

Chapter 1 : Doomed to failure, slangily crossword clue

doomed to failure, doomed to fail adj adjective: Describes a noun or pronoun--for example, "a tall girl," "an interesting book," "a big house." (destined not to succeed).

We have become so wedded to this idea that we no longer recognise it for what it is, an idea. It is a theory of change. Nothing more, nothing less. It is simply a hypothesis and in some circumstances it works. That does not make it universally true. It is the mental model we hold about how things actually happen. When the outcomes we get differ from those our theory projected it should ring alarm bells. Something should be telling us that the way things really happen is different to our theory. So we need to re-examine our mental models if we are to be more successful. In the UK, so many government programmes of change are predicated on this theory of pilot and roll-out. It holds true for many global corporations as well. Invariably, the successes of the pilots and there are often many successes fail to be replicated at scale in the wider system. We notice this but continue to pursue the same model in each new change initiative. If we are to break this pattern we need to consider afresh the way in which we attempt major change. The pilot and roll-out model works well in a mechanistic system. If I have a problem with the suspension on my car I can adjust the damping until I get a setting that works better. Applying that adjustment to all similar suspension systems on all similar models of car will most likely be a success. This is a characteristic of mechanistic systems; they are predictable. When we come to work with human systems something different occurs. Jake Chapman described the difference between mechanistic and living systems in a wonderful metaphor. If a mechanistic system is like throwing a rock in that it is predictable, with a knowledge of basic ballistics you can accurately predict where the rock will fall then a living system is like throwing a bird. Once it leaves your hand who knows where it may go, perhaps the place you intended but not necessarily by your predicted route. Or it may go somewhere entirely different. Cesar Hidalgo explores how knowledge and know how are transferred in order that we might make things. He has plotted the network of relationships between industries, employment and places. The bigger and more complex the network that holds this information, the harder it is to move it. Only a few countries are major producers of jet engines for example. Moving and copying the information in a large network such as all the technology involved in producing jet engines is much harder than moving and copying the information in a small network such as how to make shirts. Most countries have manufacturers involved in shirt production. Hidalgo describes this as moving a jigsaw puzzle. Imagine having to pick up all the pieces of a jigsaw and move them from one place to another. The relationships between the pieces that hold them are broken and so when you get to the new location you have to start to build the puzzle all over again. Now lets take this a stage further. People who are in relationship with each other. People who are in relationship also with others outside the puzzle. Now imagine saying to one operating company, or hospital or city, we want you to do what our pilot company or hospital or city is doing. In order to this in this living system, it would be necessary to replicate all those key relationships, inside and outside the topic area, such that it would work. Pilot and roll-out in human systems is doomed to failure. Well, in a living system the clue is in the name. Something that infects the system and spreads through it such that each node or place in the system grows its own response. This means giving up control from the centre. Once the ideas start to spread and grow, your ability to control them is gone. The role of leadership shifts from the illusion of control to the holding of space. This means formulating sufficiently strong relationships, aligned around a broad strategic intent that creates the space for people to grow the ideas you are seeding. It means nurturing these ideas rather than limiting or killing them. This seems inherently weak for people who feel they are held accountable for results. It is an act of considerable courage to let go of this illusion of control. If we opened our eyes we would see the wonderful irony. Trying to manage human change through pilot and roll-out has actually grown something. A proliferation of project managers. The Big Five Error: View 5d2b may not exist Share this:

Chapter 2 : doomed to failure - English-French Dictionary - Glosbe

Doomed to Failure. We don't like it. We don't agree with it. We'd prefer an honest and stable money supply, and the impartial discipline it exacts on an economy.

