking, the population is opposed.

During my lectures I always do a little research:

If you were the Parliament now, yes, the German Bundestag, and the question to you would be: Are you opposed to the fact that German Tornado-Fighters are penetrating Syrian airspace, thus participate in the war there ... now all those who do not want that I ask you to please raise your hand ... I just want to get an impression.

Look around, just do it ... hold up your hands please and take a look around! You see, people don't want that, the majority does not want it.

Now to the second question: Who does not want to see soldiers being deployed to Afghanistan? Yes ... and who does not want Serbia to be bombed?

This has occurred a long time ago already. Yes, this is more or less what can I see in all of my lectures.

Yes, the people don't want this. Nevertheless it is so.

We have German troops in Kabul. This is simply a fact and people are told that it is a contribution to peace.

The bombardment of Serbia is a contribution to peace, Tornado-Fighters over Syria are a contribution to peace.

Now ask yourself the following question: How would you feel if the Syrian Air Force would circle around Germany? You would not want that.

How would you feel if armed Afghan men were walking about in Munich and in Dresden? You would not like that either. How would you feel if the Serbs bombed Cologne? You would not want it.

This is precisely the principle of national sovereignty, which actually is valid worldwide.

Every country desires freedom from foreign troops and invaders.

Now, this is the same for every country. In this world we are 193 countries and therefore it is very, very important that everyone really respects the borders. As one also respects the boundaries of our neighbors. We don't go to our neighbor's place, kick in his door, crash on his couch and say: "Now I'll take your TV with me. This is a peacekeeping action." OK, you just don't do that ... do you? This is simply not decent, right?

A question I forgot to ask: do you understand me well, is the microphone OK, my Swiss accent, no problem? OK. I can't help myself.

Now, I want to point out that we also do have International Law and you can always orient yourself to this International Law for guidance.

If you feel you can't understand anymore what is going on, what is top and what is bottom. Then, go to see the UN, the World Peace Organization.

And the UN has a UN-Charter, and this UN Charter states very clearly:

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

This is, of course, 'Lawyers English' always a bit long for actually just a fourliner. In short, this means: All members refrain in their international relations from the use of force. This means all countries refrain from use of force. This is currently applicable International Law. This is the Law, effective since 1945, but of course it has been broken time and again.

And there lies the real problem. This is why we have a mess, yes. It's like at home. In your neighborhood you have this law too: You don't kick in your neighbor's door. He would not like it.

As this is the rule, if you don't care about good neighborhood-relations, you will end up having stress, simply stress with conflicts and it is exactly the same in International Politics. The UN Security Council in New York is actually responsible for maintaining World Peace. There are 15 member countries in the UN Security Council, but only five are permanent members.

It's the USA, It's Russia, It's China, It's France and It's the UK. These five should help preserve World Peace. Problem is, these five are also the largest arms exporters. Now one does not need to be brilliant to recognize a contradiction here.

In addition there is a triple presence of NATO within the UN Security Council: The USA,

France and Great Britain are NATO members. This means, if a NATO country is waging a war, it is not condemned, because the NATO countries of the Security Council will always prevent condemnation and criminal convictions.

Of course this is annoying. And the citizens worldwide feel this is unjust and it is unjust, right?

When Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait in 1990 – a concrete example – he was condemned by the UN Security Council. The countries gathered in New York and said... this is a breach of the UN Charter. That guy just crosses the border and attacks Kuwait?... that's not acceptable at all!

They then sentenced him and that was rightful. Saddam Hussein is a war criminal.

But when France and Great Britain – together with Israel – attacked Egypt in 1956 during the Suez crisis, the Security Council wanted to condemn them too but the French and the English vetoed. Unfortunately, that's the way it is. This means they can protect themselves with their own veto if they have a permanent seat in the Security Council.

Now, this actually means – you can see this very clearly in my book "Illegal Wars" – that the NATO-countries continue to conduct and wage illegal wars, but are not condemned. And this is just not right.

Of course it is very important not to mix up NATO and UN. The UN is the World Peace Organization. The NATO is the largest defense alliance.

The NATO calls itself a 'Defense Alliance', but considering the facts, we should rather speak of an 'Attack Alliance'. Currently there are 28 countries that are part of the NATO, while the UN counts 193.

So, you can roughly say all the countries of the world are part of the United Nations. But in the NATO ... there you have – of course – the USA, then Canada, Germany, France, Spain, Portugal, Great Britain, Norway, Poland, Turkey, Greece, Italy, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania etc. These are the 28 NATO-countries.

Switzerland is not part of the NATO and Austria too is not part of the NATO. But unfortunately these two countries are members of the 'Partnership for Peace'.

This is as equates to the kindergarten of the NATO. An interesting fact is that most Swiss citizen don't even know that we are in the 'Partnership for Peace'.

Also in Switzerland I encourage people to start thinking about it this, because to me it seems it's not – as proclaimed – a 'Partnership for Peace' ... it is much more a 'Partnership for War'. And I think we should have a public vote within the next ten years in Switzerland on this issue and then we shall leave the so-called 'Partnership for Peace'. This is my conviction.

Honestly, I think that Germany also should leave the NATO, which is not easy unfortunately this will not be easy. You understand this ... do you? This is a difficult thing ... it takes a long perseverance and you have to proceed very peacefully ... yes.

So I am repeatedly asked: How could Germany ever leave the NATO? To begin with, it takes a dialogue among the population. This is always the the first step. And then it takes a dialogue between the parties. This is the second step and then talks with the NATO-partners are needed. This is the third step. Things always have to progress in this order and you have

to approach it in peace and harmony and you shall do that not at a hurried pace.
Of course NATO has friends.

The American president Nixon once said that the only international organization, that has ever worked, is the NATO, because it is a military alliance and we have to take the lead. This is just plain language. It is true that these 28 NATO countries do not all have the same power, ... and of course the Americans are leading the NATO. This is obviously the case. And because the Americans lead the NATO, the command center of the NATO is not located in Brussels but in the Pentagon. This must be understood.

And, of course, the Europeans always ask themselves, is the NATO not led by the Europeans? And then I say "No, because the 'Supreme Allied Commander Europe' – that is the so-called SACEUR – is always an American general.

The Europeans may appoint the Secretary-General.

