

LES MENSONGES DE LA GUERRE DE L'OCCIDENT CONTRE LA LIBYE

Par Jean-Paul Pougala (*)

A- Les vraies raisons de la guerre en Lybie

1-Premier satellite Africain RASCOM 1

C'est la Libye de Kadhafi qui offre à toute l'Afrique sa première vraie révolution des temps modernes : assurer la couverture universelle du continent pour la téléphonie, la télévision, la radiodiffusion et de multiples autres applications telles que la télémédecine et l'enseignement à distance ; pour la première fois, une connexion à bas coût devient disponible sur tout le continent, jusque dans les zones rurales grâce au système par pont radio WMAX.

L'histoire démarre en 1992 lorsque 45 pays africains créent la société RASCOM pour disposer d'un satellite africain et faire chuter les coûts de communication sur le continent. Téléphoner de et vers l'Afrique est alors le tarif le plus cher au monde, parce qu'il y avait un impôt de 500 millions de dollars que l'Europe encaissait par an sur les conversations téléphoniques même à l'intérieur du même pays africain, pour le transit des voix sur les satellites européens comme Intelsat. Un satellite africain coûtait juste 400 millions de dollars payable une seule fois et ne plus payer les 500 millions de location par an. Quel banquier ne financerait pas un tel projet ? Mais l'équation la plus difficile à résoudre était : comment l'esclave peut-il s'affranchir de l'exploitation servile de son maître en sollicitant l'aide de ce dernier pour y parvenir ? Ainsi, la Banque Mondiale, le FMI, les USA, l'Union Européenne ont fait miroiter inutilement ces pays pendant 14 ans.

C'est en 2006 que Kadhafi met fin au supplice de l'inutile mendicité aux prétendus bienfaiteurs occidentaux pratiquant des prêts à un taux usuraire; le guide Libyen a ainsi mis sur la table 300 millions de dollars, La Banque Africaine de Développement a mis 50 millions, la Banque Ouest Africaine de Développement, 27 millions et c'est ainsi que l'Afrique a depuis le 26 décembre 2007 le tout premier satellite de communication de son histoire. Dans la foulée, la Chine et la Russie s'y sont mises, cette fois en cédant leur technologie et ont permis le lancement de nouveaux satellites, Sud-Africain, Nigérian, Angolais, Algérien et même un deuxième satellite africain est lancé en juillet 2010. Et on attend pour 2020, le tout premier satellite technologiquement 100% africain et construit sur le sol africain, notamment en Algérie. Ce satellite est prévu pour concurrencer les meilleurs du monde, mais à un coût 10 fois inférieur, un vrai défi.

Voilà comment un simple geste symbolique de 300 petits millions peut changer la vie de tout un continent. La Libye de Kadhafi a fait perdre à l'Occident, pas seulement 500 millions de dollars par an mais les milliards de dollars de dettes et d'intérêts que cette même dette permettait de générer à l'infini et de façon exponentielle, contribuant ainsi à entretenir le système occulte pour dépouiller l'Afrique.

2. Fond Monétaire Africain, Banque Centrale Africaine, Banque Africaine des Investissements

Les 30 milliards de dollars saisis par M. Obama appartiennent à la Banque Centrale Libyenne et prévu pour la contribution libyenne à la finalisation de la fédération africaine à travers 3 projets phare :

- la Banque Africaine d'Investissement à Syrte en Libye,
- la création dès ce 2011 du Fond Monétaire Africain avec un capital de 42 milliards de dollars avec

Yaoundé pour siège,

- la Banque Centrale Africaine avec le siège à Abuja au Nigeria dont la première émission de la monnaie africaine signera la fin du Franc CFA grâce auquel Paris a la main mise sur certains pays africains depuis 50 ans.

On comprend dès lors et encore une fois la rage de Paris contre Kadhafi. Le Fond Monétaire Africain doit remplacer en tout et pour tout les activités sur le sol africain du Fond Monétaire International qui avec seulement 25 milliards de dollars de capital a pu mettre à genoux tout un continent avec des privatisations discutables, comme le fait d'obliger les pays africains à passer d'un monopole public vers un monopole privé. Ce sont les mêmes pays occidentaux qui ont frappés à la porte pour être eux aussi membres du Fond Monétaire africain et c'est à l'unanimité que le 16-17 décembre 2010 à Yaoundé les Africains ont repoussé cette convoitise, instituant que seuls les pays africains seront membres de ce FMA.

Il est donc évident qu'après la Libye la coalition occidentale déclarera sa prochaine guerre à l'Algérie, parce qu'en plus des ses ressources énergétiques énormes, ce pays a une réserve monétaire de 150 milliards d'Euros. Ce qui devient la convoitise de tous les pays qui bombardent la Libye et qui ont tous quelque chose en commun, ils sont tous financièrement en quasi faillite, les USA à eux seuls ont 14.000 Milliards de dollars de dettes, La France, la Grande Bretagne et l'Italie ont chacun environ 2.000 milliards de dettes publiques alors que les 46 pays d'Afrique Noire ont au total moins de 400 milliards de dollars de dettes publiques. Créer des fausses guerres en Afrique dans l'espoir de trouver de l'oxygène pour continuer leur apnée économique qui ne fait que s'empirer ne fera qu'enfoncer les Occidentaux dans leur déclin qui a pris son envol en 1884, lors de la fameuse Conférence de Berlin. Car comme l'avait prédit l'économiste Américain Adams Smith en 1865, dans son soutien à Abraham Lincoln pour l'abolition de l'esclavage, **«l'économie de tout pays qui pratique l'esclavage des noirs est en train d'amorcer une descente vers l'enfer qui sera rude le jour où les autres nations vont se réveiller »**

3- Unions régionales comme frein à la création des Etats Unis d'Afrique

Pour déstabiliser et détruire l'union Africaine qui va dangereusement (pour l'Occident) vers les Etats-Unis d'Afrique avec la main de maître de Kadhafi, l'Union Européenne a d'abord tenté sans y parvenir la carte de la création de l'UPM (Union Pour la Méditerranée) Il fallait à tout prix couper l'Afrique du Nord du reste de l'Afrique en mettant en avant les mêmes thèses racistes du 18-19ème siècle selon lesquelles les populations africaines d'origine Arabes seraient plus évoluées, plus civilisées que le reste du continent. Cela a échoué parce que Kadhafi a refusé d'y aller. Il a compris très vite le jeu à partir du moment où on parlait de la Méditerranée en associant quelques pays africains sans en informer l'Union Africaine, mais en y invitant tous les 27 pays de l'Union Européenne.

L'UPM sans le principal moteur de la fédération africaine était foirée avant même de commencer, un mort-né avec Sarkozy comme Président et Mubarak, le vice-président. Ce que Alain Juppé tente de relancer, tout en misant sur la chute de Kadhafi, bien sur. Ce que les dirigeants Africains ne comprennent pas est que tant que ce sera l'Union Européennes à financer l'Union Africaine, on sera toujours au point de départ, car dans ces conditions, il n'y aura pas d'effective indépendance. C'est dans le même sens que l'Union Européenne a encouragé et financé les regroupements régionaux en Afrique. Il était évident que la CEDEAO qui a une Ambassade à Bruxelles et qui tire l'essentiel de son financement de l'UE, est un obstacle majeur contre la fédération africaine. C'est ce que Lincoln avait combattu dans la guerre de sécession aux Etats-Unis, parce qu'à partir du moment où un groupe de pays se retrouvent autour d'une organisation politique régionale, cela ne peut que fragiliser l'organe central. C'est ce que l'Europe voulait et c'est ce que les Africains n'ont pas compris en créant coup sur coup, la COMESA, l'UDEAC, la SADC et le Grand Maghreb qui n'a jamais fonctionné encore une fois grâce à Kadhafi qui lui l'avait très bien compris.

4-Kadhafi, l'Africain qui a permis de laver l'humiliation de l'Apartheid

Kadhafi est dans le coeur de presque tous les Africains comme un homme très généreux et humaniste pour son soutien désintéressé à la bataille contre le régime raciste d'Afrique du Sud. Si Kadhafi avait été un homme égoïste, rien ne l'obligeait à attirer sur lui les foudres des occidentaux pour soutenir financièrement et militairement l'ANC dans sa bataille contre l'apartheid.