Unfortunately, this may not be possible the way things are going. As Milton Jones once revealed: A similar fate may await the larded up US economy. In short, the U. It has been too larded up and larded over with debt for any real sustainable growth to take root. More evidence, to this effect, was revealed this week. Only time will tell, for sure. But anyone with an ear to the ground and a nose to the grindstone knows the answer to that question. Moreover, it has become near impossible for corporations to grow their earnings. Still, we seem to think a bigger adjustment will occur before corporations rediscover their footing. In fact, we expect this adjustment to be accompanied by increases in layoffs, company reorganizations, and corporate bankruptcies. US non-financial corporate debt [up and away!](#) The problem is, when it does decline, it usually feels like the world is about to end. This is the result of the unholy trinity of fiat money, central banking and a fractionally reserved banking system [click to enlarge](#). Episodes of economic recession invariably happen, including massive debt pileups and bankruptcies. Where government finances are concerned, it only takes a moderate growth stall out for budgets to get blown to pieces. The money, remember, has already been allocated. So when tax receipts slide deficits explode. Then, in a seemingly counter-intuitive way, even greater issuance of debt [in the form of fiscal stimulus](#) [is needed to keep the debt from piling up even more](#). For in a twisted way, backing off on new debt issuance, and the resulting subsequent economic drop off, actually causes debt ratios to increase. This, of course, is the Keynesian argument against austerity. But unfortunately, the world as it presently exists, is based on a system of dishonest money that robs savers and rewards borrowers. Obviously, such a devious system is doomed to failure. Once the economy has become so dependent upon stimulus to persist, new stimulus fails to prop up further growth. Like the Ouroboros, the mythical serpent eating its own tail, eventually it consumes itself. From a pure financial standpoint, the United States is going to hell in a hand bucket. The calculation is based on nominal GDP, since the debt is reckoned in nominal terms as well. Still, this is the above the level that has historically been associated with economic stagnation and eventually, worse [click to enlarge](#). As noted above, per the IMF, estimated growth for is 1. In short, debt is increasing. What to make of it? We like to keep things real simple around here at the Economic Prism. Either the economy must rebound or it is slipping and sliding its way back into recession. By the looks of things, it appears the economy must go backward before it can go forward.

Chapter 3 : Doomed To Failure | Zero Hedge

If something is doomed to happen, or if you are doomed to a particular state, something unpleasant is certain to happen, and you can do nothing to prevent it. Their plans seemed doomed to failure. [+ to].

Still, he pushes onward, always grasping for the big breakthrough. The allure of something for nothing is too enticing to pass up. That prosperity can be attained without labor. Three Cheers for James Riley! Going All In All people, of both good and questionable character, share a singular talent. Why live with restraint when you can get radical? A fairly famous stretch of LA riverbed graffiti A few years ago, we briefly discussed the dynamics of sand piles in these pages, which are a special field of study in mathematics and physics mathematically inclined readers can take a look at two papers on the subject here: Eastern Monetary Drought Smug Central Planners Looking back at the past decade, it would be easy to conclude that central planners have good reason to be smug. After all, the Earth is still turning. Naturally, we were premature in calling for the pompes When Fake Money Becomes Scarce Remaining Focused A rousing display of diversions this week assured the American populace was looking every which way but right under its collective nose. White House spats with purveyors of fake news. The forced resignation of Attorney General Sessions Old drug warrior otherwise recused on his way home to Alabama Sideshows like these, and many more, offered near limitless opportunities to focus on matters of insignificance. For many people, the attraction to gold and silver began with a desire to protect themselves from the monetary train wreck of That often grew into a sense that gold is the solution to that problem. The post GFC monetary train wreck: Roger Barris for Congress! We will briefly explain why you should vote for Roger, but first two pictures: Roger Barris, Libertarian Party candidate for the House We decided to post it belatedly anyway: Lastly we would note that we have a strong

Ever tried to learn a language but found it too hard? Best-selling language expert Paul Noble has a quick and easy way to get you back on track with his unique tried-and-tested method.