This is the one who – so to speak – does the public relations work. This is okay, but you have to be aware of the little details: Who appoints the general and who appoints the Secretary-General? The Europeans are allowed to put in the Secretary-General. At the moment it's Jens Stoltenberg.

I can only tell you how it is in Switzerland. Swiss people think, oh Stoltenberg, where does he come from? He comes from Norway. Well, Norway is a beautiful country. That's where we have been for a vacation. Nice people, lots of forest. We were there with the canoe, we even camped out. Yes, then he must be a great guy. So NATO is probably a peace organization.

I pinpoint this a bit. But this is more or less how the wind blows. This way, one does not see anymore that, in fact it actually helps the Americans and that the Americans definitely use the NATO for their own interests.

(Picture shown) As you can see, the eastward enlargement of NATO is by all means in the interest of NATO and in the interest of the USA, but not in the interest of Germany.

If then – some day – Germans and Russians collide, killing each other, they are weakening themselves, yes. This may be in the interest of a foreign actor, but it is neither in the interest of the Germans nor in the interest of the Russians.

We need to understand this geo-strategic perspective.

Stoltenberg is a friend of the NATO. His predecessor, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, was from Denmark and there again the same trick is played: Denmark? Wonderful, I have been there by bicycle. Here you say bike. You do not say Velo as we do? But you understand it – almost ... Otherwise we'll introduce subtitles.

So he is also a friend of the NATO and the NATO critics can be found mainly on the streets: Saying "No! to the NATO! No to war!" There was a demonstration in Kiel in 2009. Or later in France: "NATO = Legal Terrorism".

This means the critics take to the streets saying "There's something wrong. We don't want that!"

In other words: The NATO has critics and it has friends.

Now let me present you a few issues from my book. OK? So, I'll go through some of the chapters. I can not recount the whole book today, but maybe one example:

In 1956 the French and the British landed with parachutes in Egypt – well, the soldiers did . This is illegal! OK? I just want to state this very clearly. You can not simply land in another country with a parachute and say "Hello people, we are here now." No way. It's illegal. First of all, you need a permission from the UNO.

If you don't have it, then it is just like when you kick in your neighbor's door. That's the same. This is the so-called attack on Egypt in 1956. Previously the government in Iran was overthrown, also the government of Guatemala. That was all illegal.

I would like to proceed somewhat faster, because otherwise, we would not get properly to Afghanistan. Yes ...is this all right with you?

I can not consider every country now. I just want you to get an understanding of how the wind blows.

In 1959 Fidel Castro came to power in Cuba and the Americans immediately decided they wanted to overthrow him. Now the problem is that they are not allowed to do so. OK? The Americans are not allowed to overthrow Fidel Castro whether they like him or not. Nevertheless they tried.

How did they do that? They gathered and trained Exiled-Cubans in Florida and – as a secret unit so to speak – sent them to Cuba during the 'Bay of Pigs Invasion' in April 61, in order to overthrow Fidel, which didn't succeed. These are the Exiled Cubans that were trained and gathered by the CIA. At this point I must tell you, also with reference to the Syrian war: It is forbidden, it is forbidden to train gangs and to send them into foreign countries! It is clearly prohibited! And now this is done to Syria.

These are gangs which are designated as moderate rebels. A very clever trick, but these moderate rebels are the same as those who behead others. You would not want them in your living room.

So, you always should ask yourself what is really going on? Covert wars, that's what's going on. These are covert wars.

The procedure I'm following in my book is: I take the original documents from the Security Council and the General Assembly and – according to the documents – the Cubans complained there and said: "Excuse me, we're just being attacked by the Americans. This is illegal."

The Cuban Foreign Minister Raúl Roa declared on April 15th 1961 that the Americans are currently bombing Cuba. This is very interesting for me as a historian, to see the response of the Americans?

The answer comes from the American ambassador. His name is Stevenson. ... first of all he is a hypocrite, which is not surprising ... And Stevenson says "the US are not involved in this illegal war," he says, "because these are Cubans here. We have nothing to do with it". And then he says, "Cuban pilots ...", because at that time the bombs were falling, no discussion about that. But he says: "It is some Cuban pilots, allegedly deserted from Castro's armed forces and before leaving their home country they dropped the bombs."

Okay, that was a steep thesis, right? And then they presented airplanes, bearing FAR as an identifier. They land in Florida where pictures are taken and Stevenson takes these pictures and presents them to the Security Council saying: "Look, this is the proof: The airplanes belong to the Cubans. FAR is written on them".

Later we find out ... this is always the case with us historians, we are somewhat slow, we can not decipher this straight away, but in return we are accurate. We've figured out, the CIA has applied that FAR identifier. Super clever, isn't it?

Yes, that's how it works. This is called False Flag, False Flag. That means these airplanes were actually controlled by the CIA and the Pentagon, they bombed Cuba. But then, all this

did not work out.

Fidel Castro repelled the attack. Later on the Pentagon received the order: How could one really overthrow Cuba? And then the generals in the Pentagon proposed within the framework of Operation Northwoods – now listen very carefully – “We could blow up an American ship at the Guantanamo base and say: That was Fidel”.

What can I tell you? How about the neighbor example? I can't really depict it, but this is the picture: You blow up your own mailbox and then you accuse your neighbors: “You broke my mailbox. That's a no-go, you will pay for a new one!” And that would actually be the harmless kind of conduct. But as it is, such covert warfare has been planned. It was not realized.

Another proposition was: “We take airplanes, let them fly over Cuba, replace them in the air with unmanned drones and then we blow them up, sending a 'Mayday'-call pretending these were American students, who wanted to help in Peru and now, Fidel has shot them down.”

This is 'Operation Northwoods', if you don't know it, just google for Northwoods.

Let's go to Vietnam. Vietnam was a dreadful war with 3 million dead. This war started in 1964, again with NATO participation. So the American Empire started this war. But they claimed that it was a defensive war.

How did they do that?

They had no mandate from the UN-Security-Council, therefore it is an illegal war.

Here is what the Americans said, here the American president ... And this is the original quote. He said:

“As President and Commander in Chief, it is my duty to the American people to report that renewed hostile actions against United States ships on the high seas in the Gulf of Tonkin (offshore of Vietnam) have today required me to order the military forces of the United States to take action in reply. (So he said, “I just react”.) The initial attack on the destroyer Maddox, on August 2nd, was repeated today August 4th by a number of hostile vessels.

this new act of aggression, aimed at our own forces, shows the importance of the struggle for peace and security in southeast Asia. Firmness ... is indispensable to preserve peace.

