

The Libyan Conflict - The Moment of Truth for the Caribbean 'Anti-Imperialist' Left?

Mervyn Claxton

Introduction

This paper has two sections. Part 1 is an Analytical Overview and Commentary; Part 11 is an Annotated Reference Source of Documents and Factual Information (both text and video) on Gaddafi, the Libyan régime, and the Libyan conflict. Part 11, which is voluminous, is intended to be a comprehensive data base of primary and secondary source documents on the Libyan conflict. For that reason, journalists, students and researchers should find it useful. While it is suggested that Part 1 be read in its entirety, Part 11 is intended for ad hoc consultation, verification, cross checking, confirmation of specific issues, facts and information and, if desired, for scrolling through. It allows readers to double check for themselves the (in)accuracy as well as the objective/subjective nature of the posted and newspaper articles they may have read on the Libyan conflict, as well as the opinions and information in this paper. Part 11 is sub-divided into a number of more or less brief sections that are classified by theme, topic, or issue. At the beginning of Part 11, readers will find a complete listing of those themes etc., together with their page numbers, for easy consultation. The indexed listing will enable readers to check, very rapidly, the documentary evidence available for a particular topic, issue, theme or event. Readers who are interested, for example, in the conditions under which women or black people live in Gaddafi's Libya can immediately refer to the following sections:

The role of Women in Gaddafi's Green Book philosophy and the fate reserved for them in Gaddafi's Libya.

Gaddafi's opinion of black people and the treatment they merit, as revealed in his Green Book philosophy and the actions of his régime.

The available documentation on the Gaddafi régime and the Libyan conflict is so extensive that, for a number of issues, I have have to make a selection in order to keep the length of Part 11 within reasonable limits. However, in making that selection, I have drawn widely from media sources in different countries and cultures. Under the section, **Gaddafi's Human Rights Violations**, for example, video sources alone (that is to say, excluding text documents) include documentary videos from Aljazeera, an Iranian news agency, a Russian news agency, an African news agency, Sky news and CNN. The evidence and testimony in each and **every one of those videos tell the same horror story of Gaddafi's serious, serial human rights violations**, thereby making It very difficult, if not impossible, for any sceptic (or defender of Gaddafi's régime, of which there is an astonishing number) to accuse the media of biased reporting, or myself of making a selective use of documents. Furthermore, I invite readers to draw to my attention, and to those of other readers, any factual documentary information (not undocumented opinion pieces, please) that challenges the factual accuracy of my commentary and analysis in Part 1, invalidate any of the documents cited in Part 11, throw any further light on the issues discussed in this paper, or provide other insights into the Libyan conflict.

Because I have written this paper to counter the predominantly anti-imperialist narrative of all the writers who posted articles on the Libyan conflict on this site, I have made greater use of documents from Aljazeera than I have done from any other source. I have deliberately done so in order to forestall any criticism that my information sources are Western, or biased towards the West. No one can credibly make such an accusation against Aljazeera. Moreover, in Part 11 readers can access a video of a BBC Newsnight interview of Noam Chomsky, conducted by Jeremy Paxman, in which Chomsky declared, on two occasions, that **Aljazeera is an excellent cable news network**. What is most significant, is that Chomsky made that declaration when he cited a particular Aljazeera report on an aspect of the Libyan conflict. Not only is Noam Chomsky perhaps the world's most famous anti-imperialist but also, like virtually all the anti-imperialists, worldwide who posted articles on the Libyan conflict, he is an adamant opponent of foreign intervention in Libya.

As those who view the Newsnight video will see for themselves, Chomsky supports his opposition to foreign intervention with many of the same arguments that the writers referred to above utilized. I draw Chomsky's opinion on Aljazeera's excellent reporting on the Libyan conflict to the attention of those anti-interventionists (including an esteemed colleague who sent me an e-mail on the subject), who accept that Aljazeera is an excellent cable news network but insist, nonetheless, that the network's reporting on the Libyan conflict is "obviously biased". Bias is like beauty, it resides in the eye of the beholder. I would suggest to opponents of foreign intervention, who praised the excellence of Aljazeera's reporting of the Tunisian and Egyptian revolutions but criticize its reporting of the Libyan revolution, despite the fact that there is no discernible difference in the cable network's reporting on the three revolutions, that their alleged bias resides in their own eyes rather than in Aljazeera's reporting.

The anti-interventionists, apparently, criticize Aljazeera for its alleged biased reporting solely because the cable network, commendably, did not shed its objective journalistic approach in order to embrace their anti-imperialistic narrative. To paraphrase the prophet Matthew (7:3), *"First cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye,"* I would provide the following advice to those well-meaning but very mistaken members of the Caribbean 'anti-imperialist' Left who posted articles on the Libyan conflict on this site, to first cast out the bias out of their own eyes; and then shalt they see clearly (as their mentor, Noam Chomsky has done to his credit), the excellence and the admirable objectivity of Aljazeera's reporting of the Libyan conflict.