UNRWA has provided Palestinian refugees and their descendants with education and healthcare for over 70 years. The British colonial government dispatched British High Commissioner Herbert Samuel to Palestine in to help implement the creation of a Jewish national home in Palestine against the will of the Palestinians and other Arabs. And now Trump has dispatched Kushner and Friedman, two strong supporters of continued Israeli colonization in the West Bank. In fact, both of them and their families have ideologically and financially backed the building of Jewish settlements on Palestinian lands. Not only did he fail to quell the aspirations of the native Palestinians, he sowed the seeds of conflict and violence that continue until today. These statements reflect ignorance and colonial hubris. Such a haughty posture failed to save the apartheid policy in South Africa and is doomed to fail in Palestine. They are invested in continued Israeli domination and subordination of the Palestinian people through settlements, power asymmetry, and military control. Kushner and Friedman are the vehicles through which Netanyahu is implementing his extreme right and racist policies toward the Palestinians. These exclusionary policies are not only directed against the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza. They have also targeted the Arab citizens of the state of Israel. This also applies to the Druze community whose youth are required to serve in the Israeli army. Although Trump is ultimately the architect of foreign policy, Kushner, Friedman, and Netanyahu are the real culprits in the design and implementation of this mean-spirited, aggressive policy. They have endorsed continued suppression of the Palestinian people, expropriation of their lands, and denial of their legitimate national aspirations and identity. Trump, meanwhile, seems ideologically vacuous, without concern for the Palestinian people or other indigenous peoples. As long as Arab dictators remain indifferent to the plight of the Palestinians and continue to receive U. Although the Palestinians are powerless to challenge the Kushner-Friedman demands or fight the occupation, their anger will continue to simmer. Many of their youth will turn to extremism and even terrorism. Many of these Israeli Arab citizens know Israel well, have native fluency in Hebrew, and are indistinguishable from Israeli Jews of Middle Eastern origins. This is the nightmare that Israeli security and intelligence services are dreading. What Does This All Mean? The Israeli right, which now occupies the political center in Israel, has never been interested in peace with the Palestinians, has never accepted the basic premise of a Palestinian state, and has even denied the existence of the Palestinians as a people. The Israeli right now feels more empowered than ever by the Netanyahu-Trump camaraderie and the direct access that Kushner and Friedman have to the Oval Office. Settlement expansion has continued at a feverish pace. The occupation has become more pervasive, controlling the lives of Palestinians all over Gaza and the West Bank, with no regard for Palestinian sovereignty in Palestinian cities, including Ramallah, the so-called administrative capital of the Palestinian state, where the Palestinian Authority president and his government reside. They always insisted that the negotiations should ultimately address the future of Jerusalem, the boundaries of their envisioned state, the status of refugees, and the right of return. Far from being radical, such a position has always been supported by the international community, including the United States. That is, until the Trump administration took office. They will not accept Israeli control in perpetuity. Otherwise, the two envoys will return to Washington empty-handed. Israeli and Palestinian pluralities still support peace between Israelis and Palestinians, but the support for a two-state solution is fading rapidly. If this is the case, any possible solution should be based on peoples, not states. Kushner and Friedman will have to understand that two peoples occupy the area between the Jordan River and the sea. Where Do We Go from Here? They should be relieved of their roles. President Trump should ask other prominent Americans to handle this task. They are respected by both sides for their even-handedness and have the gravitas and expertise to engage the two peoples. It is time for the United States to rejoin the international community in seeking a solution to this conflict. Although Trump has for all intents and purposes abandoned any leadership role in the Middle East, influential foreign policy advisers must prevail on him to take another look. A new group must take charge of

the issue.

Doomed to failure, slangily We are here to make your life easier when you are stuck. We love crossword puzzles and we know how challenging your work can be only for an www.nxgvision.com've been working for the past years to solve all the clues from the papers and online crosswords such as USA Today.