“

This means that already at that time, they talked about peace and a better world, but it was all just a lie.

This pretended attack on the Maddox just did not exist. There was a first incident, on August 2nd - yes. But the Maddox was not hit. And on August 4th there was nothing at all.

Later the Americans said, maybe there was a torpedo coming close to the boat, but as historians we can never again verify if there has been a torpedo or not. Anyway, the ship was not hit. The ship did not sink. No American died. However, it was presumably on purpose that it ran very close to the coast in order to fake an incident.

Then the American President goes and lies to the people saying: “I'm going to lead you into a war now.”– The problem is – people are informed at 11:36 pm. This is eleven thirty at night.

At that time, all are either tired or drunk.

That means ... it is very difficult, it is very difficult, then to be attentive. Then eleven years of war followed, until 1975 with 3 million dead! Let me be very clear. This is a war of aggression.

That means Vietnam was a serious crime, which I also present in my book and in this case, Johnson is a war criminal. Of course he should also be arrested and sentenced, but of course we can't do it. He died.

(Picture shown)

This is the ship Maddox, which actually triggered the incident so to speak. Here is what I can say: Today we know with certainty– also from American sources – that the Gulf of Tonkin story is a lie, a lie to incite war.

Lets go on. I will skip some.

Now we go to Serbia in 99. The American President at the time was Bill Clinton. His wife, now in the race for presidency, along with this other outstanding candidate, Trump ... so today we cannot know whether Clinton or Trump will win. But actually, both are unelectable, but that's the situation today. We are living in crazy times.

Actually, I did not mean to tell this, but it just came to my mind now. In fact I wanted to talk about Bill Clinton.

In 1999 Bill Clinton bombed Serbia. Here again, he he cannot do this! They made a big fuss about, about, about his sex life and his escapades. As a Swiss I must say, I really don't care. I truly don't care. He has to discuss that with his wife.

But as far as international relations, International Law is concerned, I do care. The USA had no right to bomb Serbia, not a single one. And vice versa Serbia too has no right to bomb the USA. Which never happened.

But imagine in 1999 Milošević would have bombed the USA. He would have been condemned right away by the Security Council. The UN would have said: "The prohibition of violence includes: 'A country may not bomb another country.'" And that would have been just right. But something else happened.

The Americans bombed Serbia and in my book I also describe how an American PR-agency propagated the demonization of the Serbs very intensely, already in the Bosnian war and then again in the Kosovo war.

That was the PR-agency Ruder Finn and the boss of Ruder Finn said, quote: "When the bombs fell on Serbia, we opened a bottle of champagne.""

You just have to understand that. Things are running at a very professional level. Lies are processed very professionally. And then he even said casually, the Americans, they have not understood anything at all. Already back in the nineties, they wondered in which African country Bosnia is located.

And there lies the level of ignorance which – of course – becomes exploited. Sadly Germany went to war then. Federal Chancellor Schröder from the SPD participated in this bombing of Serbia and also Joschka Fischer from the Green Party. And that was surprising for many people because they believed that the Green Party would deny going to war. Now you should forget this too.

It's getting very difficult for the people in Germany. They don't know anymore whom shall I vote for? Who does not go to war? I don't know it either. I really don't know.

I have sources here in Germany who told me that the election of Schröder was supported by a very good, clever election-campaign-management-team from the USA from Bill Clinton, and after Schröder came to power, he had – so to speak – an open obligation towards

Clinton.

This means there are trades run that need to be examined more closely, right? Here historical research is still at work. The question is: Did Bill Clinton help Gerhard Schröder to become elected? This doesn't mean the election was manipulated, that's not what I mean. Just that the election campaign was carried out according to professional American standards ... and this is no contradiction

And Schröder said in 2014, when talking about the Crimea, "Because I have done it myself, I have violated International Law." And he said: "When it came to the question, how things develop in the Republic of Yugoslavia, in the Kosovo war, we sent our aircraft, our tornadoes to Serbia and together with the NATO we bombed a sovereign state, without a decision of the Security Council."

Min. 30:13 bis 40:18

Mr. Schröder deserves high credit for at least admitting it. When an offense should be cleared up, first you have to accept it, then you need to talk about it and then a mourning process is needed. At some point justice must be done. It's an entire process. It works only if at first one admits: "Yes, I have breached International Law". This is very, very important. Clinton has not admitted anything at all.

He just thought it's a good idea to start bombing Serbia. And nobody has ever sued him, nobody at all. Nevertheless, as per International Law, also Clinton is a war criminal, because he may not simply bomb Serbia.

George Bush ... what can I say? After he came to power in 2001, he said: We must attack Afghanistan.

After Serbia, Germany sent troops to Afghanistan.

(Picture shown)

These are the British troops landing in Afghanistan. Obviously the question is, how come German troops are in Afghanistan?

In my book, I have outlined this too. For this is an important question, which concerns the population of Germany. Why are we at the Hindu Kush at all? How come? When was the agenda set? The Afghans, do they want us there at all? Yes, these are relevant questions. The evident answer is: Terror!

On 9/11/2001 there was that huge terror attack. Everyone in this room remembers, I assume ...

It is 15 years since, but after this terror attack, this was the sentiment: Afghanistan is responsible for this terror attack, Osama bin Laden is in Afghanistan. So we wage the Afghanistan war. Such was the reasoning. But it was never verified if this is the truth.

The attack was on September 11th and the war in Afghanistan began on October 7th. That's 3 weeks between terror and war. During these 3 weeks, nobody has ever verified anything useful. Since 15 years now, we historians have scrutinized these attacks, but still we have no clear perspective, what exactly happened. All we know so far is, that we have not been fully informed, this is for sure!

Let me briefly explain the actual contentious issue:

First an aircraft for the North Tower, then an aircraft for the South Tower, what remains is: Aircraft, aircraft, Tower, Tower.

For most people, this is the 9/11 terror attack.

But in the background there is a third building, called World Trade Center Seven. This one has collapsed too. But there hasn't been any aircraft crashing into this building.