Part 1: Analytical Overview and Commentary

The thunder and fury that the Libyan conflict has provoked on the internet having subsided somewhat, this is perhaps as propitious a time as any to examine the matter in a calm, rational, detached manner. The internet debate, if one could call such an astonishing display of declamatory, ideological rhetoric a "debate", has provoked a great deal of passion. As happens with all passionate discourses, the internet discourse on the Libyan conflict has generated a considerable amount of heat but, unfortunately, has shed little or no light. Uninformed internet readers who closely followed the "debate" on the Libyan conflict, on this website, in the hope of gaining some understanding of the nature of that

very complex issue, and what is at stake in the various possible outcomes, would have been completely and utterly misled.

Instead of clarification, they got obfuscation; instead of a factual, objective, informed analysis, they got an often incoherent, ideological discourse that was short on facts, long on ideology, full of doctrinaire rhetoric and which, most regrettably, completely ignored the core issues. The central issue in the Libyan conflict - the issue that led to the Security Council's adoption of Resolution 1973 which imposed a no-fly zone over Libyan airspace, and the *raison d'être* for NATO's intervention - is the serious human rights violations committed by the Gaddafi régime. But those who read the articles on the Libyan conflict, posted on this site, would **not** see a single reference to that centrally-important fact. By some acrobatic intellectual feat every writer, without a single exception, managed to avoid mentioning that game-changing issue.

Mark Twain once quipped, *"If you don't read the newspaper, you are uninformed; if you do read the newspaper, you are misinformed."* To paraphrase Twain, if you haven't followed the Libyan crisis in the mass media, you are uninformed; if you have followed it via opinion pieces posted on this website, you are misinformed. Many, if not most, ideologues have a very annoying tendency to adapt the facts in a given issue to fit their ideological thesis, rather than the other way around. When the evidential information is too clear to make that stratagem either credible or possible, such ideologues simply ignore the evidence and the facts. That particular strategy has been applied, in the "debate", on this website, on the Libyan conflict, to a greater extent than I have seen in my entire professional experience.

In none of the articles posted on this website has there been any attempt whatsoever, on the part of the authors, to present a balanced analysis, any attempt to state the pros and cons of the issues examined, any objective examination or analysis of **all** the available evidence, before arriving at their obviously predetermined conclusions. All first-year university students are warned against making such fundamental errors. If any university student were to submit a paper that are as one-sided and as subjective as those posted on this website, which was based on such a highly selective use of facts, with virtually all the central issues ignored or "over-looked", with no reference to essential evidential information, with some facts distorted and others suppressed, not only would the paper have got a failing mark but the student might also have been strongly advised by his/her academic supervisor to consider whether pursuing a university education would serve her/his interests.

Christopher Hitchens, the Anglo-American writer and polemicist, once declared: *"What can be asserted without evidence can be dismissed without evidence."* Nonetheless, on this occasion I do not intend to take Hitchens' advice and dismiss the many undocumented assertions that the anti-interventionist writers have made on the Libyan conflict, in the articles they posted on this website in support of their anti-imperialist narrative. On the contrary, as readers will see for themselves, I have provided evidence, overwhelming evidence, in Part 11 which demonstrates that virtually all of those writer's arguments and assertions have no factual foundation whatsoever.

In George Orwell's masterpiece, 1984, he observed that *"At a time of universal deceit, telling the truth is a revolutionary act."* The revolutionary act I am about to commit in this

paper is not to tell the truth, as such, but rather to direct readers to the various documentary sources (video and text) in Part 11 where the truth can be found by those readers who seek it. Having found it, readers would be able to make their own assessment of the Libyan conflict, compare that assessment with the unanimous assessment of those writers who have posted articles on the Libyan conflict on this site, and come to their own conclusions about the real nature of Gadaffi's régime; the reasons why people all over Libya (including Tripoli) have spontaneously demonstrated against his rule; the severity or mildness of the Libyan régime's reaction to those demonstrations; whether or not the documentary evidence corroborates the very serious accusations made by the people of Eastern Libya against Gadaffi; and the reality of the existential threat that demonstrators against the régime, in Benghazi and Eastern Libya, face(d).