Making Sense of the American Right. By Paul Edward Gottfried. Quite the contrary, it opposed traditional conservatism as an enemy of liberty. Rothbard states his view with characteristic force. He refers to "the philosophy that has marked genuinely conservative thought, regardless of label, since the ancient days of Oriental despotism: The Old Right of Nock, Flynn, Garrett, and others, was a classical liberal movement, not a conservative one. Nevertheless, his main argument very usefully supplements Rothbard. Gottfried, though himself sympathetic to European conservatism, maintains that a conservatism of this stripe could not, and did not, exist in the United States. If he is correct, then not only was the Old Right not conservative, as Rothbard says; it could not have been. But why can European-style conservatism not take root in America? Gottfried thinks that conservatism needs a social basis to flourish. Absent a hierarchical class structure, there is no basis for a viable conservatism; and such a structure did not exist in America. Conservative values do not float freely in abstraction from class. Here Gottfried has been greatly influenced by Karl Mannheim. In opposition to these reformers, conservative critics on the continent upheld the inalienability of aristocratic estatesâ€" p. The intellectuals are freely floating in that since the Middle Ages, "they have been moving around looking for classes and groups to which they could attach themselves" p. Because the appropriate social classes for European conservatism were not to be found in the United States, the attempt by William Buckley and his National Review cohorts to establish a simulacrum of European conservatism in America was doomed to failure. Russell Kirk in *The Conservative Mind* offered a list of supposed conservative principles, but his creed was amorphous and, in new editions of the book, changed with the times. Harry Jaffa endeavored to deduce a principled politics from the equality clause of the Declaration of Independence, but his attempt failed. Absolute values, it was hoped, would provide the needed basis for an American conservative politics. In what seems to me the most philosophically interesting section of the book, Gottfried rejects this project. He also contends that the attempt to establish absolute values will have disastrous consequences. Here we must avoid misunderstanding. Gottfried, in his criticism of absolute values, does not claim that all value judgments are subjective. He acknowledges, with Max Scheler and Nicolai Hartmann, that there are objective hierarchies of value: The value terminology that runs through the discourse of such ethicists as [Eliseo] Vivas, Max Scheler, J. Findlay, and the Swedish humanist Claes Ryn refers explicitly to a morally structured universe, one in which ethical judgments have to be made in terms of either a supposedly recognizable order of ascending goods or a single highest good. Often, political figures endeavor to impose their subjective preferences on everyone else. They do so by contending without reason that their values apply universally. The attempt to impose values in this way results in what Carl Schmitt called the "tyranny of values. His "highest value" can be rendered valid only in proportion to how widely he can apply it by forcing its acceptance. Certainly, the excesses of Wilsonianism and of contemporary neoconservatism count as prime instances in point. But it does not follow from this that no values are binding on everyone. Kant, after all, had arguments for the categorical imperative; he did not simply postulate it as valid. If Schmitt thinks him wrong, he must refute him. To describe what he takes to be the bad consequences of universalism does not suffice. Schmitt and Gottfried stand innocent, though, of a charge that may have occurred to some readers. If they fear the destructive effects of universalism, are they not attempting to impose a universal value of their own, namely the avoidance of destructive conflicts of value? Have they here enmeshed themselves in contradiction? I do not think so. They are best read, not as making a value claim, but rather a factual one. This is what happens, they say, if one attempts to universalize values. It is then up to us whether we view this consequence as so bad that it leads us to reject universalism. If we do so view it, we need not claim that our act of rejection itself expresses a value of universal validity. But have not Schmitt and Gottfried escaped this snare only to fall before another objection? If they say that their rejection of universalism does not itself claim universal validity, have they not

