

Nobel Peace Committee Wants Obama To Return Peace Prize

Victor Mikhin, State of the Nation, 20 September 2016

Thorbjorn Jagland, chairman of the Nobel Peace Committee, said that US President Barack Obama “should really consider” an immediate surrender of his Nobel Peace Prize Medal. According to the Swedish newspaper Svenska Dagbladet, Jagland, accompanied by four other members of the Committee, said that they had never asked for the return of the Peace Prize before, “even from such a war criminal as Henry Kissinger.” The Committee awarded the Peace Prize to Barack Obama in 2009 after he had managed to convince everyone that he was supporting “the creation of a new environment ... of multilateral diplomacy” and emphasized the role of the United Nations, and such tools for resolving international conflicts, as dialogues and negotiations.

But reality has shattered the illusions of not only members of the Nobel Prize Committee, but also of the majority of the international community that is witnessing barbarity, cynicism, impudence, frank insolence, demagoguery, cheap manipulation of facts incompetent members of the administration and the President himself freely use. “During the Obama’s reign, and through the fault of the United States, the world has become even more insecure place,” noted the Indian newspaper, Hindustan Times. “It is scary and creepy to live in it, and the future looks bleak, pessimistic and hopeless.”

Let’s, for example, take a look at last actions of Barack Obama (who will soon be gone for good) in the once tranquil but now turbulent Middle East. When foreign ministers of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) gathered in Doha (Qatar) for a meeting with Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov and US Secretary of State John Kerry to resolve the situation in the region, none other than Barack Obama generously poured oil to the fire of the conflict. According to his new order, the US armed forces can now respond to any hostile action taken against the Syrian “moderate” opposition. In addition to that, the Pentagon also reserves the right to protect opponents of Bashar al-Assad from the air and retaliate in the event they are attacked by either radicals from the Islamic State (ISIS), or the Syrian army. In essence, this means the US can now be directly involved in the civil war in Syria on the side of the Syrian opposition. It should be noted that Washington had received consent for its actions neither from the UN nor from the official Syrian government. In other words, the “world gendarme” has decided to threaten the world with its military club once again. Apparently, the “highbrow professionals” from the banks of the Potomac River have not learned their lesson from the situations with Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya and now Syria.

By the way, many are curious to know, how could the US mighty “hawks,” soaring at such an unattainable height that they can hardly see the ground, let alone its inhabitants, distinguish “good” terrorists from “bad” ones. Who will define the degree of ‘moderateness’ of the “opposition members” going into battle? Are they really the opposition members or rather common terrorists, who have just received weapons from their American advisers along with a generous “tip” for their services paid by reactionary regime bosses from the Persian Gulf? Just listen to that! It was announced that American advisers have trained ...only 60 opposition members. Now, that explains why the US would use carpet bombing to wipe out life from the Syrian territory. Just take a look at the past, when American pilots performed “great feats of courage” bombing German towns during World War II, or when they used atomic bombs against civilians in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

In view of that, the Foreign Minister of Syria Walid Muallem accused Washington of training militants from the Islamic State and allocating billions of dollars for this organization, which is outlawed in Russia. The head of the Syrian Foreign Ministry made this statement during talks with his Russian counterpart, Sergei Lavrov. Walid Muallem noted that over two thousand

militants armed with newest weapons had been recently transferred to the southern regions of Syria. He also added, "America demands a political solution, yet it allocates billions of dollars to train terrorists."

Many political analysts believe that Washington is playing a double game: while saying that they oppose the Caliphate, Washington, on the other hand, wants it to be strong, at least until the fall of the legitimately elected President Bashar Assad. In other words, it turns out that the Obama administration is informally setting priorities: let's first oust the pro-Russian and pro-Iranian regime from Damascus, and then unite all forces to strike against the Caliphate. Of course, this position has not been expressed publicly, but recent actions of the United States suggest that it follows this precise policy. It is not clear, though, just how Washington is going to dispose of the Islamic State terrorist organization later if it, like a vampire satiated with American weapons and hundreds of millions of dollars, has matured enough to live its own life and is not willing to follow the instructions of Uncle Sam any longer. Washington's relations with its creation, the terrorist organization al-Qaeda, is a good illustration of how such "deals" might evolve.

It does not take to be a rocket scientist to understand that Washington's spiteful reaction was a response to those peaceful solutions to the Middle East crisis and the anti-ISIS measures that the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Russia had voiced in Doha. "Mr. Lavrov commented the Russian proposal on the establishment of a broad anti-terrorist front backed by a coherent international legislation in order to fend off terrorists in Syria, Iraq and other countries of the regions," reads the statement issued by the Russian Foreign Ministry. The Russian side believes that "air strikes will not solve the problem," "it is necessary to form a coalition of like-minded people, including those, who will oppose the terrorist threat as armed ground forces." "It is natural that these forces should include the Syrian and Iraqi armies and the Kurds," said the Minister. He stressed that this statement expressed the essence of Mr. Putin's initiative. According to diplomatic sources, Moscow sees it as crucial for the coalition to receive an approval of the UN Security Council. Incidentally, the Russian leader intends to devote special attention to this issue in his speech at the opening of the 70th session of the UN General Assembly in New York, in September.

Not surprisingly, Russia's peace proposals in Doha were embraced by all Arab representatives, starting from the head of the Palestinian Hamas' political bureau Khaled Mashaal, and ending with the Arab heavyweights the Emir of Qatar Sheikh Tamim bin Hamad Al Thani, the Qatari head of the Foreign Ministry Khaled al-Attiyah and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Saudi Arabia Adel al-Arabia Dzhubeyrom. Political analysts are united in their opinion that the meeting in Doha gave a significant impetus to the convergence of positions and the deployment of co-operation between Russia and the Gulf states. Apparently, in the near future there will be more follow up meetings in various formats and on different platforms, including a meeting in Moscow with the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Saudi Arabia.

In the view of current developments, American newspaper The Hill expressed its opinion that Russia is winning over the Middle East, while the US and Washington's foreign policy architects are losing ground. Russia has managed to attract Saudi Arabia as one of its allies, which has dramatically changed the balance of power on the Arabian Peninsula. "Russia is a long-time ally of Syria and Iran. Saudi Arabia has made friends with Moscow and has committed itself to investing up to 10 billion dollars in the Russian economy. In return, Russia has promised to resolve the conflict between Iran and Saudi Arabia," wrote the newspaper.

In conclusion, it would be justified to once again quote the words of the chairman of the Nobel Committee. Thorbjorn Jagland said that the members of the Committee were "roaring drunk" on the day when they voted for Barack Obama, just as it was the case during the annual Norwegian wine tasting festival AQUAVIT. "Completely stoned" Committee members kept listening over and over to a record of the Obama's speech he had given in Cairo, envisioning a

glorious future: a man leading America and the whole world to a new era of peace, hope and goodwill. “Within a few hours we all felt like wide-eyed 18-year-old students on the campus of the beautiful, sunny University of Bergen! Oh, how we wept with joy!”

The Chair said that Mr. Obama could send the medal back in a simple package by regular mail if it would help him to overcome the embarrassment and shame of a public return. But here the esteemed Thorbjorn Jagland is deeply mistaken. Members of the Washington administration as well as their boss have long forgotten the meaning of such categories, as shame, honour and common decency. Instead, they have adopted lies, demagoguery and the commonplace hoax with threats to use their military and possibly even nuclear club in any corner of the world.