Readers of this paper will also discover, for themselves, whether or not a system of collective punishment for the nebulous crime of "wrongdoing" is practised in Libya; whether or not families, towns and municipalities are held responsible for the actions of individuals in their midst (e.g. readers will be able to access the following poignant testimony of a Benghazi trader: *"Everybody's suspicious, worried, afraid, because we have families. We are 10 percent afraid for ourselves and 90 percent afraid for our families. **They won't just shoot us, maybe they will get revenge on the whole household, the whole family, even the whole street. These people have no mercy, we have known them for 42 years.**"*) Readers will discover whether or not government soldiers, acting on Gadaffi's orders, **systematically raped Benghazi women and their daughters in front of their husbands and fathers, as collective punishment for the Benghazi uprising**; whether or not Gadaffi sent death squads to terrorize the population. They will discover for themselves whether or not **Libyan law forbids partisan political action, to the extent that it is considered "treason against the homeland" and is punishable by death.**

Readers will discover, for example, whether or not political dissent is a statute crime in Libya; whether or not Gadaffi had political dissidents assassinated at home and abroad; whether or not such targeted assassinations were/are publicly avowed government policy; whether or not Gadaffi and his ministers, as a deterrent to potential dissidents, boasted publicly afterwards of the dissidents and political opponents that the régime's hired guns had assassinated. Readers of this paper will discover, whether or not the seriousness of Gadaffi's human rights violations caused the Security Council to condemn Gadaffi and his régime, last February, by a **unanimous** resolution (Resolution 1970) which, at the same time, also referred those human rights violations to the International Criminal Court (ICC) for possible prosecution as a crime against humanity; whether or not that same (unanimously passed) resolution placed an international travel ban and an asset freeze, on Gadaffi and his entire family, and demanded that Gadaffi and his régime put an immediate stop to their human rights violations.

Readers will also discover for themselves, from documents in Part 11, whether or not Libya's vaunted social achievements (vaunted in articles posted on this site) are true or mere hype; whether or not Libyan citizens spend billions of dollars each year on medical treatment abroad because of their country's abominable health care system; whether or not Libya's education system has *"failed beyond belief in the last 40 years"* (that is to say, in the period since Gadaffi came to power). They will also find documents and web links to the texts of resolutions adopted by the UN Security Council, the Arab League, the African

Union, the Gulf Economic Council, the Islamic Council, the African Socialist International, which reveal how those organizations really view(ed) the actions of Gaddafi and his régime, whether they condemned them or not, whether or not they called for, supported, opposed, or expressed neutrality on the issue of a no-fly zone over Libyan territory, and whether or not they continue to support external intervention and which organizations maintain such support. Those are but a few of the many issues in the Libyan conflict, the truth of which readers will be able to find out for themselves, simply by consulting the relevant source documents in Part 11.

Readers will discover, for themselves, whether or not, when requested by the Arab League to impose a no-fly zone over Libyan airspace, a major reason why the Security Council was persuaded to do so (Security Council Resolution 1973 of 17 March) was because **the Gaddafi régime had refused to comply with the Council's demand in Resolution 1970 to stop committing human rights violations against his own people**. After perusing the source documents (in Part 11) pertaining to the above issues, readers will be able to come to their own conclusions as to why none, not a single one, of the writers of the articles posted on this site **made any reference whatsoever to any (not a single one) of the several topics and issues cited above**.

Information on, and knowledge of, the issues mentioned above is of critical importance in arriving at a proper understanding of the desperate resistance that the under-armed, untrained, civilian Libyan insurgents are putting up against Gaddafi's vastly superior forces; of their adamant refusal to negotiate a political settlement unless and until Gaddafi gives up power and leaves the country; of the persistence with which NATO, and the Arab countries that provide material support to its military intervention, are pursuing their U.N. mandated mission. The net result of the omission, by the authors of the posted articles on the Libyan conflict, of such a critical mass of essential information can be compared to the effect produced by a heavily censored newspaper in which almost the entire front page is blacked out by the censors, with the intention of depriving readers of all the important information, leaving them with only a few carefully selected innocuous items of information. However, the key difference between the posted articles in question and the blacked out newspaper page is that readers of the latter would know that their paper had been heavily censored, while readers of the posted articles would be completely unaware that the latter had undergone an equally rigorous (self) censorship.

The "single story" narrative.

In the following video, Chimamanda Adichie, the Nigerian female novelist, delivers a very instructive, witty, moving denunciation of the danger of the "single story".

http://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story.html

The essence of her message is that our lives and our cultures are composed of many overlapping stories and she warns that if we hear only a single story about another person, another country, or another culture, we risk forming a critical misunderstanding of that person, country or culture. Adiche illustrated her "single story" narrative with an account of the attitude of her first room mate - a white American - when she went to study in the United States at the age of nineteen. Her room mate *"had a single story of Africa....in this single story....there was no possibility of Africans being similar to her in any way....no possibility or connection as human equals..."*

There were a number of articles on the Libyan conflict posted on this website in recent weeks, almost all of which were written by Caribbeans, either resident in the region or from the diaspora. To simplify my designation of them I shall refer to them as "Caribbean". A little over two weeks ago, five of the ten articles posted under the heading, "Recently written articles" were on the Libyan conflict, that is to say, fifty per cent of the total. All of the posted articles on the Libyan conflict posted on this website, **every single one of them**, projected a "single story" narrative of that conflict. The Caribbean 'anti-imperialist' Left were in their element. They had the wind in their sails, having found an issue on which they could unleash their pent-up anti-imperialist ire. Amazingly, the authors of those posted articles all succeeded in reducing a highly complex, multi-faceted situation in a multi-tribal society, with its many overlapping stories, issues, and heart-rending dramas, to a "single story" narrative - an imperialist plot to control Libya's strategic oil reserves. With their red flag hoisted at full mast, all the authors of the posted articles, without exception, stridently opposed any foreign intervention whatsoever in the Libyan conflict, even including that authorized by the Security Council.