C'est pour cela que à peine libéré de ses 27 ans de prisons, Mandela décide d'aller rompre l'embargo des Nations Unies contre la Libye le 23 Octobre 1997. A cause de cet embargo même aérien, depuis 5 longues années aucun avion ne pouvait atterrir en Libye. Pour y arriver, Il fallait prendre un avion pour la Tunisie ; arriver à Djerba et continuer en voiture pendant 5 heures pour Ben Gardane, passer la frontière et remonter en 3 heures de route par le désert jusqu'à Tripoli. Ou alors, passer par Malte et faire la traversée de nuit, sur des bateaux mal entretenus jusqu'à la côte libyenne.

Un calvaire pour tout un peuple, juste pour punir un seul homme. Mandela décida de rompre cette injustice et répondant à l'ex Président Américain Bill Clinton, qui avait jugé cette visite «malvenue», il s'insurgea : «**Aucun Etat ne peut s'arroger le rôle de gendarme du monde, et aucun Etat ne peut dicter aux autres ce qu'ils doivent faire** ». il ajouta : «**ceux-là qui hier étaient les amis de nos ennemis, ont aujourd'hui le toupet de me proposer de ne pas visiter mon frère Kadhafi, ils nous conseillent d'être ingrats et d'oublier nos amis d'hier** ». En effet, pour l'Occident, les racistes d'Afrique du Sud étaient leurs frères qu'il fallait protéger. C'est pour cela que tous les membres de l'Anc étaient considérés des dangereux terroristes, y compris Nelson Mandela. Il faudra attendre le 2 Juillet 2008, pour que le Congrès Américain vote une loi pour rayer le nom de Nelson Mandela et de ses camarades de l'ANC de cette liste noire, pas parce qu'ils ont compris la bêtise d'une telle liste, mais parce qu'on voulait faire un geste pour les 90 ans de Nelson Mandela. Si les Occidentaux sont aujourd'hui repentis de leur soutien d'hier aux ennemis de Mandela et sont vraiment sincères lorsqu'on lui donne des noms de rue et de places, comment continuer à faire la guerre à celui qui a permis la victoire de Mandela et son peuple, Kadhafi ?

B- Ceux qui veulent exporter la démocratie sont ils des démocrates?

Et si la Libye de Kadhafi était plus démocratique que les USA, la France, la Grande Bretagne et tous ceux qui font la guerre pour exporter la démocratie en Libye ? Le 19 Mars 2003, le Président Georges Bush lance les bombes sur la tête des Iraquiens avec le prétexte d'y exporter la démocratie. Le 19 Mars 2011, c'est-à-dire 8 ans plus tard et jour pour jour, c'est le Président Français qui lance ses bombes sur la tête des Libyens avec le même prétexte de leur offrir la démocratie. Monsieur Obama, Prix Nobel de la Paix 2009 et président des Etat Unis d'Amérique, pour justifier qu'il procède à un déferlement de missiles Cruise de ses sous-marins sur la tête des Libyens a dit que c'était pour chasser le dictateur Kadhafi du pouvoir et y instaurer la démocratie.

La question que tout être humain doté de la moindre capacité intellectuel de jugement et d'appréciation ne peut s'empêcher de se poser est : ces pays comme la France, l'Angleterre, les USA, l'Italie, la Norvège, le Danemark, la Pologne dont la légitimité pour aller bombarder les Libyens se base sur le seul fait de s'être autoproclamés «**pays démocratiques** » sont-ils réellement démocratiques ? Si oui, sont-ils plus démocratiques que la Libye de Kadhafi ? La réponse, sans équivoque est NON, pour la simple et bonne raison que la démocratie n'existe pas. Ce n'est pas moi qui l'affirme, mais celui-là même dont la ville natale, Genève abrite l'essentiel du commandement des Nations Unies. Il s'agit bien entendu de Jean-Jacques Rousseau né à Genève en 1712 qui affirme dans le chapitre IV du Livre III de son très célèbre «

Contrat Social » que : « **il n'a jamais existé de véritable démocratie, et il n'en existera jamais** ». Pour qu'un état soit véritablement démocratique Rousseau pose 4 conditions selon lesquelles la Libye de Kadhafi est même de loin plus démocratique que les États-Unis d'Amérique, la France et tous les autres qui prétendent lui exporter la démocratie à savoir :

1- Dimension de l'Etat : plus un état est grand, moins il peut être démocratique, pour Rousseau l'Etat doit être très petit pour que le peuple soit facile à rassembler et que chaque citoyen puisse aisément connaître tous les autres. Avant donc de faire voter les gens, il faut s'assurer que chacun connaisse tous les autres sans quoi voter pour voter est un acte dénué de tout fondement démocratique, c'est un simulacre de démocratie pour élire un dictateur. La structure de l'organisation de l'Etat Libyen se fonde sur une base tribale qui regroupe par définition le peuple en de petites entités. Le sentiment démocratique est plus présent dans une tribu, dans un village que dans une grande Nation, parce que le fait que tout le monde se connaisse et que la vie tourne autour des mêmes points communs apporte une sorte d'autorégulation, d'autocensure même pour peser à chaque instant, la réaction ou la contre-réaction des autres membres pour ou contre les opinions qu'on peut avoir. Sous cet angle, c'est la Lybie qui répond le mieux aux exigences de Rousseau, ce qu'on ne peut pas dire de même pour les États-Unis d'Amérique, la France ou la Grande Bretagne, des sociétés fortement urbanisées où la majorité des voisins ne se disent même pas bonjour et donc ne se connaissent pas, même vivant côte-à-côte pendant 20 ans.

Dans ces pays, on est passé directement à l'étape suivante : « **le vote** » qu'on a malignement sanctifié afin de faire oublier que ce vote est inutile à partir du moment où je m'exprime sur l'avenir d'une nation sans en connaître ses membres. On est ainsi arrivé jusqu'à la bêtise du vote des citoyens vivant à l'étranger. Se connaître et se parler est la condition essentielle de la communication pour le débat démocratique qui précède toute élection.

2- Il faut la simplicité des mœurs et des comportements pour éviter que l'on passe l'essentiel du temps à parler de justice, de tribunal pour trouver des solutions aux multitudes querelles d'intérêts divers qu'une société trop complexe fait naître naturellement. Les Occidentaux se dé finissent comme des pays civilisés, donc aux mœurs complexes et la Libye comme pays dit primitif, c'est-à-dire aux meurs simples. Sous cet angle, encore une fois, c'est la Libye qui répondrait mieux aux critères démocratiques de Rousseau que tous ceux qui prétendent lui donner des leçons de démocratie. Dans une société complexe, les trop nombreux conflits sont résolus par la loi du plus fort, puisque celui qui est riche évite la prison parce qu'il peut se permettre un meilleur avocat et surtout, orienter l'appareil répressif de l'état contre celui qui vole une banane dans un supermarché, plutôt que le délinquant financier qui fait crouler une banque. Dans une ville comme New York où 75% de la population est blanche, 80% des postes de cadres sont occupés par des Blancs et ils ne sont que 20% des personnes en prison.

3- L'égalité dans les rangs et dans les fortunes. Il suffit de voir le classement FORBES 2010 pour voir quels sont les noms des personnes les plus riches de chacun des pays qui jette la bombe sur la tête des Libyens et voir la différence avec le salaire le plus bas dans chacun des pays et faire de même pour la Libye pour comprendre qu'en matière de redistribution de la richesse du pays, c'est à la Libye d'exporter son savoir faire à ceux qui la combattent et non le contraire. Même sous cet angle, selon Rousseau, la Libye serait plus démocratique que ceux qui veulent pompeusement lui exporter la prétendue démocratie. Aux États-Unis 5% de la population possèdent 60% de la richesse nationale. C'est le pays le plus déséquilibré, le plus inégal du monde.

4- PAS DE LUXE. Pour Rousseau pour qu'il y ait la démocratie dans un pays, il ne faut pas qu'il y ait de luxe parce que selon lui, le luxe rend nécessaire la richesse et cette dernière devient la vertu, l'objectif à atteindre à tout prix et non le bonheur du peuple, « **le luxe corrompt à la fois le riche et le pauvre, l'un par la possession, l'autre par la convoitise ; il vend la patrie à la mollesse, à la vanité ; il ôte à l'Etat**

tous ses citoyens pour les asservir les uns aux autres, et tous à l'opinion ». Ya-t-il plus de luxe en France ou en Libye ? Ce rapport d'asservissement des employés qui sont poussés jusqu'au suicide les employés mêmes des entreprises publiques ou semi-publique, pour des raisons de rentabilité et donc de possession de luxe d'une des parties est-il plus criant en Libye ou en Occident ?