embraced value subjectivism? How then can they appeal to the objective value hierarchies of Scheler and Hartmann? Here I think one must distinguish between objectivity and universality. One can consistently hold that certain values are true independently of personal preference while holding at the same time that these values do not impose binding obligations on all, come what may. If what I have said so far is right, though, am I not left with a problem of my own? I have said that Schmitt and Gottfried have failed to refute the universalist claims of Kant and others like him. But neither have I refuted their claim that universalism leads to destructive conflicts about values. Am I left in the uncomfortable position, then, of asserting that a system of values that leads to destructive conflicts may nevertheless turn out to be true? My escape lies in the nature of the values claimed to be universally true. What if these values include the claim that one may not initiate force against others? Would not a system that includes this value be able to sustain itself against the charge of a tyranny of values? Of course, I have not conjured this idea out of my imagination. It is precisely the libertarian ethics defended by Murray Rothbard. I hope that Gottfried will in his future work respond in more detail to the claims of libertarian ethics, as well as develop at length his fascinating remarks about ethical theory. As our author abundantly shows, neither National Review conservatives nor neoconservatives have been able to sustain a coherent set of values. Instead, as leftist views have become ever more dominant in public opinion, these supposed defenders of absolute truth have bowed with the wind. They have themselves moved leftward, in an effort to accommodate themselves to the prevailing consensus. He is held to have favored a strict policy of nondiscrimination and to have spurned special treatment for blacks. But within twenty years, the same sources not only played down what until a few years earlier had enflamed their editors, but they were discovering in a once-despised social radical a deeply conservative Christian theologian. In his detailed account of the peregrinations of values conservatives, Gottfried indicts not only his customary target, the neoconservatives, but also William Buckley, Jr. As Gottfried shows, Buckley has often played a malign role in purging from conservatism those not in accord with the values he at the time professes. He would not allow Old Rightists such as John T. Flynn access to his magazine to argue against the Cold War statism it was the principal aim of National Review to advance. Buckley continued his nefarious course even as late as , in his shameful obituary of Murray Rothbard. A man of principle who refused to accommodate himself to the current consensus was too much for Buckley to bear. It is an indispensable work for understanding what passes for American conservatism in our day. I am glad to see that Gottfried mentions J. Findlay, an undeservedly neglected thinker.

Their plans seemed doomed to failure 2 adj Someone or something that is doomed is certain to fail or be destroyed. I used to pour time and energy into projects that were doomed from the start.

Only the Trump team seems particularly eager to see this plan come about, which is telling. No matter what Jason and Jared may have heard, none of their Arab interlocutors is in a position to move forward on a deal that the Palestinians have summarily rejected. Trump approaches the entire question of Palestine transactionally, in line with his approach to most issues. This view was reflected in an interview Kushner gave to the Palestinian newspaper, al-Quds. But the entire interview seems to reflect just such a view. US negotiators have routinely, and justifiably, been accused of being deaf to the pulse of the Palestinian people, but Kushner seems even more hard of hearing than usual. The Trump team has shrouded the peace plan in mystery. Right now, the plan has no chance of success. Indeed, it could do a great deal of damage. The Details Although nothing has been confirmed about any potential Trump peace plan, there have been persistent rumors about the basic points. Nothing is ever certain with Trump, but the details that have been circulating are cause for great concern. In exchange, Israel will withdraw from three to five Arab villages and neighborhoods east and north of Jerusalem. Saudi Arabia would be given some involvement in administering the Temple Mount, although exactly what that means is unclear. Israel would not evacuate any other West Bank settlements and would maintain full control over the Jordan Valley. Egypt would facilitate movement of workers from Gaza through the Rafah crossing. Israeli restrictions would continue as they have been. If these points are accurate, the plan is a recipe for disaster. And the repercussions would be felt not only in Israel, the West Bank, and Gaza, but all around the region. If the plans for El-Arish move forward, it further entrenches the separation between Gaza and the West Bank and makes reunification more complicated. Also, in coordination with Egypt, Fatah-Hamas reconciliation talks will resume with the goal of reviving the national-unity government in Gaza. But whether or not there is movement toward reconciliation, the rest of the plan is a non-starter. No matter what kind of economic incentives the United States and its partners in the Persian Gulf offer, Palestinians are not going to accept a deal that leaves Israel in control of their freedom of movement from one population center to another and of the growth of their towns and cities. They will not accept a pseudo-state with little sovereignty. And they will not simply forget all about the millions of Palestinian refugees living outside the West Bank and Gaza. Abbas will reject the plan. Trump and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu will paint him as intransigent, and he will also likely face some backlash from the Saudis. Hamas, since it too will certainly reject the deal out of hand, will need to find a way to keep working with Egypt. This plan allows for that possibility. Israel The Israeli government seems decidedly unenthusiastic about the Trump peace plan, and for good reason. The love affair between Netanyahu and Trump continues apace. The unrest in Gaza is little more than an unpleasant news story for most Israelis. The PA continues to maintain quiet in the West Bank, where in recent months even isolated attacks have been few and far between. An indictment that seemed imminent at the beginning of the year continues to loom just beyond the horizon. The prime minister has managed to leverage Russia into pushing Iran out of Syria and has emerged from the first Israel-Iran engagements as the victor. Most Israelis are unaffected by the opprobrium their government has gotten for its response to peaceful protests in Gaza. Neither the Israeli public nor Netanyahu wants to see the boat rocked right now. Jordan Perhaps the most baffling part of the rumored plan is the idea of giving Saudi Arabia an increased role on the Temple Mount. It was also the key selling point for the peace treaty between Jordan and Israel that has allowed the survival of an agreement highly unpopular among Jordanians. Given the recent instability in Jordan and the role the kingdom plays in maintaining the status quo on the explosive issue of the Temple Mount, this point is a matter of grave concern. Just holding that meeting in Amman was a risky decision for Abdullah, as the recent protests in Gaza have intensified the always significant anti-Israel sentiment in Jordan. Netanyahu surely must understand that there is no good, and potentially a great deal of harm, for Israel in shifting the status quo on the Temple Mount. It would not be surprising to see this plank removed from their peace platform, but then it remains to be seen how MbS will