That "single-story" narrative is by no means a monopoly of the Caribbean 'anti-imperialist' Left. Their tunnel vision is shared with the Australian 'anti-imperialist' Left, for which Mark Bahnisch, the Australian sociologist, has roundly criticized them. Describing the multi-faceted, complex nature of the Libyan peoples' revolution, Bahnisch considers it a *"democratic revolution of an unexpected and unanticipated kind, springing from many of the cultural and social changes and contrasts that arise from the compression of time and space that is globality in the present. **A desire to reduce everything to mono-causality.....There seems, in some quarters of the left, an inability to conceive that human action always has multiple motivations...It is the zombie-like power of those ideological categories which have reduced a historical hinge to a desperate flight by many in the 'anti-Imperialist' Left to a Manichean view which resolves into a complete evacuation of the content of principles about democracy and justice, and leaves only slogans murmuring in the air.**"* (The Left battles ideology while Libyans fight for democracy). The web link to Bahnisch's article can be found in Part 11.

The suppression, by the prosecution, of a single item of key evidence that could perhaps influence the outcome of a court case, is a very serious act which, in itself, is considered more than sufficient grounds for the judge to summarily dismiss all charges against the accused. In such cases, the court prosecutor who suppressed that information risks disciplinary sanctions or a criminal charge. By ignoring, or refusing to acknowledge, the existence of many key items of evidential information which, if known, would completely invalidate the arguments put forward in their prosecutorial articles, the anti-interventionist authors risk losing all credibility.

In their determined efforts to depict Gaddafi as the innocent victim of imperialist aggression and the Libyan insurgents as impertinent, disloyal citizens, one writer questioned the legitimacy of the insurgents' claims. When one stops and considers that the insurgent claims concern the most basic of democratic rights - the right to demonstrate peacefully; the right to oppose arbitrary arrest, imprisonment, and torture; the right of their womenfolk not to be raped with impunity by agents of the régime; the right of their menfolk not to be abducted by government forces at will, never to be seen again (1000 Benghazi men and more than 1100 men from Misrata abducted and still missing); the right to choose their

own government in free elections, among many others, one wonders whether the writer in question realizes that we are in the 21st century, not the Middle Ages.

To support his argument that the NATO operation exceeds the terms of Security Council Resolution 1973, another writer cites Russia's and China's abstention on the Resolution. However, that same writer carefully avoided mentioning that those two countries were among the 15 members of the Security Council which unanimously adopted Resolution 1970 the previous month, which *inter alia* referred Gaddafi's human rights violations to the International Criminal Court (ICC). That selective use of documentary evidence had a specific purpose. To have cited that latter Resolution, and Gaddafi's referral to the ICC for having committed crimes against humanity, would have completely torpedoed that writer's thesis that Gaddafi is the victim rather than the villain of the piece. So, he decided to "overlook" it. Just like that.

False assertions, erroneous presumptions, wrong premises, pre-determined conclusions.

The authors of the posted articles make confident assertions which turn out to be totally false; they make false or unlikely assumptions, which would then be transformed into premises from which they would develop arguments that would lead readers to their preconceived conclusions. The alleged collateral damage from NATO's bombardment, for example, is either stated or assumed to have caused more civilian deaths than Gaddafi's human rights violations and his bombardment of insurgent cities - an assertion/assumption that is grossly false, as readers will see for themselves when they consult the relevant documentation in Part 11. However, one author developed his argument on that false premise which led him, predictably, to his pre-conceived rhetorical conclusion: *"should we stop a massacre by another massacre?"*

Qualifying the couple of dozen verified, accidental deaths of civilian victims of collateral damage caused by NATO's military operations as "*massacres*" and equating them to the verified "*massacres*" of thousands of insurgent civilians, caused by Gaddafi's tanks, long-range artillery, and roof-top snipers (1,000 in Benghazi, 1,200 in Abu Salim prison, and more than 1000 in Misrata alone) reminds me of the following exchange between Alice and Humpty Dumpty, in Lewis Carroll's mordant political satire, "Alice in Wonderland":

Humpty Dumpty: *"When I use a word, it means just what I choose it to mean – neither more nor less."*

Alice: *"The question is whether you can make words mean different things."*

Alice's very pertinent question should be directed to the writer in question.

