

# The Political Motives behind NATO Aggression against Libya

It's a mind stretching exercise to think critically about two almost simultaneous calls to overthrow the Gadhafi-led Jamahiriya system in Libya by Libyan rebels whom pro-Israel U.S. Senator John McCain describes as "my heroes." The first call came on 14 April 2011 in a new video released by Osama Bin Laden Deputy Ayman al-Zawahiri, whereas the second came on 15 April 2011 in a joint letter by U.S. President Obama, UK Prime Minister Cameron, and French President Sarkozy to The Times of London, the International Herald Tribune, and Le Figaro. **The Libyan rebels and their Arab League and African Union allies are nothing but a fig leaf to hide the Sarkozy-Obama conspiracy to assassinate Gadhafi, a flagrant violation of international law. President Obama pressured President Ali Bongo Ondimba of Gabon and President Goodluck Jonathan of Nigeria to let down Libyan Leader Gadhafi, while President Sarkozy used the same tactic on Senegal's President Abdoulaye Wade and other African Union leaders. The Libyan rebels have now promised to recognize Israel, according to Jewish-French philosopher and writer Bernard-Henri Lévy who says he has passed the message on to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. The New York Times (April 1, 2011), the leading Zionist newspaper in the world, noted that the "One Man [who] Made Libya a French Cause" was Jewish [Bernard-Henry Levy](#) who "managed to get a fledgling Libyan opposition group a hearing from the president of France and the American secretary of state, a process that has led both countries and NATO into waging war against the forces of the Libyan leader, Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi." I believe that the US government and the American people have no national interest in the destruction of the Libyan state, whereas the State of Israel & its supporters do (despite keeping a low profile in public as usual). When Libyan rebels or NATO's ground mercenaries entered Tripoli, their spokesman Ahmad Shabani told Israeli newspaper Haaretz (8/24/2011): "We are asking Israel to use its influence in the international community to end the tyrannical regime of Gadhafi and his family." See also NATO Secretary General's Visit to Israel ('Common Solutions to Common Problems') on February 9, 2011 (on the eve of the Libyan rebellion). Since NATO's 'revolutionaries' entered Tripoli, two Israeli "accomplishments" were cited at the UN Human Rights Council 18th Session: (1) the Council recommended that the UN General Assembly should lift Libya's suspension from the Human Rights Council and (2) there were no resolutions under the Israel-specific agenda item at this session.**

Why did NATO intervene so quickly and so violently to protect a hotchpotch collection of armed and unarmed Libyan rebels (including al-Qaeda veterans, clannish tribalists, royalists, uprooted liberals, and plenty of youth who were dazzled and deceived by the new information and communication technologies), whereas it did nothing to protect unarmed civilians in Tunisia, Egypt, Yemen, Bahrain, the Palestinian territories, Somalia, Iraq, Cote d'Ivoire (Ivory Coast), etc...? In his book "The Arab Revolt and the Imperialist Counterattack", Petras noted: "NATO's War and the Phony "Rebel Uprising" Nothing is more obvious than the fact that the entire war against Libya was in every strategic and material fashion NATO's war. The casting of the rag-tag collection of monarchists, Islamist fundamentalists, London and Washington-based ex-pats and disaffected Gaddafi officials as "rebels" is a pure case of mass media propaganda. From the beginning the 'rebels' depended completely on the military, political, diplomatic and media power of NATO, without which the de facto mercenaries would not have lasted a month, holed up in Benghazi." **The savage execution of Gen. Abdul Fattah Younis (the top rebel military commander) on July 28, 2011 illustrates the hotchpotch nature of these rebels.** Many of these youth appear to be using the political templates of the Somali Shabab and Afghani Taliban movements domestically, and the Iraqi model of Sahawat in their international relations and alliances. News reports showed that the Libyan rebels began their violent movement by a classic bank robbery--they drilled a hole in the wall of the Benghazi branch of the Central Bank of Libya and robbed over \$500 million (read Charles MacKay's "**Popular Admiration for Great Thieves**"). Now they want the Obama administration to work with Congress to rob the frozen Libyan assets in the United States and elsewhere. The US Senate Banking Committee is planning to vote a bill to confiscate and distribute billions of dollars of Libya's frozen assets along the lines of the robbery of the Benghazi branch of the Central Bank of Libya. This robbery has now culminated into the signing of an order handing over the Libyan Embassy in Washington to the rebels. The US treasury froze \$30 billion of liquid assets, and US banks \$18 billion (Mahmood Mamdani, "Libya: Behind the Politics of Humanitarian Intervention," in *African Awakening*, 2012, page 152). This will certainly destroy the lives of many Libyan civilians in addition to cancelling many Libyan-funded development projects in developing countries, especially African ones. **U.S. Senator J. William Fulbright** reminds us that "one simply cannot engage in barbarous action without becoming a barbarian." **The NATO bombing campaign is NOT a humanitarian war designed "to protect the Libyan people" as asserted by Presidents Obama and Sarkozy and widely suggested by global media outlets. Indeed news reports indicate that NATO forces deliberately left 61 African migrants to die of hunger and thirst in the Mediterranean near the Italian island of Lampedusa, in addition to NATO massacre of at least 85 Libyan civilians (including 33 children, 20 men, and 32 women in the town of Majer during the late evening hours of August 8, 2011), and the massive bombing and destruction of Libya's infrastructure as a wicked and malicious policy to secure future RECONSTRUCTION contracts for NATO members.**