Le sociologue Américain *C. Wright Mills* a décrit en 1956 la démocratie américaine comme « **la dictature des élites** ». Selon Mills, les Etats-Unis d'Amérique ne sont pas une démocratie parce qu'en définitive, c'est l'argent qui y parle dans les élections et non le peuple. Le résultat de chaque élection y est l'expression de la voix de l'argent et non la voix du peuple. Après Bush-père et Bush-fils, pour les primaires républicaines de 2012, on parle déjà de Bush-benjamin. En plus, si le pouvoir politique se base sur la bureaucratie, Max Weber fait remarquer qu'il y a 43 millions de fonctionnaires et militaires aux Etats-Unis qui commandent effectivement le pays, mais qui n'ont été votés par personne et qui ne répondent pas directement au peuple de leurs activités. Une seule personne (un riche) est donc votée mais le vrai pouvoir sur le terrain est tenue par une seule caste de riches qui ne résulte purement et simplement que de nominations comme les ambassadeurs, les généraux de l'armée etc...

Combien de personnes dans les pays autoproclamés « **démocratiques** » savent qu'au Pérou la constitution interdit un deuxième mandat consécutif au président de la république sortant ? Combien de personnes savent qu'au Guatemala, non seulement le président sortant ne doit plus jamais se présenter comme candidat à cette fonction, mais qu'en plus à aucun degré de parenté, aucun membre de sa famille ne pourra plus prétendre à cette fonction ? Combien savent que le Rwanda est le pays qui intègre politiquement le mieux les femmes au monde avec 49% de parlementaires femmes ? Combien savent que dans le classement de la *CIA 2007*, sur 10 pays les mieux gérés au monde, 4 sont Africains ? Avec la palme d'or à la Guinée équatoriale dont la dette publique ne représente que 1,14% de son PIB.

La guerre civile, les révoltes, les rebellions sont les ingrédients d'un début de démocratie soutient Rousseau. Parce que la démocratie n'est pas une fin, mais un processus permanent pour réaffirmer les droits naturels des humains que dans tous les pays du monde (sans exception) une poignée d'hommes et de femmes, confisquant le pouvoir du peuple, l'orientent pour se maintenir aux affaires. On trouve ici et là des formes de castes qui usurpent le mot « démocratie » qui doit être cet idéal vers lequel tendre et non un label à s'approprier ou un refrain à vanter parce qu'on est juste capable de crier plus fort que les autres. Si un pays est calme comme la France ou les Etats-Unis, c'est-à-dire sans aucune révolte, pour Rousseau cela veut tout simplement dire que le système dictatorial est suffisamment répressif pour empêcher toute tentative de rébellion. Si les Libyens se révoltent, ce n'est pas une mauvaise chose. C'est prétendre que les peuples acceptent stoïquement le système qui les opprime partout dans le monde sans réagir qui est très mauvais. Et Rousseau de conclure : « *Malo periculosam libertatem quam quietum servitium* - **traduction : S'il y avait un peuple de dieux, il se gouvernerait démocratiquement. Un gouvernement si parfait ne convient pas à des hommes** ». Dire qu'on tue les Libyens pour leur bien est un leurre.

C- Quelles leçons pour l'Afrique?

Après 500 ans de relations de dominateur et de dominé avec l'Occident, il est dès lors prouvé que nous n'avons pas les mêmes critères pour définir le bon et le méchant. Nous avons des intérêts profondément divergents. Comment ne pas déplorer le Oui de 3 pays africains au sud du Sahara, Nigeria, Afrique du Sud et Gabon pour la résolution 1973 inaugurant la nouvelle forme de colonisation baptisée « **protection des peuples** », validant la théorie raciste que les Européens véhiculent depuis le 18ème siècle selon laquelle l'Afrique du Nord n'a rien à partager avec l'Afrique Subsaharienne, l'Afrique du nord serait ainsi plus évoluée, plus cultivée et plus civilisée que le reste de l'Afrique. Tout se passe comme si la Tunisie, l'Egypte, la Libye, l'Algérie ne faisaient pas partie de l'Afrique. Même les Nations Unies semblent ignorer la légitimité de l'Union Africaine sur ses états membres. L'objectif est d'isoler les pays d'Afrique

subsaharienne afin de mieux les fragiliser et les tenir sous contrôle. En effet, dans le capital du nouveau Fond Monétaire Africain (FMA), l'Algérie avec 16 milliards de dollars et la Libye avec 10 milliards de dollars contribuent à eux tous seuls pour près de 62% du capital qui est de 42 milliards de Dollars. Le premier pays d'Afrique subsaharienne et les plus peuplés, le Nigeria suivi de l'Afrique du Sud arrivent très loin derrière avec 3 milliards de dollars chacun.

C'est très inquiétant de constater que pour la première fois de l'histoire des Nations Unies, on a déclaré la guerre à un peuple sans avoir exploré au préalable la moindre piste pacifique pour solutionner le problème.

L'Afrique a-t-elle encore sa place dans une telle organisation ? Le Nigeria et l'Afrique du Sud sont disposés à voter OUI à tout ce que l'Occident demande, parce qu'ils croient naïvement aux promesses des uns et des autres de leur donner une place de membre permanent au Conseil de Sécurité avec le même droit de veto. Ils oublient tous les deux que la France n'a aucun pouvoir de leur attribuer le moindre poste. Si elle l'avait, il y a belle lurette que Mitterrand l'aurait faite pour l'Allemagne de Helmut Kohl. La réforme des Nations Unies n'est pas à l'ordre du jour. La seule manière de compter, est la méthode chinoise : tous les 50 pays africains doivent quitter les Nations Unies. Et s'ils doivent y retourner un jour, ne le faire que s'ils ont obtenu ce qu'ils demandent depuis longtemps, un poste pour toute la fédération africaine, sinon rien.

Cette méthode de la non-violence est la seule arme de justice dont disposent les pauvres et les faibles que nous sommes. Nous devons tout simplement quitter les Nations Unies, car cette organisation de par sa configuration, de par sa hiérarchie est aux services des plus forts.

Nous devons quitter les Nations Unies afin de marquer notre réprobation de cette conception du monde basée uniquement sur l'écrasement du plus faible. Tout au moins ils seront libres de continuer de le faire, mais pas avec notre signature, pas en rappelant que nous sommes d'accord alors qu'ils savent très bien qu'ils ne nous ont jamais interrogés. Et même quand nous avons donné notre propre point de vue, comme la rencontre de samedi 19/3 à Nouakchott avec la déclaration sur la contrariété à l'action militaire, ceci a été passé tout simplement sous silence pour aller accomplir le forfait de bombarder le peuple africain.

Ce qui arrive aujourd'hui est le scénario déjà vu auparavant avec la Chine. Aujourd'hui, on reconnaît le gouvernement Ouattara, on reconnaît le gouvernement des insurgés en Libye. C'est ce qui s'est passé à la fin de la deuxième guerre mondiale avec la Chine. La soit disant communauté internationale avait choisi Taiwan comme unique représentant du peuple Chinois en lieu de place de la Chine de Mao. Il faudra attendre 26 ans, c'est-à-dire le 25 octobre 1971 avec la résolution 2758 que tous les Africains devraient lire, pour mettre fin à la bêtise humaine. La Chine est admise, sauf qu'elle a prétendu et obtenue d'être membre permanent avec droit de veto, si non elle n'entre pas. Cette exigence satisfaite et la résolution d'admission entrée en vigueur, il faudra attendre un an pour que le 29 septembre 1972, le Ministre Chinois des Affaires Etrangères donne sa réponse avec une lettre au Secrétaire Général des Nations Unies pas pour dire Oui ou Merci, mais pour faire des mises au point, en garantie de sa dignité et de sa respectabilité.