Another writer was more elaborate, imaginative and specific in his transformation of false assumptions into a premise on which he proceeded to develop an argument with a predetermined conclusion: *"it seems to me so far that NATO/US involvement has done a better job of killing civilians than Ghaddafi's forces allegedly has.....On a humanitarian measure, I reason that less loss of human life is better than more loss of life.....[NATO's intervention] actually accomplishes the opposite – the greater loss of human life."* The alleged killing of huge numbers of civilians ("*massacres*") by NATO's bombardment, which the documentary evidence demonstrate to be a complete fabrication, is transformed into fact, while the documented killing of thousands of civilians by Gaddafi's forces are described as "*alleged*". *Quod erat demonstrandum!*

One writer, with a remarkable intellectual sleight of hand that provoked my grudging admiration, managed in one short phrase to fabricate an important item of (mis)information which then served as an indictment of the Western powers for violating the arms embargo decreed under Security Resolution 1973 and, at the same time, as an indictment of the insurgents for their (impliedly) treasonable act of trying to overthrow their "government", the latter being an implicit endorsement of the legitimacy of the Libyan government: "... a section of the Libyan people (who have taken up arms and are using **the arms supplied to them by Western interests** to try and overthrow their government)". With superb audacity, that particular writer attempted to pull off a veritable double whammy. By his suggestive wording, he implied not only that Gadaffi's "government" was a legitimate one but that it also had a perfect right to put down, by force of arms, the supposedly treasonable attempt of a section of Libya's population to overthrow it.

In his verbal *tour de force*, that writer "overlooked" the inconvenient fact that Libya's impliedly legitimate "government" was not elected; that Gadaffi had seized power 42 years ago in a military *coup d'état*; that **not a single general election has been held since**; that there is no rule of law in Libya and that, because of his serious human rights violations, Gadaffi and his régime had been formally accused last February by the Security Council of having committed crimes against humanity (an accusation subsequently substantiated by the Chief Prosecutor of the ICC); The writer also tried to convince us, impliedly, that the Libyan victims of those human rights violations and crimes against humanity were committing a treasonable act by taking up arms, in desperation, to overthrow the government.

The author of one posted article grudgingly conceded that the Libyan insurgents have a right to replace an authoritarian regime by a more democratic system. Astoundingly however, he appeared to subject that right to the prior publication of a specific political programme in a proper schematic form, presumably for his own approval and that of the Caribbean 'anti-imperialist' Left: "*The people has the right to want to replace an authoritarian regime by a more democratic system. **However, these claims are far less organized and without specific program.***" I could not believe my eyes. Victims of crimes against humanity, thousands of whom have been killed, illegally imprisoned, tortured, and made to "disappear" without trace by a brutal dictator who, in a televised address to the nation, had vowed to "*disinfect*" his country from the "*filth*" (the insurgents) "*house by house, room by room, alley by alley, person by person,*" must first formulate and publicize a specific political programme, in a proper schematic format, before their claims for basic political rights could be considered legitimate.

Popular uprisings never begin with a defined political programme. The fact that such a programme comes much later in a people's revolution would be evident to anyone who has followed the course of the other Arab revolutions. Not a single one began with a specific programme - not in Tunisia, not in Egypt, not in Yemen, not in Bahrain, and not in Syria. Nor do the Moroccans, Jordanians, and Algerians who have demonstrated for more political rights possess a specific programme. Indeed, the loose coalition of demonstrators in Cairo's Tahrir Square, who had spearheaded the Egyptian revolution, have demanded repeatedly that elections be postponed for at least a year so that they could be better prepared for it, including being able to present to the electorate a proper political programme.

I am reminded of the classic Greek tragedy, Medea, in which Euripides describes Medea's descent into self destructive madness, which he summed up in one pithy comment: "*Those whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad.*" The highly irrational arguments, the systematic "overlooking" of inconvenient facts; the persistent information distortion, the suppression of essential facts, or their fabrication when convenient facts do not exist; and the very selective use of source documents, in the articles on the Libyan conflict posted on this site, are so blatant that one cannot help wondering whether the anti-interventionist authors have already been divinely smitten by the same fate as Medea.

The "Great Satan" - the ideological bogey man of the 'anti-imperialist' Left.

The "single-story" narrative of the anti-interventionists has more to do with a fanciful imagination than with factual information. In their narrative, the anti-interventionist writers have cast the US as the chief villain of the piece, precisely because the standard imperialist conspiracy narrative requires it. No one who has read their posted articles would even suspect that the U.S. was, and still is, the most reluctant of all the Western countries to get actively involved in the Libyan conflict, so much so that, as was recently revealed, the British government was at one time convinced that the U.S. was trying to torpedo the UN no-fly zone resolution. The French were, and are, the most gung-ho interventionists, with the British only slightly less so.