The NATO campaign is designed to overthrow the Libyan Jamahiriya system and its architect Muammar Gadhafi in order to achieve three main goals: (1) undermine the emerging African Union, (2) weaken and slow down the pace of the African Union-led United Nations reform, and (3) nip in the bud the global shift from representative democracy to direct democracy.

On the geopolitical level, Sarkozy's France, the Obama administration, the Arab Gulf Cooperation Council, and the State of Israel strongly resent and fear the crucial role played by Libya in the establishment of the African Union in 1999 as an emerging regional power that has since (1) weakened and diluted French neocolonial policies in Africa thanks to three African Union-European Union summits, (2) blocked the various skims (the so-called NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue; Libya's former ambassador to the UN, Shalgham, acknowledged on Alarabiya TV on October 17, 2011, that he had a strong disagreement with Gadhafi on this matter before he defected) to unite North Africa with the European Union instead of the African Union, (3) denied the United States government an African-based headquarters for the newly established USAFRICOM combatant command, (4) eclipsed the ineffective regional organization of the Arab League (especially with two-thirds of Arabs in Africa and with Libya's strategic plan for the *gold dinar*, a single African currency made from gold that would rival the dollar and euro), and (5) made Israel very nervous about the future of its overall African policy (in 1986 Israel had the Reagan Administration come very close to assassinating Gadhafi in his bedroom thanks to the Mossad Trojan Horse operation, as related in former Israeli Mossad case officer Victor Ostrovsky's book "The Other Side of Deception", pages 113-117). It's also revealing to observe that the Obama administration (Obama told the Israel lobby Policy Conference 2011: "the commitment of the United States to the security of Israel is ironclad"), Sarkozy's France (Sarkozy has Jewish background and was an Israeli *sayan* before he became a "French" president), and the Arab Gulf Cooperation Council (for example, Qatar is the headquarters of the Zionist Brookings Doha Center owned by American-Israeli Haim Saban, while Saudi Prince Alwaleed Bin Talal's Alarab Cable News Channel is expected to be a partner of Jewish-American Michael Bloomberg's Bloomberg L.P.) continue to reject the legitimate mediation of the African Union in an internal conflict in an African Union member. In Remarks by President Obama and President Sarkozy of France on September 21, 2011 in New York, President Obama stressed that his partnership with President Sarkozy has been "evidenced by the extraordinary work that we've done together in Libya"; Sarkozy replied: "I wish to say to what extent I am sensitive to the boldness, the courage, the intelligence, and the sensitivity of President Obama, my friend. I liked him before his election; I liked him once he was elected; and I especially appreciate him now, when the tough times are upon us." The British represent simply a tail in the Libya war as they were in the Iraq war. However, one can notice a remarkable difference between the "Iraq war" and the "Libya war" (the latter was launched eight years *to the day* after the former, and came as a campaign kickoff announcement for President Obama re-election in 2012). Whereas U.S. military intervention in Iraq was led by pro-Israel "neo-conservative gentlemen" (such as Elliott Abrams, William Kristol, Richard Perle, Paul Wolfowitz, and Robert Zoellick), U.S. military intervention in Libya (whose cost reached \$1 billion as of June 2011) was led by pro-Israel "neo-democrat ladies" (such as Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, UN Ambassador Susan Rice, and National Security Council member Samantha Power). Of the three, perhaps the least committed to Israel is Secretary of State Hillary Clinton who told the Israel lobby Policy Conference 2010: "as a future mother of the bride," "guaranteeing Israel's security is more than a policy position for me. It is a *personal* commitment that will never waiver." There is a clear conflict of interest in Secretary Clinton's position on Israel. There is also a contradiction in Secretary of State Clinton's speech before the African Union when she said: "I know it's true that over many years Mr. Qadhafi played a major role in providing financial support for many African nations and institutions, including the African Union... But... I urge all African states... to call for Qadhafi to step aside. I also urge you to suspend the operations of Qadhafi's embassies in your countries, to expel pro-Qadhafi diplomats, and to increase contact and support for the Transitional National Council." The absence of any US national interest in the Libya war and Secretary Clinton's "personal commitment" to Israel were further exposed when the US House of Representatives voted to block funding for US military operations in Libya.