Qu'est-ce que l'Afrique espère obtenir des Nations Unies sans poser un acte fort pour se faire respecter ? On a vu en Cote d'Ivoire un fonctionnaire des Nations Unies se considérer au dessus d'une institution constitutionnelle de ce pays. Nous sommes entrés dans cette organisation en acceptant d'être des serfs et croire que nous serons invités à table pour manger avec les autres dans les plats que nous avons lavés est tout simplement crédule, pire, stupide. Quand l'UA reconnaît la victoire de Ouattara sans même tenir compte des conclusions contraires de ses propres observateurs envoyés sur le terrain, juste pour faire plaisir à nos anciens maîtres, comment peut-on nous respecter ? Lorsque le président Sud-Africain Zuma déclare que Ouattara n'a pas gagné les élections et change à 180° après un tour à Paris, on peut se demander ce que valent ces dirigeants qui représentent et parlent au nom de 1 milliard d'Africains.

La force et la vraie liberté de l'Afrique viendront de sa capacité à poser des actes réfléchis et en assumer les conséquences. La dignité et la respectabilité ont un prix. Sommes-nous disposés à le payer ? Si non, notre place reste à la cuisine, aux toilettes pour garantir le confort des autres.

Genève le 28/03/2011

Jean-Paul Pougala

(*) Jean-Paul Pougala est un écrivain d'origine camerounaise, directeur de l'Institut d'Etudes Géostratégiques et professeur de sociologie à l'Université de la Diplomatie de Genève en Suisse

Coalition of Crusaders Join with al Qaeda to Oust Qaddafi and Roll Back Libyan Revolution

Created 03/23/2011 - 07:49

by **Gerald A. Perreira**

The West – the former colonial powers and the United States – have not only coordinated their assault on Libya, but orchestrated the rebellion against Col. Qaddafi from the start, says the author. Qaddafi's claim that al Qaeda is involved is only dismissed by those who fail to understand that "al Qaeda is a Wahhabi/Salafi ideological movement and it has reinvigorated Salafi movements and cells worldwide." Qaddafi deserves support at this critical hour, as "a revolutionary leader who has consistently opposed western hegemony in the Arab and African World."

This article previously appeared in [Global Breaking News \[5\]](#).

"It is now crystal clear that this rebellion in Benghazi was an orchestrated attempt, supported by foreign sources, to use the events taking place across North Africa as a cover for the overthrow of the Libyan revolution."

A coalition of Crusaders, as Qaddafi described them, including the US, Britain, France, Italy, Norway, Denmark, Spain and Canada, have begun an all out military assault against Libya. Using what Libya claims is an invalid and illegal UN resolution as a pretext, the coalition is pounding the Libyan defense forces with a military might that has not been seen since the Gulf war.

The real and illegal goal of what has been called Operation "Odyssey Dawn" is "regime change." A replay of the nightmarish Gulf war scenario, the plan is clear: to disable Libya's defense ability, and to arm and strengthen the reactionary conglomerate of rebel forces in Benghazi, in the hope that this rag tag bunch will roll back, once and for all, the Libyan revolution.

This is not the first imperialist attempt to lynch Qaddafi and bring Libya to its knees. In 1986, the US falsely accused Libya of the bombing of a discotheque in Berlin and Reagan attempted to assassinate Qaddafi, by bombing the Bab al-Azizia compound in Tripoli where he was housed, killing Qaddafi's daughter and over one hundred Libyans. Next, Libya was falsely accused of the 1988 Lockerbie bombing as an excuse for initiating sanctions, in order to economically cripple the revolution.

Not the first time Britain and al Qaeda have collaborated on Libya

In 1996, British intelligence employed the services of an al Qaeda cell inside Libya, paying them a huge fee to assassinate Muammar Qaddafi. A grenade was lobbed at Qaddafi as he walked among a crowd in his hometown, Sirte. He was saved by one of his bodyguards, who threw herself on the grenade.

Former MI5 operative David Shayler revealed that while he was working on the Libya desk in the mid 90s, British secret service personnel were collaborating with the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group, which is connected to one of Osama bin Laden's trusted lieutenants.

Muammar Qaddafi and the Libyan revolutionary forces were the first to issue an arrest warrant for Osama bin Laden. They have spent years trying to warn the world about the very serious threat posed by these Islamic deviants. According to Shayler, western intelligence turned a deaf ear to Libya's warnings because they were actually working with the al Qaeda group inside Libya, to bring down Qaddafi and the Libyan revolution.

"In the mid 90s, British secret service personnel were collaborating with the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group."

Anas al Libi was a member of the Libyan al-Qaeda cell. He remains on the US government's most wanted list, with a reward of \$25 million for his capture, and is wanted for his involvement in the African embassy bombings. al Libi was with bin Laden in Sudan before the al Qaeda leader returned to Afghanistan in 1996.

Surprisingly, or not so surprisingly, despite being a high-level al Qaeda operative, al Libi was given political asylum in Britain and lived in Manchester until May of 2000.

Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM)

The claims by Qaddafi and the Libyan revolutionary forces that the rebels in Benghazi are inspired by al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) and the serious threat this poses, not only to Libya but to the entire region, are once

again falling on deaf ears, just as David Shayler said they did back in the mid 90s. Why? Because once again, British intelligence forces, among others, are clearly in collaboration with the rebels in Benghazi - those referred to all over Libya as the 'bearded ones', who have close ties to al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb.

The evidence for this is overwhelming. As revealed by Shayler, the British have a long standing relationship with the al Qaeda affiliated Libyan Islamic Fighting Group, based inside Libya. The British also have an historical relationship with the Wahhabi/Salafi brand of Islam, espoused today by Ikhwan al Muslimeen (Muslim Brotherhood) and their offshoots, including al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb.

A Battle with a Long History

In 1744, an alliance was formed between the founder of Wahhabism, Muhammad ibn Abdal-Wahhab and the ruthless tribal leader, Muhammad ibn Saud, whose descendants rule Saudi Arabia up to today. This reactionary brand of Islam was the perfect theological foundation for the colonial creation of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and Wahhabism remains the official Islamic tendency in Saudi Arabia up till today. In 1915, the British entered into a treaty with the murderous House of Saud, protecting their lands and supplying them with weaponry, as part of the colonial project to establish the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. At the same time, the British did everything they could to help the Wahhabist doctrine to flourish, recognizing it as the perfect ideological tool to further their imperialist objectives. Some scholars have argued that the British actually helped to create Wahhabism.

Imagine, today, the British are calling on the descendants of Muhammad ibn Saud, the current Saudi regime, and their present day army of Wahhabis in the form of al Qaeda, to join in a medieval crusade to crush a bastion of revolutionary Islam, which is present day Libya. And the contradictions verify this. We have to wonder why a Saudi government official can say on BBC that *"to allow the people to choose their own government is a very bad thing"*, and why, with all the Western outcry about women's rights in the Muslim world, the Saudi regime, which does not even allow women to vote or drive motorcars, is never questioned. Instead they are the ones that the Americans, British, and French are calling on to join them in the destruction of Libya which has liberated women and struggled to bring real democracy to its people.

"Benghazi has been the center for those who have consistently opposed the liberatory Islam articulated by Qaddafi."

As early as the mid 19th century, Wahhabi fundamentalism was imported into Benghazi by the reactionary and feudal Senussi fraternity. The influence of this tendency has been passed on from generation to generation, and Benghazi has been the center for those who have consistently opposed the liberatory Islam articulated by Qaddafi and implemented by the Libyan revolution.

The Muslims of Benghazi, who embrace the same ideology as al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb, and have done for the last hundred years or more, have been reinvigorated in the last few years by AQIM's presence on Libya's borders. There is a renewed interest in the possibility of achieving the stated goal of AQIM, which is the establishment of an Wahhabi Islamic Emirate in the Maghreb, stretching over the entire North African region. When we understand the history of this region, we realize why the imperialists have not gone out of their way to find Osama bin Laden and Ayman al Zawahiri and how and why these reactionary forces and doctrines are actually encouraged by western powers.

To understand Qaddafi's current claims about al Qaeda in the Maghreb, we have to understand both the history of this current battle and also the present day chapter: how al Qaeda affiliated organizations operate in the region in 2011. There is a deliberate attempt to misguide the uninformed with the suggestion that Qaddafi is throwing up a simplistic image of Osama bin Laden directing the rebellion in Benghazi from a cave somewhere, as a scare tactic. Nothing could be further from the truth.

"We must understand how al Qaeda affiliated organizations operate in the region in 2011."

Qaddafi is well aware of the reactionary aims of Wahhabism and understands only too well their modus operandi in the region. Being affiliated to al Qaeda does not mean that each cell refers to an al Qaeda central command. Rather, al Qaeda is a Wahhabi/Salafi ideological movement and it has reinvigorated Salafi movements and cells worldwide. The term Salafi simply refers to a contemporary strain of Wahhabism.