But what good is a grand imperialist conspiracy without the "Great Satan" at its head? Both the British and the French have an impressive record of colonial, neo-colonial, and post-colonial imperialist interventions in countries of the South, but they pale in comparison with America's notorious record. Undeterred by that minor inconvenient truth, the anti-interventionist authors decided to adapt the facts on the ground to their ideologically-driven narrative, instead of adapting their narrative to the facts. Thus, in every single one of the articles posted on this website, without exception, the United States is portrayed and denounced as the chief villain of the piece, while France and Britain (the real leaders of the intervention) were relegated to the sidelines. To employ a card game analogy, far from put off by the minor inconvenience that the **Jack of Spades** (the U.S.) was lurking at the bottom of the pack, instead of being in its "rightful" place - at the top, with a lightening-swift intellectual sleight of hand (too rapid for eye or mind to follow) our anti-interventionist authors finessed the errant **Jack of Spades** from the bottom of the pack and, with perfect aplomb, dealt it off the top to the unsuspecting players (their unsuspecting readers).

During the initial period (the first few days) of the intervention, when NATO, whose decisions require the unanimous consent of its members, was still considering the role it should play, the U.S. was the only country that possessed the organizational capacity to co-ordinate a multi-national military effort. Consequently, at the request of Britain and France, the U.S. co-ordinated and spearheaded the initial phase of the military intervention. However, as soon as NATO got its act together, the U.S. insisted on taking a back seat in NATO's military operations, providing *ad hoc* and back-up assistance to NATO when needed and requested. The degree of America's desire to remain as militarily uninvolved as possible in the Libyan conflict, is shown by its refusal to agree to NATO's pressing requests, to make available to it, the U.S. fleet of low-flying ground-attack A-10 aircraft and AC-130 gunships, which are the only aircraft in the Western arsenal capable of taking out Libyan government forces positioned in urban areas, with great precision.

Mark Bahnisch has described and analysed, with great subtlety and finesse, the dilemma that Australian anti-interventionists of the anti-imperialist Left face, in having painted themselves into an ideological corner. His analysis, the web link for which readers will find in Part 11 of this paper, applies equally to the authors of the articles posted on this website, who have painted themselves into a similar ideological corner. The following is a pertinent excerpt from Bahnisch's article:

*"A large part of the 'anti-Imperialist' mindset has its own paradoxical consonance with American ideology. The US is always figured as all-seeing, all-knowing and all-powerful. Yet the whole strategic and geopolitical picture in the Middle East demonstrates that America is an Emperor, while not yet naked, with fewer and fewer clothes. **Still, there seems to be considerable comfort for the Western Left in positing an effectively omnipotent Imperial puppet master.** As with the American and European power elites' own ideological confusion, there's a large element in the discourse of the anti-Imperialist Left that betrays the inadequation of political concepts to historical and contemporary realities. To some degree, **the fixation on anti-Imperialism has its own historical obsolescence after the end of Actually Existing Communism.....it has become a trope which impedes rather than fosters thought.**"*

The poverty of ideas in the anti-interventionist articles posted on this site is eloquent evidence that, like their Australian counterparts, their anti-imperialism "**has become a trope which impedes rather than fosters thought.**" They have yet to recognize, or acknowledge, the obsolescence of their "single story" anti-imperialist narrative. History has seemingly passed them by, without their noticing it. Like generals who are always fighting the last war, ideologues seem to be always fighting the last ideological battle. The anti-interventionist authors on this website appear to be stuck in a cold-war era time warp. The author of one posted article declared: *"I do see the incursion by Western powers and rejection so far of the Libyan government's entreaties and request as serving more an "oil war" agenda for regime change...."* As far back as the beginning of the 1990s, the control of strategic oil reserves in countries of the South had ceased to be a top geopolitical priority for the United States and its Western allies. The primacy of that strategic interest has since given way to international terrorism - a strategic geopolitical priority of the highest importance that makes the maintenance of regional and country stability in geopolitically vulnerable regions absolutely essential for the U.S and its Western allies.

According to the prevailing theory, unstable countries could easily become failed states, in which the limited geographical area over which state authority is effectively exercised would make them very attractive as international terrorist havens. Afghanistan and Somalia are two apposite examples. Isolated from the march of history by the "time-warp" in which they are stuck, certain anti-interventionist writers have cited America's refusal to intervene in Syria, Yemen, and Bahrein despite those countries' serious human rights violations, as conclusive proof of their oil conspiracy theory. Quarantined in their "time-warp" bubble, the anti-interventionist writers are, apparently, unaware that the real reason why intervention in Syria is off the table is because of the great fear that such intervention risks bringing about a state collapse.

That is precisely why George Bush senior did not seize control of Iraq, despite the fact that

that country has world's second-largest reserves of petrol - far greater than Libya's. Apart from being seriously intellectually challenged, his son, George Bush junior, bought into the pro-Israel narrative of the neo-conservatives re regime change in Iraq because it accorded with his and the extreme Religious Right's Millenarium theories concerning the Apocalypse and the Holy Land. Moreover, with international terrorism at the very top of the list of the West's strategic priorities, unless one is too blinded by ideology to see anything outside of its framework anyone can see why intervention in Yemen (Al Qaeda's Middle-East haven) is also off the cards. The same goes for Bahrein which, as the headquarters of the U.S. Fifth Fleet, has a pivotal role in America's so-called "War against terrorism."