On the UN reform, Gadhafi spoke before the UN General Assembly in 2009 and suggested giving UN Security Council seats to regional groupings such as the European Union and the African Union instead of individual nations. This could end the UNDEMOCRATIC veto power enjoyed solely by the five permanent members of the UN Security Council: US, UK, France, Russia, and China. **The African Union was poised to secure soon a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. This would have been a historic change in international relations because the African Union would be in a position to VETO aggressive wars like the one NATO is waging against the Libyan people, society, state, and infrastructure.**

On the political theory level, **REPRESENTATIVE** democracy in the West, **ETHNOCRACY** in Israel, and **MONARCHY** in the Arab world are increasingly on the defensive as more and more young (and not so young) people want **PARTICIPATION** rather than representation in the political economy of sharing power, wealth, and weapons in their societies. They want the

**EXPRESSION of FREEDOM, not simply the FREEDOM of EXPRESSION.** This is the essence of the global shift from representative to direct democracy. Everywhere people are tired and increasingly disappointed with repeatedly electing officials to define policies, enact laws, allocate resources, and declare war on their BEHALF and in their ABSENCE. The new information technologies have widely disseminated such disappointment through new Internet networks of communications, especially among the youth who are often enthusiastic about their ideals but also vulnerable to deception by cunning politicians. Young people are rightly sensitive, but their vulnerability to political manipulation and deception is documented by the simple fact that young people are often the ones sent to die in wars they do not fully understand (why don't societies send older & more educated people in their 30s, 40s, 50s, or 60s to fight and die in those wars?). For example, the average age of the 58,000 Americans killed in Vietnam was around 19. Who would argue today that the Vietnam War was right, wise, necessary, or worth it? Was the government killing its own young people in this case? If some young people inside or outside Libya believe genuinely that NATO did what it did in Libya to save "civilians", one has to view these young people as naïve and has to question their cognitive abilities and their overall social science education. They believe in fantasies & illusions. For example, the widely publicized "Gay Girl in Damascus" turned out to be an "American Man in Scotland" after Facebook groups called for her freedom and the State Department was looking for her. Though the Libyan Jamahiriya system (a form of direct democracy) has been widely vilified and even satanized by a whole global army of mercenary journalists, pseudo-Arab intellectuals, military analysts, and Islamic clerics all of them on the payroll of the Zionist Brookings Doha Center and/or the Qatari government-owned Aljazeera Satellite Channel, it is not that bad at least in its theoretical articulation. It is based on a simple principle: **NO REPRESENTATION in lieu of the people, which means DIRECT democracy that shall free the people from the TYRANNY of the 51 percent majority rule: "Political struggle that results in the victory of a candidate with, for example, 51 per cent of the votes leads to a dictatorial governing body in the guise of a false democracy, since 49 per cent of the electorate is ruled by an instrument of government they did not vote for, but which has been imposed upon them"** (see Gadhafi's *Green Book* at <http://www.mathaba.net/gci/theory/gb.htm>). In other words, "majority rule" is not and should not be seen as synonym to "democratic rule."