If there remains any skepticism regarding Qaddafi's claims, let us turn to the Washington based think tank, the Council on Foreign Relations, which gives us a description of AQIM's operations in the region.

On their official website they state:

"Terrorist activity in North Africa has been reinvigorated in the last few years by a local Algerian Islamist group turned pan-Maghreb jihadi organization: al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM). A Sunni group that previously called itself the Salafist Group for Preaching and Combat (GSPC), the organization has taken responsibility for a number of terrorist attacks in the region, declared its intention to attack Western targets, and sent a squad of jihadis

to Iraq. Experts believe these actions suggest widening ambitions within the group's leadership, now pursuing a more global, sophisticated, and better-financed direction. Long categorized as part of a strictly domestic insurgency against Algeria's military government, AQIM claims to be the local franchise operation for al Qaeda, a worrying development for a region that has been relatively peaceful since the bloody Algerian civil war of the 1990s drew to a close. European officials are taking AQIM's international threats seriously and are worried about the growing number of Europe-based cells."

The Struggle Continues

This current battle in Benghazi is not new in Libya. For many years, the revolutionary forces have been struggling to keep this feudal, reactionary brand of Islam in check.

On February 24th, 2011, at the very outset of the Benghazi rebellion, al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb posted the following statement on the al Qaeda affiliated al Fajr website: *"We declare our support for the legitimate demands of the Libyan revolution. We assert to our people in Libya that we are with you and will not let you down, God willing. We will give everything we have to support you, with God's grace."*

A few days after this statement was issued by AQIM, al Libi resurfaced. The same al Libi exposed by David Shayler as an al Qaeda operative working inside Libya back in the 90s. Now a top al Qaeda commander based in Afghanistan, he urged his countrymen to overthrow Muammar Qaddafi's regime and establish Islamic rule. Al Libi, a pseudonym that means 'the Libyan' in Arabic, said in a video, produced by As-Sahab, the media wing of al Qaeda, that *"it would bring shame to the Libyan people if the strongman (Qaddafi) were allowed to die a peaceful death"*.

Al Qaeda and Drugs in the Maghreb

Libya's revolutionary forces have also made continual references to the fact that there are drug problems in the region and that many of the young people are affected. Once again, this claim was scoffed at by Western media and analysts, who are ill informed about what is actually taking place on the ground.

As recently as November 2010, Moroccan police detained 34 people with ties to al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb, attempting to move 1,300 pounds of cocaine through the country.

Moroccan Interior Minister, Taieb Cherquaoui said *"We are dealing with an apparent coordination and collaboration between drug traffickers and terrorists linked to al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb."*

He added that the leader of AQIM's drug ring was detained in Mali, and he stated that the international drug peddling ring involved local Moroccan drug traffickers, who were collaborating with al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb, as well as cartels in Latin America.

Until recently, Moroccan authorities have been able to keep the actions of al Qaeda inside Morocco at bay. The drug activity, however, has now revealed the extremist organization's growing network, and the interior minister expressed *"the urgent need for the Sahel countries to collaborate to secure their territories and to fight the group's expansion."*

Tragically, the "coalition of crusaders" has seen fit to pound Qaddafi's defense installations, thereby preventing Libya from being able to challenge AQIM's expansion into their sovereign territory.

In a further development on this front, the Wahhabi spiritual leader of Ikhwan al Muslimeen, Egyptian cleric, Yusuf al-Qaradawi, issued a fatwa stating that any Libyan soldier who can shoot dead embattled leader Muammar Qaddafi should do so *"to rid Libya of him."*

Qaradawi is a neo-feudalist, who has defended the practice of female genital mutilation, called for the death penalty to be applied to those who leave Islam and advocates separate systems of law for different classes of citizens. Such are the views of those who are opposing Muammar Qaddafi.

"Qaddafi stated clearly that the destabilization of Libya's eastern cities was being inspired and assisted by al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb."

In a letter to Barack al Hussein Obama and in a separate letter to Sarkozy, Cameron and Banki Moon hours before the coalition launched its first military strikes, Qaddafi stated clearly that the destabilization of Libya's eastern cities was being inspired and assisted by al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb, and he invited member states of the coalition to come to Libya and confirm this reality for themselves.

Of course, just as the war in Iraq was not about establishing the truth regarding weapons of mass destruction, this war against Libya was not about discovering the truth of events on the ground or verifying Qaddafi's claims. When we understand the historical and present day facts, we realize that the crusader coalition is well aware of exactly who they are fighting and who they are supporting. In fact, that is why they were in such a hurry to act – to prevent any international fact finding mission which would verify Qaddafi's claims for the world to see.

In the letter to Obama, Qaddafi asked him if al Qaeda was occupying American cities what Obama would do so that he (Qaddafi) could follow his lead. All to no avail, because Qaddafi has been demonised to the point of being inhuman and therefore not requiring even the courtesy of a response. Named by US media as the Castro of the Middle East there is only one aim – remove him by any means necessary.

Why?

In contrast to the Wahhabis and the neo-colonial regimes in the region, Qaddafi is a revolutionary leader who has consistently opposed western hegemony in the Arab and African World. Libya's revolution has, for the past three decades, assisted liberation movements all over the world struggling against neo-colonialism and imperialism.

Libya's oil resources are of course a factor. We know for sure that control of oil resources is a top priority for the the US and Europe. but even more worrying for the imperialists is Qaddafi's call for a United States of Africa – with one government, one army and one currency.

Not surprisingly, the actions taken against Qaddafi and Libya are in stark contrast to western inaction with regard to events on the ground in other countries in the region such as Yemen, Bahrain, and Saudi Arabia, where protesters are being shot in the streets. In the case of Bahrain, protesters are being brutally suppressed with the assistance of invading Saudi ground forces and in Saudi Arabia itself, the regime has told its people that “anyone who raises a finger against the Saudi monarchy will have their finger cut off!”

The so-called international community can barely name their long time partner in crime, Saudi Arabia, in their pronouncements, such is their support for this most undemocratic of regimes. In fact, far from condemning the actions of these governments, the Crusading coalition is frantically trying to get some of these same Arab countries to actively join the military operation against Libya so that this whole thing does not look like another US and European led aggression.

Are we going to hear impassioned pleas regarding the aspirations of the people of Bahrain and Saudi Arabia? Are the US, Britain and France going to launch attacks on Yemen and Bahrain to assist the uprisings there to achieve regime change. I don't think so.

Arab League legitimizes Crusade

The Arab League endorsed this imperialist attack on Libyan soil despite the nightmare of Iraq, where the number of civilian deaths has now reached one and a half million. It is an honor for Qaddafi to have no support among this league of bloated imperialist surrogates. At a recent meeting, he told them, prophetically it now seems, that they should be ashamed of themselves, having sat by and watched the US hang the entire leadership of the Iraqi Arab Ba'ath regime. It should be noted that although there were serious ideological and political differences between Qaddafi and Saddam Hussein, Libya took a principled position regarding hostile external aggression against Iraq. A few days ago, the National Leadership of the Arab Ba'ath Socialist Party issued a statement expressing solidarity with the revolutionary forces of Libya.

The Arab League has been consistently embarrassed by Qaddafi's outspoken criticism of their double standards and hypocrisy with regard to Palestine, Iraq and a host of other issues, they are terrified by Qaddafi's revolutionary Islam, and are contemptuous of Black Africa and Qaddafi's attempts to bring about African-Arab unity.

Recently, when Qaddafi urged Libyans to intermarry with Africans, following the example of Prophet Muhammad himself, who encouraged intermarriage between races, Libyan and Arab contempt for Black Africans re-surfaced. Extremely few fair skinned Arabs would sanction the marriage of their daughters to a Black African. Rarely do fair skinned Libyans marry Black Libyans. Their disdain for Black people runs deep.

“The Arab League are terrified by Qaddafi's revolutionary Islam, and are contemptuous of Black Africa and Qaddafi's attempts to bring about African-Arab unity.”

In fact, across other Arab countries, such as Saudi Arabia, Lebanon and the Gulf States, the horror stories emerging regarding the mistreatment of African domestic servants is reminiscent of the kind of treatment meted out to Black people during the days of chattel slavery. So a project for the development and unification of all of Africa, uniting, on equal terms, the 'Arab' north with Black Africa, is not close to the hearts of many fair skinned Arabs. Qaddafi is an exception to the rule.