You see, we historians have this riddle to solve: 3 towers, 2 aircraft. That's tricky, because the official story goes: The towers collapsed due to the airplanes.

Here I always say: 3 towers, 2 airplanes, how can this go? This is not like bowling. An airplane ... attention now ... Have not 2 airplanes penetrated 2 towers after which they collapsed?

Then the third building has collapsed on 9/11 and has triggered the deployment of the Bundeswehr in Afghanistan.

Basic knowledge: 9/11 – I assume you are all well informed. But who in this room did NOT know that THREE buildings collapsed? Short hand signal please.

Who ignored? See? And who knew? See? Maybe you have read it in the 'Spiegel'. I don't know.

At the time I was teaching at the University of Zurich and with the students we have read the official report. It was published in 2004. There, Bush laid his hand on it and said 'That's the truth!'

Open bracket: this has made me skeptical right away - Close bracket.

The unanswered question was: how do they explain the collapse of the third building? As no airplane has crashed there. And I can tell you that this was resolved in an elegant way.

In the official investigation report, WTC 7 is mentioned, but not that it collapsed.

Again: We are living in the so-called age of war against terrorism. Began in 2001. The Cold War is over. The wall has fallen. That's all history. Now we are in the age of war against terrorism.

Also Angela Merkel says: Syria mission – combating terror.

Now everything is fight against terror. Your civil rights are dismantled under the pretext of 'fight against terror', Patriot Act, surveillance state, all that.

But the issue is that the age of terror has begun in 2001.

I really do want to advise you urgently: Be mindful! Take a close look! What happened?

In the official investigation report, WTC7 is mentioned, but not, that it collapsed. This is not acceptable.

Now no-one can say: Yes, that was a hard day – does it matter, 3 or 2 buildings?

No, these are gross shortcomings. When I have read the NZZ ... one of the leading newspapers in Switzerland ... I had read the paper when the 9/11 report was published. And the NZZ wrote: 'This is an excellent report'. The journalists had not even understood, that one building is not mentioned.

Well, then of course I looked around a little: What were debated issues in the USA then, what was debated in Germany?

Norman Peach, a good man, always committed for peace, he said: 'International Law

was brutally pushed aside after these terror attacks. To justify a case of defense against Afghanistan, it takes evidence, that they are behind the attacks. But this has not succeeded so far."

He said it in October 2001 when the Afghanistan war was not older than 3 days.

Now: Here in Germany you have intelligent people, courageous people who understand that international law may not be breached just like that. Who understand that one can't just say: "Yes, that country is behind it! I can't prove it, but that's how it is."

You can't do that! You must submit evidence. This evidence was not delivered.

Then in Switzerland I went to talk to structural engineers and in 2006 I have published my first article on 9/11. There I was not aware that some problems will follow.

But I have been for 10 years in this research and Jörg Schneider is an emeritus professor in statics. He knows how buildings function. I am just the historian. I have never built a concrete-steel-building.

He says: "In my opinion, with high probability, WTC7 has been professionally blown up."

And I said: But we have no blasting – officially.

Then he said: "You have to watch the corners."

(Picture) These three corners here – he says the fall is symmetrical.

These are the seconds argued about (I go back and forth now. It didn't go back and forth. I just want to call your attention to something. That's why I show it.)

The other approach is that the building has collapsed due to fire. It's either fire or explosion.

Now watch out: I am giving the ball back to you. You have to think for yourself. Is it fire or explosion. I can't resolve this for you.

This is where the whole war against terror is hooked up. At any rate, the building has collapsed. For certain. This is not questioned. And it was not hit by an aircraft. So you have two possible causes: Fire or explosion.

I say: Why not talk it over with three of the smartest persons you know.

Ask them: "What do YOU think? WTC7: fire or explosion?"

If he says: "WTC7, never heard of it", he is not one of the smartest. Then you have to continue your search. I don't know your friends. I don't mean to offend you.

Now from the historic perspective: For such an important event, we even consider construction plans of the buildings. Not always. But now the plans of the buildings come to help the historians.

We'll simply take a cross section.

Here the Technical University Dresden is the perfect place to discuss this.

Apparently we have a building with vertical steel columns. 81 of them. We have 81 solid steel columns.

In 2008 the Americans published a second report, issued by the „National Institute for Standards and Technology“ – „NIST“.

It can be compared to the German TÜV or just one of these institutions whom you believe that they are doing a clean job. So you believe. Now is this so with the NIST? ... Mostly ...

And now in the report about this building NIST said: "WTC7 has collapsed due to fire."

In 2008 was the end of George Bush's presidency and just before he left, this report came.

Of course for most people this was not an issue any longer, but for us this is essential.

So I said to the structural engineers, look here, NIST says: "Column 79 was destabilized by office fires and that's why the whole building collapsed in free fall."

Min. 40:18 – 1:00:08

This is the story, adopted by Wikipedia. Then the engineers said: "To make it go down symmetrically ... Symmetry requires the blasting of all columns in the same second. Otherwise there is no symmetry!" That's the debate. I say, the experts must really confront this issue.

No-one can say: come on, again it's this petty-minded Swiss historian. Why does he still care about these details?

This has triggered the deployment of the Bundeswehr in Afghanistan. That's why! First of all, the terror attacks are a shock event. When shocked, people can be controlled – that's just a fact. It's an old trick. How can you drive a herd of sheep over the cliff? You produce a loud bang. That's it.

Needless to say that I investigated on how the debate was led in Germany.

For a start I have seen – the Americans said: "It was Osama Bin Laden. It was 19 Muslims." By the way, one of them, Mohammed Atta, has studied in Hamburg.

You were really lucky that the Americans did not say: Here we must act and bomb. Actually, this kind of logic is rather bizarre. We have seen it when France said, we must intervene in Syria, previously there was a terror attack in which Belgians were involved.

OK, Belgians has been lucky that the French did not say: "We have to bomb Belgium."

So, what happens in these wars against terror is - how can I say - astonishing, very astonishing.

And Bush had said: We have to go to Afghanistan! And in Europe, Schröder had said: "These terror attacks" – that was on September 12th, the next day – "These terror attacks are a declaration of war against the whole civilized world ... The rule must be: Whoever helps terrorists or protects them, are in breach of all fundamental values of coexistence of all peoples."