The imperialist conspiracy thesis of the anti-interventionists is totally impervious to the facts on the ground. It ignores, distorts, rejects, "selects out" all inconvenient facts - facts that either do not fit into their straitjacketed narrative or facts that contradict it. Key evidential information is treated as if it simply does not exist. We are treated to repetitive statements and denunciations concerning past imperialist actions, in several regions of the world, going as far back as the 19th century. A country's past actions are, indeed, an important indication of what that country is capable of, what are likely to be the motives behind its current actions, and what the short, medium, and long term objectives of such actions might possibly be. In those several respects, the anti-interventionists are quite justified in putting the past actions of NATO powers under a microscope.

In the "single-story" narrative of the anti-interventionists, the Libyan conflict is depicted, rather simplistically, if not disengenously, as a conflict between the Gadaffi régime and Western imperialist powers. Consequently, one would have expected that the anti-interventionist writers would have examined Gadaffi's past actions and those of his régime as closely as they did those of the U.S. and its Western allies. But what do we get? Nothing, absolutely nothing. It is as if Gadaffi has no past at all, or at least none that could throw any light on his current actions, the motives that might lie behind them, or provide some indication of his and his régime's short, medium and long term objectives.

That most extraordinary omission, on the part of **all** the authors of articles on the Libyan conflict posted on this website, every single one of them without exception, is most puzzling because very detailed, documented information on Gadaffi's past actions, and those of his régime, is not only in the public domain but it is also easily available. It can be found in Security Council Resolutions and in relevant resolutions adopted by the African Union, the Arab League, and a number of other regional organizations and bodies. It can be found in various reports of the international Red Cross, Human Rights Watch and those of many other human rights organizations, Libyan and international. It can be found in the archives of all the major news agencies. Were the anti-interventionist authors unaware of the existence of the wealth of existing information on Gadaffi or did they all decide to suppress that information because it would invalidate their anti-imperialist narrative? Since the first option would require too improbable a suspension of disbelief, we are left with the second one, particularly since some of the authors actually cited carefully selected minor bits of certain documents which they thought would support their thesis, while "overlooking" the rest of the same document(s) that clearly invalidate their thesis.

Gadaffi's Green Book

Anyone who wants to understand Gadaffi, the nature of his régime, and obtain insights into

the Libyan leader's past, current and likely future actions, should begin with the Green Book. Written by Gadaffi and published in 1975, the Green Book is a treatise on Qadaffi's political, social, and legal philosophy and, as such, it could justifiably be considered Gadaffi's "Bible" or political testament. The Green Book not only reveals the Libyan leader's worldview but also provides very valuable insights into his personality and psychological make-up. Moreover, the Green Book gives a clear indication of the kind of political and social régime Gadaffi desires for Libya. Although it was written and published more than three decades ago, not only are the ideas set out in the Green Book still valid but they are also central to understanding the Libyan leader's political thinking as well as the kind of policies he intends to apply in Libya. Gadaffi made that crystal clear when, in his televised address to the nation on 22 February, he read passages from the Green Book, emphasizing to Libyan viewers that he intended to continue governing Libya in accordance with the principles and tenets contained therein.

It is not without significance that, in the very same address and the same context, Gadaffi not only publicly ordered the army and police to crush the uprising, but also warned protesters that they would be executed, threatening to purge Libya "*house by house*" and "*inch by inch*." Gadaffi also vowed to fight to his last, shouting "*This is my country, my country*", adding that he is "*the leader of the revolution forever*." Anyone who has read the Green Book would not have been in the least surprised by the tone or the content of Gadaffi's outburst. It accorded perfectly with the views he had expressed in the Green Book and the insights into the Libyan leader's personality and psychological make-up which those who have read it would have gained.

Thus, the Green Book is arguably an accurate guide for anyone interested in ascertaining what Gadaffi has in store for the country, the possibility or likelihood of a negotiated settlement to the Libyan conflict, what kind of political arrangements, if any, Gadaffi would consider acceptable, whether or not he is capable of making the political concessions required to bring about an agreed solution to the conflict, and whether or not Gadaffi would respect such an agreement, if it did come about.

The only other "political testament" I have come across, of such prophetic importance, is Hitler's *Mein Kampf* (1925-1926) which the Allied Powers ignored to their great cost. Exactly as Gadaffi later did with his Green Book, Hitler spelt out very clearly his political philosophy in *Mein Kampf*, as well as his worldview, his views on the Jewish people, the vision he had for Germany, its future, and the place it should rightfully occupy in Europe. Like Gadaffi's Green Book, *Mein Kampf* also provided very valuable insights into Hitler's personality and psychological make-up. Again, like Gadaffi's Green Book, Hitler's *Mein Kampf* gave a very clear indication of the likelihood or possibility of the Allied Powers reaching a political agreement with Hitler and the chances of his respecting any agreement that might be reached.