In his book *“Islam and the Third Universal Theory: The Religious Thought of Muammar Qaddafi,”* the respected Muslim scholar, Mahmoud Ayoub, states that:

“he (Qaddafi) wishes to follow the example of the Prophet who fought with such determination against oppression and inequality in society that Bilal, the Black slave, became equal with his master Umayyah. He sees his own mission and the task of the

Libyan revolution as having the same motivations and goal for modern Muslim society. The basic aim of the Green Book is to present in general and contemporary terms the ideals of justice and equality which Qaddafi sees in the Qur'an and the life of the Prophet and his community."

And what of Libya's African neighbors?

'A Million Man March'

Already an estimated 16,000 African freedom fighters (not mercenaries as the BBC, CNN and Al Jazeera would have us believe) have poured into Libya from the Congo, Guinea, Zimbabwe, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Niger, Chad, Mauritania, Southern Sudan, Kenya, Ethiopia and Burkina Faso to fight to the death for the Libyan revolution and Brother Muammar Al Qaddafi.

According to an official in northern Mali, hundreds of young Tuaregs from Mali and Niger are also among the African fighters, *"We're very worried"*, said Assalat Ag Abdou Salam, president of the Regional Assembly of Kidal, *"These young people are moving in droves to Libya. It's very dangerous for us because whether Qaddafi wins or falls the impact will be felt in our region."*

We are witnessing a Pan-African unity on the ground that we have never seen before. Who is this man and this revolution that has the moral authority and power to draw an army of Africans from every corner of the continent?

One Tripoli resident answered with the following statement: *"Qaddafi is our Che Guevara, and for Libyans and many people around the world, he is a symbol of freedom and democracy."*

["An estimated 16,000 African freedom fighters have poured into Libya."](#)

He explained that the West does not understand Libya and the age old tribal and religious battles that are being waged, and pointed out, that even if Qaddafi was to leave Libya, these armed gangs and tribes would fight till judgment day. He added that it is Qaddafi who has tried for the last 40 years to overcome these age old conflicts and the backwardness that accompanies them, and build real democracy, through a system of people's congresses and popular committees.

He finished by saying that *"the West does not know this man but that they would surely come to know who he is now."*

The Pan-Africanism we are finally witnessing is not the ivory tower academic brand, which has been viewed as relatively harmless and ineffective by the imperialists, but a grassroots Pan-Africanism - bottom up - which has given birth to the continent's first Pan-African army, willing to lay down their lives for a revolution and a leader that they love and to whom they owe a great deal.

Many of these fighters and liberation movements have received education, military training and assistance from Libya when they were battling imperialist backed despotic regimes in their own countries, and now they are determined to defend the man and country who stood by them in their darkest hour. This attack on Libya has serious repercussions for the entire African continent.

The Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania (South Africa) travelled to Libya to meet with Qaddafi face to face and express their support and solidarity. They issued a statement expressing *"their support to Qaddafi, who had been crucial to the PAC during the days of apartheid in South Africa."*

"We have a long cooperation with Qaddafi himself and Libya. Our cadres were trained in Libya by Qaddafi and a friend is a friend no matter what," said the party's spokesman,

Mzwanele Nyhontso.

Qaddafi has been a friend to all oppressed peoples throughout the world. There is hardly a liberation movement that has not been helped in some way by Qaddafi and Libya over the past three decades. He is our friend and brother and let's hope everyone is clear on who our enemies are.

The Emperor is naked - what's new?

Of course, imperialist maneuvers and crusades similar to this current one have been on going for centuries. In more recent times, from Vietnam to Iraq, we have seen the same scenario played out based on a litany of lies. So what is different this time around?

Certainly not the lying part – they are still weaving their usual web of lies. The African freedom fighter Kwame Ture, who had close ties with the Libyan revolution, warned us that *"the imperialists don't just lie sometimes, they lie all the time."*

What is different is that things are changing for the imperialists as the world plunges deeper and deeper into chaos, and their ability to influence affairs worldwide is diminishing rapidly. In the midst of rebellions all over the Arab world, what is clear is that fewer and fewer people give a damn what the US and Europe thinks. So they saw fit to take

desperate measures in an attempt to regain some political hegemony and limit the demise of their strategic influence in the region.

Even as Mussa Kussa, the Libyan Foreign Minister, announced a cease fire and the Libyan authorities determination to accept the UN resolution and utilize it in a positive way, the French and British were in a frenzy, trying to get international support for military strikes against the Libyan forces. We have witnessed their war mongering before, however, they were quite literally foaming at the bit this time.

“The imperialists will become more and more desperate in their attempts to regain their influence.”

Such a frenzy can only be understood against a backdrop of their dwindling ability to dominate. Even in the economic sphere, their power is decreasing, as China, India and Brazil emerge as vital new trading partners in Africa and South America. In the words of Kwame Nkrumah, *“Neo-colonialism is not a sign of imperialism’s strength, but rather of its last hideous gasp”*.

In 2011, the imperialists have brought the world to the brink of disaster. At an economic summit, at the outset of the current ongoing global capitalist crisis, former president of Brazil, Lula da Silva, publicly told the gathering that *“the credit crunch was the fault of white, blue-eyed people.”*

As the capitalist crisis worsens, and the world plunges deeper and deeper into chaos, the imperialists will become more and more desperate in their attempts to regain their influence and direct events worldwide as they are used to doing. Events which they are increasingly incapable of comprehending – not only because of the speed at which these events are occurring, but also because of the complexity of the events and the paradigm shifts taking place, that are, quite simply, far outside their western imagination.

Furthermore, they have lost all credibility as the Iraq and Afghanistan debacles continue. The Emperor is naked, and the hypocrisy of the Empire has become so transparent, that even the least informed observers are finally realizing that something is horribly wrong.

A Last Hideous Gasp?

Imperialism is experiencing its “last hideous gasp” and it is imperative for progressive and revolutionary movements worldwide to seize this moment and to oppose this current assault with all of our collective strength. Those who still struggle to see the wood from the trees remain enablers of the continued enslavement of our people. As Pan-Africanists we need to come together as never before to defend this brother and the Libyan Al Fateh revolution.

Sadly, the African Union has become another impotent international body with a neo-colonial mindset, due to the fact that unfortunately, a number of member states are still imperialist facilitators. The Pan-Africanist scholar, Chinweizu, calls these facilitators of imperialism “leaders in Africa,” because, as he points out, they are not “African leaders.”

Despite this, the African Union, under the guidance of progressive members, have managed to take a principled stand on Libya. In a statement issued by the AU Peace and Security Council, headed by Zimbabwe, they unanimously opposed any foreign military intervention and recognised the unity and territorial sovereignty of the North African State of Libya. The statement went on to call for *“an urgent African action for the immediate cessation of all hostilities.”*

How good and how pleasant it would be, before God and man...

Muammar Qaddafi has a vision for Africa - a United States of Africa - with one government, one army and one currency. Of course, if this were to happen, it would shift the balance of power globally. The well documented fact is that if Africa stopped the flow of all African resources and raw materials to the western nations for just one week – the United States and Europe would grind to a halt – they are that dependent on Africa and are therefore determined to maintain their ability to control events on the continent.

Control over Africa’s affairs has always been a priority for the imperialist project. As Minister Louis Farrakhan pointed out many years ago at a conference in Libya, *“Europe and the US cannot go forward into the new century without unfettered access to the vast natural resources of Africa”* and he added that *“Qaddafi is one who stands in their way.”*

If they cannot maintain control, then at least they must try to maintain Africa's divisions, thereby ensuring it is always in a position of weakness. African unity and true independence is something white supremacy, in all of its manifestations – capitalism, imperialism and neo-colonialism - will oppose with all its might.

When Sarkozy the clown, to quote Saif Qaddafi, made his ridiculous pronouncement recognizing the rag tag conglomerate of reactionaries in Benghazi as the sole legitimate representative of the Libyan people, and Hillary rushed to meet with the “Libyan opposition,” the sinister imperialist plot began to unfold. Their mission was certainly not to “protect innocent civilians.” They had from the outset, very clearly chosen a side and now, as they bombard the Libyan revolutionary forces we know without any doubt, whose side they are on.

“If they cannot maintain control, then at least they must try to maintain Africa's divisions.”