That's a clear message and – well, it can be said like this – but also International Law has to be observed! Who violates International Law violates also all fundamental values of coexistence. Right, dropping bombs on another country is a very severe offense!

The Green Party under Joschka Fischer said: "When violence occurs, when severe crimes threaten or are even perpetrated, we need to take action.

On September 16th they were already on their warpath. Time to take action again.

The FDP, The Liberal Party was in opposition at the time and Westerwelle said to the Greens: "Supporting war, today you are leaving the peace movement."

The FDP had voted against it. In Germany, the delegates often don't decide by their conscience, but by party membership.

Now, if they form the government, they all vote for the government – let's go to war. And if the others form the government, they say: that's the opponents, we are against this war. This is an astonishing mechanism, if I may say so.

Also the CDU was in opposition and Merz, a delegate had said: "Such a government, such a

Chancellor does not deserve our trust."

So here you can see a clear pattern: Green Party and SPD endorse an attack on Afghanistan, while the opposition, the FDP and the CDU reject.

So for example, SPD delegate Gert Weisskirchen said: "The German Army is deployed

in Afghanistan, to finally bring about peace."
The others say: Things don't work that way. You cannot send military personnel to another country.

If the Afghans would say: now we send our soldiers to Germany in order to finally bring about a good experience.

Unacceptable. Everyone should understand that this will always be received as an occupation. Always!

Now there has been 15 years of war in Afghanistan. 15 Years!

Whatever the goals might have been, the Taliban can't be dispelled (dislodged?). You know why? They are living there.

On November 16th the German parliament voted – always under the shock of 9/11 – it was tight: 336 Yes against 326 No (Nay? lol).

And then – the German army in Afghanistan. This means: Once more, Germany is pushed into a war. By whom? By the USA.

Once it was Clinton to lead them into the Kosovo War. Then Bush has led them to Afghanistan. It is saddening.

And the Afghan population is not responsible at all. These are poor people. Poor people.

Some of the American generals have said: "Our missiles cost more than a million and these mud huts, where the Afghans live, are not even worth 5000\$. Isn't this a waste of material?'" These are original quotes!

Now, just how decadent is this, to bomb one of the poorest countries, based on an unsolved terror attack.

If you have the feeling, the deep feeling that something is not right, I can only affirm to you. It just is not right! Because life is holy. It is not allowed to kill other people! It's as simple as that. (applause).

Why don't we want to get killed? Why don't we want that our children are killed? Why don't we want to see our parents killed? Because life is holy! It's as simple as that. You don't need a higher education, in order to understand this.

If somebody comes along and kills your own child, something is very wrong. And this is skewed and presented as terrorist stories, terror stories – it's a total chaos, and we are living in an age of confusion. I can't help but state it.

"The Germans must learn to kill", the 'Spiegel' reported in 2006. When I saw this, I bought a copy of it, what I rarely do, and flicked through a bit and I asked myself:

What is THIS? What kind of a statement is this?

It comes from an American General and the 'Spiegel' sets this on the front page. This is war mongering! If this does not deserve the term of warmongering, then what? Then what?

Merkel 2009 in Afghanistan – quite astonishing. Indeed she always has this – you call her Mummy or so – she has that kind of smile – I don't know if you ... I just read it repeatedly. She has that kind of "Shall-I-bake-another-cake-smile".

Yes, that's likely. And I understand it. It works. It appears friendly.

(Pictures of Merkel and Bush are shown) Now if you compare – where is it – it doesn't appear very much alike.

Well. Germany has gone to Afghanistan and has achieved nothing, nothing at all. Summing up: really nothing.

These deployments abroad should also be evaluated under the aspect of: What were the objectives, what is the result, what are the costs, what else could have been done with that money?

Now people here in Germany begin to wake up.

(Picture shown) This is a rally in Berlin on October 16th:

“NATO, the most aggressive military alliance worldwide” a quote of Drevermann.

Or: “Stop aggression against Syria!”

People take to the streets because at the moment they don't know how to make themselves heard at all.

Among them are also people who have been with the peace movement for some time. Some have already rallied against the Vietnam War. Now they are back on the street again and they figured “so we do it again, I have to take to the street once more”.

I really want to encourage people to pronounce themselves firmly against war.

People often ask me: “But Mr. Ganser, don't you have the feeling that we are powerless? We have no chance to achieve something.”

By all means I would differentiate: In fact you don't have the means to stop the war in Syria tomorrow. That's not possible. My wife and I have protested in 2003 in Berne against the attack on Iraq. It was a big rally. Also in Germany there were big rallies.

But Bush and Blair didn't care, which saddened me quite a bit. But ok.

One cannot stop it when politicians go to war.

It is really a problem, but, you do have influence over what you read tomorrow. You decide that. Who you will talk to tomorrow and about what. Only you decide that.

If you turn the TV on or off. It's your decision. What you eat tomorrow, your decision. The Christmas present you make, your decision.

Whatever you do (are doing?), I would simply advise you to abide by this guideline:

“Life is holy.”

If you follow it you cannot lose the thread.

But if you are getting confused by war propaganda, you might end up endorsing wars you don't understand and you are present with soldiers in countries that haven't hurt you.

That's the same with American soldiers fighting the Iraq war, shooting Iraqis and a survey revealed that the Americans deployed there, believe that Saddam Hussein is involved in 9/11.

That's the utter brainwash. Saddam Hussein is not involved in 9/11.

OK – these soldiers are ill-informed. They have confounded Saddam Hussein with Osama Bin Laden. And it's all these foreign names.

But here I say: Then they are in the wrong country. Osama is in Afghanistan. Indeed it is important to obtain information.

In tangible terms, the war in Iraq was an attack war and it was led on the basis of lies.

(Picture shown)

Here: The lie was: Saddam has weapons of mass destruction! At the time that was said by the American Secretary of State Colin Powell.

It was a lie. You have seen that. They exaggerate grossly and they assume that the population in general either does not understand or is too anxious to resist.

These two premises are the basis.

Then Saddam was overthrown and of course: Saddam is a war criminal. I told you this before, because in 1990 he attacked Kuwait and in 1980 he attacked Iran.

But many have forgotten that in 1979 it was the CIA to bring him to power in the first place. Because they wanted Saddam to attack Iran.

Because they wanted Saddam to run up against Khomeini. And they said: Let them kill each other.

So we can sell weapons to both sides and they will weaken themselves.