Without a genuine shift to direct democracy that envisions **a NEW political theory of interactive PARTICIPATION (rather than periodic representation) and a NEW geopolitical theory based on REGIONAL GROUPINGS** (such as the African Union or an African-Arab Union), the scenario of the blind leading the blind will continue to mark the so-called "Arab revolution/Arab spring/Arab awakening" of 2011 as it did mark the so-called "Arab revolution" of 1916 (which led to the partition and colonization of the region along the lines of the current NATO intervention to recolonize the region). Did we learn anything from the Iraq war, which killed over 1 million Iraqis, created 4.7 million Iraqi refugees, and produced a deep sectarian divide between Iraqis, but not just the Iraqis? Do we want the "Arab awakenings" to be a replicate of the Iraq *sahawat*? Should we really believe that President Obama cares about the suffering of "civilians" in Libya (when he had just vetoed a UN Security Council resolution that would have stopped the criminal eviction of civilian Muslim/Christian Palestinians from their ancestral homes by foreign Jewish settlers in Jerusalem) or about international law (when he is working relentlessly with Sarkozy to assassinate Gadhafi in a war without US congressional approval so far)? The core slogan of these "Internet revolutions"---"the people want the fall of the regime"---reveals the lack of a clear political alternative **AFTER** "the fall of the regime" and indicates the inability of Arab political elites to articulate popular demands or conceive a genuine revolutionary political theory of popular participation (instead of representation). Their political & intellectual shallowness is reflected in the absence of any proclaimed political or geopolitical theory. It was noted that the leaders of these "Internet revolutions" seem to know what they don't want, but they do not seem to know what they want. Consequently these "orphan revolutions" are being highjacked by the G8 countries & put up for adoption for the IMF & the World Bank as indicated by Obama's Speech on U.S. Policies in Middle East & North Africa (5/19/2011) and reiterated by the "Deauville Partnership with the people of the Middle East & North Africa" adopted by the G8 Summit (5/26-27/2011). Even Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan is now touting his country's multiparty political system as a model for all Arab nations, while French President Sarkozy and British Prime Minister Cameron make their first tour of "free" Tripoli. A number of things are now clear: (1) the Sarkozy-Obama-led NATO war was designed to kill Gadhafi and replace him with a puppet government; (2) NATO is a military alliance of 28 countries with a population of over 900 million (150 times the size of the Libyan population) and an economy of over \$32 trillion (430 times the size of the Libyan economy); (3) NATO maintains bilateral and/or multilateral partnership with 22 non-member countries all of them participated directly or indirectly in the war against Libya; (4) Gadhafi was NOT and could NOT have been overthrown by internal opposition as was the case in Tunisia and Egypt (it took more than 200 days of carpet bombing of Tripoli and sea blockade of Libya by a NATO-led coalition of 50 countries to get Gadhafi out of Tripoli and kill him in Sirt on October 20, 2011); (5) we don't know for sure whether Gadhafi died from a NATO bomb blast, was summarily executed, died from gunshot wounds, or bled to death in an ambulance; (6) NATO has bombed Libya back to Stone Age and NATO's re-colonization of Libya has now begun; (7) the resistance to such re-colonization will certainly continue without Gadhafi; and (8) it is possible that Libya is now moving back to its Ottoman/pre-Gadhafi

era: a mere buffer zone between the Maghreb and Egypt dominated by an insignificant collection of **desert Arabs, mountain Berbers, and sea pirates**. In his recent book *The Shallows: What the Internet Is Doing to Our Brains*, Nicholas Carr argues that we are losing our capacity for concentration and contemplation because of the impact of the Internet on our cognition. He stresses that the technologies we use to find, store, and share information can literally **REROUTE** our neural pathways. He concludes that "we're being molded by our new information environment" and "as we come to rely on computers to mediate our understanding of the world, it is our own intelligence that flattens into artificial intelligence." Yet President Obama brags: "It's no coincidence that one of the [protest] leaders of Tahrir Square [a major public town square in Cairo] was an executive for Google."