Their plot further unraveled, when a Dutch helicopter, carrying Dutch marines on some kind of sabotage/espionage mission was captured right inside Libyan territory. The Dutch government finally acknowledged that its warship, the Tromp, was offshore in the sea off Sirte and the captured helicopter had lifted-off from there. If the rebellion in Benghazi was, as the media has reported, “a spontaneous rebellion, like others in the region,” then the Dutch were surprisingly well prepared. Actually, it would have been impossible for them to arrive so swiftly at the scene, and so they had to have had prior knowledge of what was taking place. It is now crystal clear that this rebellion in Benghazi was an orchestrated attempt, supported by foreign sources, to use the events taking place across North Africa as a cover for the overthrow of the Libyan revolution.

And then there was William Hague's brazen landing of the British SAS personnel inside Libyan territory to make contact with the al Qaeda inspired rebels. Of course it is no surprise that the British and al Qaeda are on the same side – as noted above they have been collaborating to destroy Libya for a very long time. Reactionaries inevitably end up dovetailing, and a partnership with the imperialists is after all where al Qaeda had its beginnings: as a US instrument in the war against the Soviets in Afghanistan. George Bush Senior had close ties with the Taliban, and Ronald Reagan poured millions of dollars into assisting the Jihadists in Afghanistan, the forerunners of al Qaeda, which means 'the base', and refers to a data base of Mujahideen from numerous countries, compiled with the help of the CIA.

Many Battlefronts

In addition to the battle between “true religion and false religion” to paraphrase the Muslim revolutionary thinker, Ali Shariati, there is another major battlefront in Libya. It is the battle between Black Africans and those fair skinned 'Arab settlers', who embrace a “separatist” stance, refusing to acknowledge their African heritage, and who want little to do with the Pan-African project although they are on the African continent. As noted above, these 'Arabs' look upon black people with utter contempt and disdain. They definitely do not share Qaddafi's vision of a united Africa and resent the resources of Libya being used to assist projects towards this end throughout the continent.

It has been well documented that the Libyan rebels are committing crimes against humanity. There have been “African hunts” in rebel held territory. Black workers, students and refugees have been detained, raped and executed - some of them were led into the desert and stabbed to death. Even Black Libyans have been targeted, and many of them have been abducted by armed rebels and are being held in secret locations. These are the forces that the imperialists are racing to support. There has been a deafening silence from the so-called international community and western media regarding these well documented “African Hunts” and the massacre of Black Africans by the rebels.

“Black workers, students and refugees have been detained, raped and executed.”

From Washington, France and London, they continue their attempts to demonise Muammar Qaddafi with their lies. But the truth is that he is a revolutionary and a freedom fighter, who has assisted almost every struggle for liberation over the past three decades, and worked tirelessly, day and night, to facilitate African advancement and unification. At the same time, the revolution he has led, has taken Libya from the status of being the poorest country in the world to a country that has attained the highest standard of living in Africa. The “weapons of mass deception” assembled by the Crusaders can never succeed in portraying him as a ruthless dictator - an enemy of humanity? Let us heed the warning of the great revolutionary, Al Hajj Malik Al Shabazz, better known as Malcolm X:

“The media's the most powerful entity on earth. They have the power to make the innocent guilty and to make the guilty innocent, and that's power because they control the minds of the masses.”

As I write this article, Qaddafi is addressing the world. He is defiant, preparing Libyans for a long war and assuring the crusaders that they will never get their hands on Libya and its resources. Meanwhile, the coalition of Crusaders and their Arab enablers are starting to show some signs of strain.

I am reminded of Qaddafi's words in 1986, when Reagan bombed his residence,

“They may hit us with long range missiles and aircrafts – this is expected, but they will never stay. This land is too hot for their feet.”

Gerald A. Pereira has lived in Libya for many years. He served in the Green March, an international battalion for the defense of the Libyan revolution and was an executive member of the World Mathaba based in Tripoli. He can be contacted at mojadi94@gmail.com [6].

THE ROVING EYE

There's no business like war business

By Pepe Escobar

Lies, hypocrisy and hidden agendas. This is what United States President Barack Obama did not dwell on when explaining his Libya doctrine to America and the world. The mind boggles with so many black holes engulfing this splendid little war that is not a war (a "time-limited, scope-limited military action", as per the White House) - compounded with the inability of progressive thinking to condemn, at the same time, the ruthlessness of the Muammar Gaddafi regime and the Anglo-French-American "humanitarian" bombing.

United Nations Security Council resolution 1973 has worked like a Trojan horse, allowing the Anglo-French-American consortium - and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) - to become the UN's air force in its support of an armed uprising. Apart from having nothing to do with protecting civilians, this arrangement is absolutely illegal in terms of international law. The inbuilt endgame, as even malnourished African kids know by now, but has never been acknowledged, is regime change.

Lieutenant General Charles Bouchard of Canada, NATO's commander for Libya, may insist all he wants that the mission is purely designed to protect civilians. Yet those "innocent civilians" operating tanks and firing Kalashnikovs as part of a rag-tag wild bunch are in fact soldiers in a civil war - and the focus should be on whether NATO from now on will remain their air force, following the steps of the Anglo-French-American consortium. Incidentally, the "coalition of the willing" fighting Libya consists of only 12 NATO members (out of 28) plus Qatar. This has absolutely nothing to do with an "international community".

The full verdict on the UN-mandated no-fly zone will have to wait for the emergence of a "rebel" government and the end of the civil war (if it ends soon). Then it will be possible to analyze how Tomahawking and bombing was ever justified; why civilians in Cyrenaica were "protected" while those in Tripoli were Tomahawked; what sort of "rebel" motley crew was "saved"; whether this whole thing was legal in the first place; how the resolution was a cover for regime change; how the love affair between the Libyan "revolutionaries" and the West may end in bloody divorce (remember Afghanistan); and which Western players stand to immensely profit from the wealth of a new, unified (or balkanized) Libya.

For the moment at least, it's quite easy to identify the profiteers.

The Pentagon

Pentagon supremo Robert Gates said this weekend, with a straight face, there are only three repressive regimes in the whole Middle East: Iran, Syria and Libya. The Pentagon is taking out the weak link - Libya. The others were always key features of the neo-conservative take-out/evil list. Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Bahrain, etc are model democracies.

As for this "now you see it, now you don't" war, the Pentagon is managing to fight it not once, but twice. It started with Africom - established under the George W Bush administration, beefed up under Obama, and rejected by scores of African governments, scholars and human rights organizations. Now the war is transitioning to NATO, which is essentially Pentagon rule over its European minions.

This is Africom's first African war, conducted up to now by General Carter Ham out of his headquarters in un-African Stuttgart. Africom, as Horace Campbell, professor of African American studies and political science at Syracuse University puts it, is a scam; "fundamentally a front for US military contractors like Dyncorp, MPRI and KBR operating in Africa. US military planners who benefit from the revolving door of privatization of warfare are delighted by the opportunity to give Africom credibility under the facade of the Libyan intervention."

Africom's Tomahawks also hit - metaphorically - the African Union (AU), which, unlike the Arab League, cannot be easily bought by the West. The Arab Gulf petro-monarchies all cheered the bombing - but not Egypt and Tunisia. Only five African countries are not subordinated to Africom; Libya is one of them, along with Sudan, Ivory Coast, Eritrea and Zimbabwe.

NATO

NATO's master plan is to rule the Mediterranean as a NATO lake. Under these "optics" (Pentagon speak) the Mediterranean is infinitely more important nowadays as a theater of war than AfPak.

There are only three out of 20 nations on or in the Mediterranean that are not full members of NATO or allied with its "partnership" programs: Libya, Lebanon and Syria. Make no mistake; Syria is next. Lebanon is already under a NATO blockade since 2006. Now a blockade also applies to Libya. The US - via NATO - is just about to square the circle.

Saudi Arabia

What a deal. King Abdullah gets rid of his eternal foe Gaddafi. The House of Saud - in trademark abject fashion - bends over backwards for the West's benefit. The attention of world public opinion is diverted from the Saudis invading Bahrain to smash a legitimate, peaceful, pro-democracy protest movement.

The House of Saud sold the fiction that "the Arab League" as a whole voted for a no-fly zone. That is a lie; out of 22 members, only 11 were present at the vote; six are members of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), of which Saudi Arabia is the top dog. The House of Saud just needed to twist the arms of three more. Syria and Algeria were against it. Translation; only nine out of 22 Arab countries voted for the no-fly zone.