That's the idea and I think they want to repeat this with Germany and Russia. Make them run up against each other, because this would weaken both. Therefore, look after the German-Russian friendship. Take care of this friendship! This is really important!

(applause)

Fear is always fomented by saying: We have reason to believe that Saddam Hussein is building nuclear weapons. That's wrong! That's wrong! Dick Cheney lied. He too is a war criminal.

And Tony Blair in the UK said, "Iraq has chemical and biological weapons. (...) Their missiles are ready for launch within 45 minutes."

In other words, people are intimidated.

You see this: "Within 45 minutes ..." this means that in the next hour a bomb can explode here.

If they had said within 45 months instead, then people might have said: Yes, well, are there any other possibilities than war?

Alas, there is always some kind of warmongering, and this is dangerous. It is no good for all of us!

In my book I have described these conflicts.

So if you ask yourself, what are actually the contents of this book? On one hand there is what I just addressed: the attack on Iraq, which is illegal.

Then we have the coup in the Ukraine.

Let me say a short word about the Ukraine – in my book it is described more in detail.

Our Western press – including Switzerland – always wrote: The problem in the Ukraine started with Putin. That is a lie.

To begin with we have the NATO eastward enlargement, followed on February 20th, 2014 by a coup in Kiev.

Victoria Nuland is involved in this, she is part of the US State Department.

And there is her statement – please excuse my language – "Fuck the EU";

That's why we call this internally "Fuck-the-EU-Coup", maybe this is a bit difficult to translate.

It comes from a recorded conversation between Victoria Nuland and the American ambassador Geoffrey Pyatt. They talked about who should come to power after the coup.

And then they raise the question if they should inform the EU and then she said loosely:

"No, fuck the EU";

This actually means we don't consider EU interests. We should better take note of this.

That was back in February 2014. And it was only afterwards in March 2014, that Putin took hold of the Crimea because there he has his Black Sea Fleet. And that is why he is also active in Syria. There he has yet another naval base. Can you really imagine that the Russians would let NATO snatch away all his naval bases? They would certainly not accept that! The Russians are good chess players, they would not let their King and Queen be taken. You better forget that!

Now I have not mentioned all the countries. But I want to say that also the war against Nicaragua is in the book. There the USA were condemned because they supported the contras. This was under President Reagan.

Also the coup d'état in Guatemala 1954. The Pig Bay Invasion. The Syrian war since 2011. The attack on Libya 2011. The Suez Crisis, the attack on Egypt. The Vietnam War. And also the war against Yemen. The coup in Iran and the war in Afghanistan including 9/11.

So here we have thirteen wars which you can research step by step simply by means of the facts – what is really going on?

In the background – I think – there are many wars for resources. Usually this is somewhat concealed.

They don't like to talk about it and in my opinion the goals are not about Human Rights, but about mining rights. And if you take a closer look, this is always admitted.

Joschka Fischer said: "The Gulf region remains the gas station of the world economy."

That's a clear message and I agree with this analysis.

Looking at the facts, you can see here – the green columns – the the largest conventional oil reserves. And they are just right here, under the Persian Gulf. Saudi-Arabia, Iraq, Iran.

And now, try to visualize a world map of the religions and lay it over these oil fields and you can easily see that the green area is the Muslim area. Violet represents the Christian area. Namely North America is Christian. South America is Christian. Europe is Christian. South Africa is Christian. Australia is Christian. India is Hindu. China is atheist. Russia is Orthodox-Christian. And this green area is the Muslim area. And there is the oil.

That means – it is evident and clear that the Muslims did not move there when they heard that there is oil.

(Applause)

But the hatred between religions, between Christians and Muslims, is stirred up again and this is wrong. It is wrong!

We should rather meet in fraternity. We should not kill someone just because he has a different religion.

In Switzerland we have done this before.

Catholics against Protestants - in Germany too. "Ah, you have the wrong religion – head off. You know too much. You are a witch – burn at the stake!

We have done it all before: back and forth, we don't need another new version ... And what surprises me is that since 9/11 the reputation of Muslims really plunged into the basement. Did you notice this too?

This means that all these wars that are going on within the Muslim countries, are being 'sold' as counter terrorism fight, which is why they are so willingly accepted. Simply because – beforehand – the Muslims have been discredited.

Now I would like to explain something about 'Psychological Warfare'. I'll just reverse these roles of what happened in the last 15 years. It did not really happen, it's just an opposite version of events. Listen to it and try to feel what the atmosphere would be like:
In 2003 Iraq attacked Great Britain and the USA. Bush was hanged.
In 2011 Libya bombed France. Sarkozy was buried.
In 2001 Afghanistan invaded Germany. In Berlin, the Taliban were patrolling the area to protect the population.
Stop, that's enough already. Do you feel intuitively that this would not have been accepted. No-one would have accepted it. The opposite occurred and here in Europe and also in North America the impression is: Well, these Muslims they are just arsonists. Now they just keep trying to constantly cause stress.
What we have are 'Wars of Aggression' followed by asymmetric warfare. What is asymmetric warfare? The countries become occupied and the young men blow themselves up. That's how it is.

Recently I was in Paris where I gave a lecture. "En Français, c'était difficile." (In French it was difficult.) And I told the French: "Look, in 1940 you were occupied by Germany," and they said: Yes!
Then I said, "And then you did kill the Germans." They said: Yes! And I asked them: "What was that?" They said: "Resistance." Then I asked, "What is this, was it honorable?" And they said: "Yes, very honorable!" Then I said, "Wasn't that terror?"
That was a total breach of taboo. They said: "No, this is not terror."
Then I said: "Okay. Now if someone blows himself up in Iraq, against the Americans or the British, isn't this terror?" And they answered: "Yes, that is terror."

And then I said: "And in Syria? You are bombing Syria now. If anything happens in Syria, it is always terror."
"Yes, of course, terror."
You are French. And the French are also in Afghanistan, Germans are in Afghanistan. When people use violence there – it's a clear case of terrorism, isn't it?