The most likely outcome of the "creative chaos" of these "Arab revolutions" or "security/media/demography breakdown" seems to be **either a full-scale "Afghanization" or "Somalization" of the Arab world (with so many failed states) or a mere and boring shift from "single-party" to "multi-party rule"** (as indicated by the unfinished Tunisian and Egyptian transitions), a déjà vu political reality in almost all post-Cold War Eastern European countries and African countries south of the Sahara. Anyway it's too little and too late. As the Arabic saying goes: **he fasted a whole year and broke his fast on an onion! Welcome to the second edition of Lawrence-of-Arabia's model of Arab revolutions!** As leading feminists, EU foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton & US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton should welcome the first post-Gadhafi "strategic" decision by NATO's inept National Transitional Council to lift restrictions on polygamy in Libya following the barbarian execution & mutilation of Gadhafi & other POWs & civilians under NATO's watch and "just two days" after US Secretary of State Clinton has visited Tripoli to congratulate NATO's Libyan rebels and perhaps to coach them on what to do with Qaddafi when they capture him (See David Sanger's "Confront and Conceal—Obama Secret Wars and Surprising Use of American Power", Crown Publishers, New York, 2012, page 354. See also Secretary Clinton's reaction to the capture and execution of Qaddafi at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FpGTOxVovV4> and [http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=endscreen&v=J\\_x04Gn3-2g&NR=1](http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=endscreen&v=J_x04Gn3-2g&NR=1) ). If Gadhafi was so "unpopular," why did NATO allies & their Libyan marionettes bury Gaddafi's mutilated body in a secret location & pass legislation making "praising or glorifying Moamar Gaddafi, his regime, his ideas or his sons... punishable by a prison sentence?" Welcome to NATO's rat democracy!

**Israel**  
A representation of the stereotypical view of US-Israeli relations  
Adapted from Work by Ian Antonio, <http://www.communism.com/2011/02/01/2011-02-01-01/>

**“I know what America is.. America is a thing you can move very easily, move it in the right direction.”** —Benjamin Netanyahu, Israeli Prime Minister, 1996-99 & 2009-present. The Netanyahu, In 2001, PM boasted of manipulating Oslo accord. <http://www.communism.com/2011/02/01/2011-02-01-01/>

**America**  
It's the case of 'a minnow swallowing a whale' 'the tail wagging the dog'  
"who here is the elephant and who the ant? ... when Barack Obama and Benjamin Netanyahu meet at the White House, it will be hard to tell which one is the real leader of the world" —Gideon Levy, Haaretz, 3/4/2012

**“The U.S. can no longer afford \$725 billion each year for defense, much of it borrowed. Given the poor return on our investment, it's clear we need another strategy, one free of Zionist goals that advance behind serial conflicts and the debt incurred to fund them. We know what to do. What's required is the leadership to do it.”** Jeff Gates, 11/28/2010, <http://www.communism.com/2011/02/01/2011-02-01-01/>

**The New Libyan Leadership**  
According to <http://libyanfreepress.wordpress.com>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YIM3FWT1Tw&feature=related&bpctr=1342615756&skipconrtinter=1>  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/21/world/africa/qaddafi-is-killed-as-libyan-forces-take-surt.html>

Dr. Mohamed Elyassini teaches Geography of the Middle East at Indiana State University. He is a U. S. Fulbright Scholar at the United Arab Emirates University for the 2011-2012 academic year.

*NB: This is not an official Department of State website or blog. The views and information presented in this blog and in the website below are solely those of the author and do not represent the Fulbright Program, CIES, the U.S. Department of State, Indiana State University, or the United Arab Emirates University.*

<http://faculty.indstate.edu/melyassini/>