respond. Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and the UAE MbS is quickly developing a reputation as a policy bungler to go along with his much more positive reputation as a power broker. But bringing this controversy into an already fraught peace plan is simply foolhardy. One effect of the Trump peace plan would be to relegate the Arab Peace Initiative—something Saudi King Salman sees as a major diplomatic accomplishment—to the dustbin of history. The question is whether MbS would feel so slighted if the US canceled this part of the proposal that he would reduce his political or financial support for the rest. Trump wants Qatar involved in the financing of the Gaza projects. This is actually sensible, as far as it goes. It also makes sense to have Qatar, along with Egypt, continue to be a player in Gaza if Israel and the US want to reduce any potential for Iran to take a more substantial role there. The Saudis and the United Arab Emirates, however, do not agree. They are so anxious to cut Qatar out of the equation that they have said they will pay more for the Gaza projects to make up for blocking the Qataris. This is all simmering now, but it promises to be a much more difficult enigma for the US and the region if and when the peace plan is announced. Egypt Last Thursday, Egypt issued this statement: Egypt appears pleased with the idea of some investment in the free trade zone that might help to quell the violence in Sinai and ease conditions in Gaza. But Egyptian President Abdel Fattah el-Sisi seems to recognize that this is not a substitute for a political solution. The statement clearly contradicts any plan for a Palestinian capital other than East Jerusalem and would also implicitly reject Israeli control of the Jordan Valley. This schizophrenic attitude toward the Trump plan reflects the dueling impulses among an Arab leadership weary of Abbas and frustrated by the Palestinian issue. The MbS-led faction seems decidedly indifferent to the plight of the Palestinians, would like to work much more closely with Israel, and is not eager to differ with Trump. Like King Salman, al-Sisi does not favor entrenching the split between Gaza and the West Bank, which seems to be the strategy at the heart of this plan. Territorially, it reflects the desires of the Israeli right. But Netanyahu and his allies have pursued their vision of control of the Jordan Valley, keeping the settlements in place and isolating Gaza, in smaller steps. The less patient Americans are trying to move the process along faster, oblivious to the risks it entails. The optimal outcome is for Trump to bury this plan. It stands to reason that a group of US Jews from the far right, who support Israeli settlements and hold Palestinian rights in low regard, is not likely to come up with a viable plan. Unless the rumored details are way off the mark, this plan cannot possibly succeed.