Min 01:00:08 – 01:12:15

This means: In NATO-countries every form of resistance is served to the public under the term of "terror". This is not correct. Anyway, in Northern Ireland, you know the IRA, the Irish Republican Army, they are Catholics.
They don't want the English in Northern Ireland because they are Protestants. That is why there is terror! It's not because the Catholics are particularly violent, but because they don't want the occupation, you understand?
In the background are fights for raw materials.
Already at the End of world war two, the Americans told the British, here the American president Roosevelt: "The Persian oil belongs to you, that is Iran. We share the oil in Iraq and in Kuwait, and, concerning the Saudi oil, this is ours." Clear statement! It's about raw materials. It is always about raw materials! Oil and gas!
Sarah Wagenknecht, one of the best politicians now in my opinion (applause), she is smart and courageous, a rare combination.

She said: "He who really wants to provide more safety has to stop participating in oil and gas wars with countless civilian victims and he also has to cease the logistic support of US drone killings (which means to close Ramstein Air Base), and to stop the export of weapons in conflict areas immediately." (Applause).

Then, peace movements are often addressed with questions like: "What kind of poor sports are you? Why can't we just bomb this or that country? Do you have any solutions?" Yes the peace movement does have solutions. First of all: Respect international law! Second of all: Don't bomb foreign countries! Thirdly: No wars for raw materials! Fourthly: No delivery of weapons for these countries! And fifthly: Don't spread (disseminate?) any war propaganda, which stirs up people against each other! A simple 5-point-programme! (applause).

Bush of course has a different view. He says: "If you are not with us, you are against us! And if you are against us, you are actually an illegal enemy combatant and we will kill you!" Okay! This is that entirely radical fundamentalist approach of: "I kill you, if you don't agree (concur?) with me." That is just what we are not teaching our children. Well, there is a multitude of perspectives and this is what we teach our children.

Has anybody ever said to his family: "Whoever has a differing opinion, will be killed!" What kind of stupid statement is this? How could one ever dare to behave like this – or in school: Would anyone in school argue in this manner?

Are there any teachers who say: "Well, with these three boys I have severe problems, they make so much trouble, we have to hang them!" That is ridiculous! Ridiculous! Eventually the students could say: "This teacher is completely unfair, and his lectures are so boring. Tomorrow we are going to shoot him".

That is wrong! Yes, I am exaggerating.

It does not work inside a family, it does not work in school and it does not work in international politics either. Don't allow yourselves to be talked into believing we could solve problems with violence. It's not true.

We cannot resolve the greatest problems of the 21st century with violence.

No way! (Applause)

We should try to listen to other voices and opinions also. We should find out: How about the young men in Iraq? What do they think of the American occupation? I can tell you quite clearly: They reject this occupation! They don't want to have them there! Is this a surprise? No!

I can predict your feelings, if tomorrow your neighbor would kick in your door. You are angry! So it is. A historian can recognize patterns, yes. Only few will say: Fine!

No way – that's not it.

Are you still able to listen?

Shall we discuss Libya? Are you still with me? Take a deep breath! (Applause)

This topic is exhausting . I know it is.

Concerning Libya I simply want to point out: There was a resolution of the security council ... What then? Find the details in my book.

This resolution said: A no-fly-zone may be established. This means a region is under flight ban. It's like clearing the streets, nobody is allowed to drive, but this is in the air. Moreover the Russian and the Chinese said "yes". Then the British, the French and the Americans have transformed this into a regime change. But this was NOT covered by this resolution, right?

Now, the Chinese and the Russian perceive this as a deception. And quite rightly so. Because it WAS a deception! Then in 2011 there were the air strikes against Libya by the NATO countries Great Britain, France and USA. That is illegal, that is simply illegal! You simply are not allowed to bomb Libya!

Libya was one of the richest countries in Africa. By the way, Gaddafi has prevented Afri-Com, which means African Command.

The Americans divide the world into several command-areas, North-Com is North America, South-Com is South America, EU-Com is European Command, Switzerland is in the EU-Com, we don't like to hear this and Afri-Com is the African Command, Pac-Com is the Pacific Command and Cent-Com is the Central Command. Well, these are the different command areas. All countries of the world are in one or another command area and actually the Afri-Com should have been established in Africa but the Africans said: "We don't want it". No country allowed them to establish it. Thus they built it up in Germany. That is crazy! Well. Africa bombed. And Ghaddafi was killed. There was no UNO mandate for this, none at all. Instead the rebels were armed ... These are the rebels (picture shown). –and it was said: They stand for stability.

We have all been lied to.

I have researched on this and again outlined in my book, that english and american secret services armed the rebels even before the unrest broke out.

That's the trick with gangs: A gang is armed. The gang provokes unrest. Then they say: "Look here! There is unrest. We must help".

Then the Security Council issues a mandate for a no-fly-zone, which then is misused for a regime change.

That was Libya.

2011 the Ukraine coup d'état I have already explained. I am skipping Yemen now.

Finally, I would like to talk about Syria and then we are through.

Okay? Are you still with me? (applause).

About Syria, it is said that there is a poison-gas-dictator throwing barrel bombs, therefore Assad has to be eliminated. That's what you can hear each day in the media.

All I can say here is: It is illegal to overthrow a president of another country. In fact the issue is not if you like Assad or not.

It's not about that kind of: I like him or I don't like him. No, the issue is: no-one is allowed to violate the sovereignty of another country. That's it! (Applause).

And the French AirForce has been active in Syria since September 27th 2015. The French justify it with the fight against terrorism and actually refer to Assad whom they have to overthrow now, because this is an important project for humanity.

And of course for Human Rights, Democracy, well, Egalité, Fraternité, Liberté.

Not many remember that once, Syria was a French colony, yes, and that the French are all but famous for respecting human rights in their colonies.

Well, that was long ago, when they went there with their flags and trumpets, now we are the colonial masters, raising our flag.

Nowadays, that's not the way things are done. This is not well received anymore.

Instead, today covert wars are produced.

Here, French airplanes (picture shown).

Then I am reading about the American peace movement. I am learning a lot from the peace movements in the USA. And I can only advise that the peace movements in Russia, in Germany, in Switzerland, in the USA, in Norway, in Sweden, in Iran, also in Saudi-Arabia, that the people join forces and don't allow to get divided by nationalities.

Because that's one of these tricks: people get divided by nationalities, by religions, by income and by parties. When all are isolated, it is easy to sweep them away.

Because then all are powerless.