Now Saudi Arabia can even order GCC head Abdulrahman al-Attiyah to say, with a straight face, "the Libyan system has lost its legitimacy." As for the "legitimate" House of Saud and the al-Khalifas in Bahrain, someone should induct them into the Humanitarian Hall of Fame.

Qatar

The hosts of the 2022 soccer World Cup sure know how to clinch a deal. Their Mirages are helping to bomb Libya while Doha gets ready to market eastern Libya oil. Qatar promptly became the first Arab nation to recognize the Libyan "rebels" as the only legitimate government of the country only one day after securing the oil marketing deal.

The 'rebels'

All the worthy democratic aspirations of the Libyan youth movement notwithstanding, the most organized opposition group happens to be the National Front for the Salvation of Libya - financed for years by the House of Saud, the CIA and French intelligence. The rebel "Interim Transitional National Council" is little else than the good ol' National Front, plus a few military defectors. This is the elite of the "innocent civilians" the "coalition" is "protecting".

Right on cue, the "Interim Transitional National Council" has got a new finance minister, US-educated economist Ali Tarhouni. He disclosed that a bunch of Western countries gave them credit backed by Libya's sovereign fund, and the British allowed them to access \$1.1 billion of Gaddafi's funds. This means the Anglo-French-American consortium - and now NATO - will only pay for the bombs. As war scams go this one is priceless; the West uses Libya's own cash to finance a bunch of opportunists Libyan rebels to fight the Libyan government. And on top of it the Americans, the Brits and the French feel the love for all that bombing. Neo-cons must be kicking themselves; why couldn't former US deputy defense secretary Paul Wolfowitz come up with something like this for Iraq 2003?

The French

Oh la la, this could be material for a Proustian novel. The top spring collection in Paris catwalks is the President Nicolas Sarkozy fashion show - a no-fly zone model with Mirage/Rafale air strike accessories. This fashion show was masterminded by Nouri Mesmari, Gaddafi's chief of protocol, who defected to

France in October 2010. The Italian secret service leaked to selected media outlets how he did it. The role of the DGSE, the French secret service, has been more or less explained on paid website Maghreb Confidential.

Essentially, the Benghazi revolt *coq au vin* had been simmering since November 2010. The cooks were Mesmari, air force colonel Abdullah Gehani, and the French secret service. Mesmari was called "Libyan WikiLeaks", because he spilled over virtually every one of Gaddafi's military secrets. Sarkozy loved it - furious because Gaddafi had cancelled juicy contracts to buy Rafales (to replace his Mirages now being bombed) and French-built nuclear power plants.

That explains why Sarkozy has been so gung ho into posing as the new Arab liberator, was the first leader of a European power to recognize the "rebels" (to the disgust of many at the European Union), and was the first to bomb Gaddafi's forces.

This busts open the role of shameless self-promoting philosopher Bernard Henri-Levy, who's now frantically milking in the world's media that he phoned Sarkozy from Benghazi and awakened his humanitarian streak. Either Levy is a patsy, or a convenient "intellectual" cherry added to the already-prepared bombing cake.

Terminator Sarkozy is unstoppable. He has just warned every single Arab ruler that they face Libya-style bombing if they crack down on protesters. He even said that the Ivory Coast was "next". Bahrain and Yemen, of course, are exempt. As for the US, it is once again supporting a military coup (it didn't work with Omar "Sheikh al-Torture" Suleiman in Egypt; maybe it will work in Libya).

Al-Qaeda

The oh so convenient bogeyman resurfaces. The Anglo-French-American consortium - and now NATO - are (again) fighting alongside al-Qaeda, represented by al-Qaeda in the Maghreb (AQM).

Libyan rebel leader Abdel-Hakim al-Hasidi - who has fought alongside the Taliban in Afghanistan - extensively confirmed to Italian media that he had personally recruited "around 25" jihadis from the Derna area in eastern Libya to fight against the US in Iraq; now "they are on the front lines in Adjabiya".

This after Chad's president Idriss Deby stressed that AQM had raided military arsenals in Cyrenaica and may be now holding quite a few surface-to-air missiles. In early March, AQM publicly supported the "rebels". The ghost of Osama bin Laden must be pulling a Cheshire cat; once again he gets the Pentagon to work for him.

The water privatizers

Few in the West may know that Libya - along with Egypt - sits over the Nubian Sandstone Aquifer; that is, an ocean of extremely valuable fresh water. So yes, this "now you see it, now you don't" war is a crucial water war. Control of the aquifer is priceless - as in "rescuing" valuable natural resources from the "savages".

This Water Pipelineistan - buried underground deep in the desert along 4,000 km - is the Great Man-Made River Project (GMMRP), which Gaddafi built for \$25 billion without borrowing a single cent from the IMF or the World Bank (what a bad example for the developing world). The GMMRP supplies Tripoli, Benghazi and the whole Libyan coastline. The amount of water is estimated by scientists to be the equivalent to 200 years of water flowing down the Nile.

Compare this to the so-called three sisters - Veolia (formerly Vivendi), Suez Ondeo (formerly Generale des Eaux) and Saur - the French companies that control over 40% of the global water market. All eyes must imperatively focus on whether these pipelines are bombed. An extremely possible scenario is that if they are, juicy "reconstruction" contracts will benefit France. That will be the final step to privatize all this - for the moment free - water. From shock doctrine to water doctrine.

Well, that's only a short list of profiteers - no one knows who'll get the oil - and the natural gas - in the end. Meanwhile, the (bombing) show must go on. There's no business like war business.

Pepe Escobar is the author of [Globalistan: How the Globalized World is Dissolving into Liquid War](#) (Nimble Books, 2007) and [Red Zone Blues: a snapshot of Baghdad during the surge](#). His new book, just out, is [Obama does Globalistan](#) (Nimble Books, 2009).

He may be reached at pepeasia@yahoo.com.

(Copyright 2011 Asia Times Online (Holdings) Ltd. All rights reserved. Please contact us about sales, syndication and republishing.)

Les Chants de Nihil - Le Remède de Contre L'aliénation. 0. 10:05 320 ÉŠÉ±/Ñ. 4. Les Chants de Nihil - Le Dard D'une Sale Guêpe Dans Mon Oeil. 0. 08:39 320 ÉŠÉ±/Ñ. 4. Les Chants de Nihil. De La Gloire. 2009. Black Metal. 5/31/2011 10.00. Les Chants de Nihil. Propagande Eroïque. 2011. Le courant utilitariste qui voit dans la RSE une opportunité d'acquiescer une image positive de l'entreprise éthique et morale et d'augmenter ainsi sa performance financière. Ainsi, par exemple, la RSE peut-être employée comme outil stratégique de communication au travers lequel l'entreprise tente de riposter aux critiques de la société civile dans un but de développement durable et de diffuser ses bonnes pratiques de développement durable (Allouche et al., 2004; Vitari et al., 2008). L'adoption de la RSE peut donc s'expliquer par des raisons philanthropiques et/ Thierry Meyssan sur la Libye à la TV syrienne (6 octobre 2011). Doria Willoughby. 4:49. Iran les mensonges des médias occidentaux CNN. Sajed. 14:06. "Le massacre de la Ghouta, les contradictions des services secrets occidentaux" Thierry Meyssan. Rehearsais. 3:16. Thierry Meyssan - Le film anti-islam veut provoquer la haine des occidentaux dans le monde musulman. zapataguevara. 14:06. Thierry Meyssan - Le massacre de la ghouta, Les contradictions des services secrets occidentaux. zapataguevara. 14:07. Thierry Meyssan : Massacre de la Ghouta en Syrie, contradictions des services secret Human Rights Watch (HRW), Libye: il faut mettre un terme aux crimes de vengeance contre des personnes déplacées de force, 20 mars 2013 <http://www.hrw.org/fr/news/2013/03/20/libye-il-faut-mettre-un-terme-aux-crimes-de-vengeance-contre-des-personnes-deplacees>. Les opinions exprimées dans ces différentes sources relèvent de la responsabilité de leurs auteurs de la publication et ne peuvent être regardées comme reflétant la position de la Cour nationale du droit d'asile (CNDA). Les cartables ne visent pas à l'exhaustivité des informations relatives à la situation des pays abordés, et n'apportent, ni ne prétendent apporter, de preuves concluantes quant au bien fondé de la demande de protection nationale.