Chapter 7 : doomed to failure (@witchmanne) â€¢ Instagram photos and videos

According to the report's multiple internal sources, many of those working on the AirPower project believe the device may be "doomed to failure" unless engineering solutions can be found for a.

What a state the EU seems to be in? What has happened to it? The EU has become a bureaucratic system that we call a super-national confederation of states but, from the legal point of view, it has this tendency to turn into a federal state. And this is one of its essential problems. It is not just an alliance of states anymore, but a federation without a legitimate base. It has no nation, no European nation, but nations. Political relations within the union get less democratic all the time. In this situation we are losing what we call a legal state, which is of the highest priority. The euro seems to be in great trouble too. What is going to happen to it? The euro will inevitably fail. It was always clear that the euro-project would not succeed. Already in I have processed the Maastricht law suit that was mostly against the introduction of the monetary union. Without the consent of the nations comprising the EU, the euro is being used as a political lever to make the EU a super state that, for example, goes against Russia, and at the same time, serves as a counterbalance against China, the USA and other economic giants. But this lever was always economically doomed to failure. The eurozone is comprised of very different, heterogeneous economies, which can hardly be an optimal space for a common currency. A combination of internal markets with common currency requires member states to carry out revaluation and devaluation of their currencies, taking into account different levels of productivity and the efficiency of their economies. Weaker member states are not competitive, and bailouts cannot help here, as we see now. And that is not the case. It is a long way before we can possibly reach it. The worst thing here is that a common currency is counterproductive. It hampers the aims of economic development. But we still hold to the euro, because we want to make a super state out of the EU. The subject of bailouts is also causing a lot of controversy, particularly in Germany because it has to pay most of the bills. What is going to happen with bailouts? They simply say that there is no other alternative but to sometimes neglect some provisions of the treaties and our constitution. Otherwise the euro would crash. The euro is really of no value, it is only an instrument and nothing more. Nobody needs this EU, which became a bureaucratic dictatorship. I wish we could have an association of European states and nations, which would be capable of admitting the Russian Federation, a very important European state. The EU wants to be a super state politically but it will fail economically. What caused the current financial crisis in the EU? The euro has contributed, but also the debt-collection policy which has other causes. The debt existed long before, from the time of the reunification of Germany. But the southern European countries that are in trouble now, were those that could boost their loan debt because of too favorable and subsidized interest rates. They lived beyond their means. And wages in Germany rose by 5. This is all from credit. The easing of credit terms, the halving of interest rates, is a false scent. It itself is the main reason for the debt. Multiculturalism has failed, say European leaders. But what are the actual consequences of that failure? If by multiculturalism you mean people from southern Europe, Germany, northern Europe, Hungary, Poland, Russia, all European nations, living together, then no, it has not failed. There is no problem at all. The problem is with the Muslims. And Islam comes with Muslim people. They build active groups that promote Islam and advocate the establishment of Sharia law. And Sharia law, particular its criminal section, is absolutely impossible for European relationships. We have religious pluralism in Europe and not a single religion is dominant. But Islam is the religion that tolerates another religion as long as it has no power. Secularization was the biggest political event for Europe. It meant that state and church were divided and no one is entitled to impose its religion. I am determined against any tolerance of Sharia law. But it has nothing to do with tolerating Muslim people.

Chapter 8 : Reports: Apple AirPower still overheating, may be â€œdoomed to failureâ€• | Ars Technica

They might only be cruelly holding out hope to one of the doomed. We are not, as some would have us believe, doomed to an inevitable decline. But there, as well as in the House, the Irish Establishment was doomed.

Chapter 9 : Doomed to Failure: American Conservatism | Mises Institute

SportsPulse: The Patriots and Steelers have been the standard in the AFC and the NFL for over a decade, and now both face internal strife, and a realization that an era of dominance is coming to end.