Now, Robert Kennedy jr. said: "Let's finally admit, what today we call terror, in fact is simply a new war for oil and gas." He said it in the USA, in my view a striking and true statement. By the way, he is Junior. Junior means he is the son of Robert Kennedy, okay? Robert Kennedy was minister of justice in the White House. His brother was John F Kennedy, who is rather well-known. What happened then was: John F. Kennedy was shot in 1963. His brother Robert wanted to clear this up. To really clarify the facts, it makes sense to become president. He had great chances to achieve this.

He was close to being elected, but then, he too was shot.

This means: Robert Kennedy Junior knows very well how the wind blows in the USA. And he has no illusions. His father was shot, OK! So he says: "The war in Syria is a 'pipeline war'. It began in 2000, when Qatar announced a plan to build a 1500 km pipeline for 10 billion \$, through Saudi-Arabia, Jordan and Syria to Turkey."

I think this is the correct analysis of the war in Syria. It's a matter of natural gas, which should be routed through Syria.

But Assad doesn't want this pipeline. That's why they try overthrow him.

Now this has absolutely nothing to do with fighting terror, but instead it has to do with raw materials.

Here I have let my collaborators draw this pipeline. That's from our institute. There are enough people who can do this.

(Picture shown) This here is the largest gas field.

It is the biggest gas field in the world and this gas field is exploited. Exploiting this gas field, they can either forward by sea with tankers, that's liquefied natural gas then, but there is a lot of gas lost in the process of liquefaction. And they are losing money too.

Therefore it would come in handy for Qatar, to build a pipeline.

(Picture) The Qataris wanted to build this red pipeline. at first through Saudi-Arabia ... then through Jordan, then through Syria, then through Turkey.

Now, Qatar is Muslim, Sunni-Muslim. Saudi-Arabia is Muslim, Sunni-Muslim. And also Turkey is Sunnite. But watch out, Syria is dominated by Alawites, which are Shiites. It were these Shiites under Assad who did not want this pipeline to be built. Apparently this was the reason why Assad should have been overthrown.

(Picture) Here in 2009, two years before the conflict erupts, the King of Qatar went to Turkey to see Erdogan, the boss of Turkey, and says: "We are very interested in constructing a gas pipeline from Qatar to Turkey."

This was in August 2009. And this is proven.

At that time, nobody imagined that a war could break out in Syria. In Aleppo in 2009, you could drink a cup of coffee peacefully.

Min 1:12:15

And then in 2009 the Turkish said: "The EU depends strongly on Russian natural gas. A pipeline for natural gas between Qatar and Turkey would contribute to solve this problem once and for all." So, here what we have is a struggle for the European gas market, currently dominated by the Russians.

Yes, Gazprom supplies Germany and supplies Switzerland. Gazprom is Putin's natural gas company and he earns a lot of money selling us natural gas. That's how it is.

(Picture shown)

This is the gas field. Many people cannot understand that this gas field in the background boosts the war in Syria. As it does not burn and it does not explode, so the connection is not obvious. But it is the largest natural gas field on earth. It is offshore and the part in Qatar is called “Northfield” and the part in Iran is called “Southpars”. Nevertheless this is one coherent geological structure.

Now, if Iran exploits this natural gas field first, they make the big haul and if Qatar exploits it first, they make the big haul. It's all about money! Anybody surprised? Once again it is worth billions!

And – we Swiss do not have natural gas but we are quite familiar with mountains. There we build many tunnels and this is roughly the same: You can drill from both sides.

And therefore I understand it so well. This issue (audience laughs) –

Now this issue is a competition: who spuds it sooner, who exploits it quicker, who has a pipeline first?

And then Assad said: “I'll realize the pipeline with the Iranians. I'll build the pipeline with the Iranians” That's what he said. Of course Qatar was very annoyed. (Picture shown) Now, as you look at it, the plan is: building this green pipeline.

None of these have been built yet, neither the red nor the green one, but the green one is the Shiite pipeline. Okay. Iran is Shiite, (uuhm), Iraq is under Shiite control as well now and Assad with the Alavis belongs to the Shiites too. This means they have common interests.

And when you look at it from this prospect, suddenly the Syrian war becomes totally clear.

The countries that want to overthrow Assad by training jihadists is Qatar, is Saudi-Arabia, is Turkey and in the background the USA, England, France. And now Germany also.

On the other side are those who don't want to see him brought down: that's the Russians, the Iranians and the Hezbollah. The Hezbollah is the Shiite militia here.

Yes it matches the pipeline.

Very rarely you can hear in the mass media that this is actually an illegal toppling of a government.

Here is a recording on CNN. Listen to Tulsi Gabbard, member of the United States Congress. She says: “The USA and the CIA are trying to topple President Assad's government. The USA and the CIA must stop this illegal and counterproductive war.”

Clear message. That's right.

The question is:” Why do we so seldom hear this?” Well, she is from Hawaii, she surfs, she feels good. And you should better ... If you are sporting, if you are free, at times you can say things that are not exactly full mainstream, because you get over it. Therefore it is good to do sports.

We have a broadcast program in Switzerland, called “Rundschau”. On October 19th, that's less than a month ago, they travelled to Damascus and interviewed president Assad.

And the Swiss, the Swiss television has , sorry THEY have asked – SRF means “Swiss radio and television” –:

”Do you consider it a lie, that the world thinks of you as a war criminal?”

He is always pictured that way, also in Switzerland

from dg

Sources:

www.dresdengespraeche.de/

www.danieleganser.ch/1102.html

This may interest you as well:

#Iran-en - www.kla.tv/iran-en

Kla.TV – The other news ... free – independent – uncensored ...



- what the media should not keep silent about ...
- Little heard – by the people, for the people! ...
- regular News at www.kla.tv/en

Stay tuned – it's worth it!

Free subscription to our e-mail newsletter here: www.kla.tv/abo-en

Security advice:

Unfortunately countervoices are being censored and suppressed more and more. As long as we don't report according to the ideology and interests of the corporate media, we are constantly at risk, that pretexts will be found to shut down or harm Kla.TV.

So join an internet-independent network today! Click here:

www.kla.tv/vernetzung&lang=en

Licence:  *Creative Commons License with Attribution*

Spreading and reproducing is endorsed if Kla.TV if reference is made to source. No content may be presented out of context.
The use by state-funded institutions is prohibited without written permission from Kla.TV. Infraction will be legally prosecuted.