Hitler openly stated that the future of Germany "*has to lie in the acquisition of land in the East at the expense of Russia*." As Hitler declared in *Mein Kampf*, "*Only an adequate large space on this earth assures a nation freedom of existence...We must eliminate the disproportion between our population and our area.....Some of this land can be obtained from Russia.....We must secure for the German people the land and soil to which they are entitled*." Hitler's avowed policy of *Lebensraum* (living space) for Germany, explains why

he aggressively expanded Germany eastward, by invading Czechoslovakia and Poland, before launching his redoubtable panzer divisions against Russia.

In *Mein Kampf*, Hitler mapped out Germany's political and geopolitical future, which he envisaged would take place in stages, the first of which was restoring Germany's military strength through a programme of massive re-armament, in clear violation of the Treaty of Versailles. The second stage would be wars of aggression against France and her allies in Eastern Europe, in a hoped-for association with Britain and Italy (Hitler regarded Britain as a natural ally and mistakenly thought that he could persuade the British to join forces with Germany). The third and final stage would be to launch a war of destruction against the Soviet Union, the "*Judaeo-Bolshevik*" regime as Hitler called it - a war that would provide Germany with the desired "living space". Hitler's geopolitical strategy for achieving *Lebensraum* was so clearly set out in *Mein Kampf* that Andreas Hillgruber, one of Germany's most distinguished historians, dubbed it Hitler's "*Stufenplan*" (stage-by-stage plan).

When Hitler launched his "*Stufenplan*" by invading Austria in March 1938, it was clear that he intended to follow it up with an invasion of the Sudetenland, a Czechoslovak province with a large German population. During the build-up to that invasion, the British prime minister, Neville Chamberlain, flew to Hitler's retreat in Berchtesgaden, in September that year in a desperate attempt to dissuade Hitler, who promised him that the Sudetenland was the "*last problem to be solved*". With an astonishing display of wishful thinking, Chamberlain decided that Hitler was "*a man who can be relied upon*" and persuaded the Czech government to cede the Sudetenland to Germany. Chamberlain returned triumphantly to Britain and announced to cheering crowds that he had secured "*peace with honour. I believe it is peace for our time*". Less than a year later, Hitler resumed the implementation of his *Stufenplan* by invading Poland in August 1939. Chamberlain had either not read *Mein Kampf* or he had conveniently persuaded himself that Hitler did not mean what he had clearly set out in it. Chamberlain and the British government naively believed that Hitler would allow a mere agreement on paper to stand in the way of Germany fulfilling its "historic destiny".

Regrettably, the anti-interventionist authors, whose proposed solution to the Libyan conflict is that the Libyan insurgents should negotiate an agreement with Gaddafi, and that NATO should cease targeting Libyan tanks and long-range artillery which continue to bombard the insurgent civilian population, have either not read Gaddafi's Green book or are guilty of the same naïveté and wishful thinking as Chamberlain. They apparently believe that Gaddafi is "*a man who can be relied upon*"; that Benghazi, Misrata, and other cities under constant bombardment are the "*last problem to be solved*"; and that yielding to Gaddafi's unreasonable demands would secure "*peace with honour... peace for our time*".

Denouncing the Munich Pact in the House of Commons Churchill told Chamberlain: "*You were given the choice between war and dishonour. You chose dishonour and you will have war.*"

In depicting the brutal Libyan leader as the victim rather than the sanguinary oppressor that he undoubtedly is, and according their unqualified moral, intellectual and political support to Gaddafi rather than the victims of his crimes against humanity - the innocent men, women and children in the insurgent-held areas - those members of the Caribbean

'anti-imperialist' Left who posted articles on the Libyan conflict on this website have betrayed the historic mission of the Left - to denounce oppressors everywhere they exist and demonstrate solidarity to the oppressed everywhere they exist. They were given a choice between the oppressor and the oppressed. They chose the oppressor; they will have the oppressed, because the march of history is on the side of the insurgents. As someone who has fought the causes of the Left all my adult life, I cannot help but regret that most aberrant choice.

Fortunately, the Libyan insurgents turn a deaf ear to all demands they receive that they appease their dictator by entering into negotiations with him. They know, from their own bitter experience that, like Hitler, Gadaffi cannot be trusted and that they would be committing mass suicide if they were to do so. Unlike our Caribbean anti-interventionist authors, the Libyan insurgents know Gadaffi's Green Book, almost by heart. As George Tremlett, the British author, has pointed out, Libyan children spend two hours a week studying the Green Book as part of their curriculum. Excerpts are broadcast every day on television and radio, and its slogans are found on billboards and painted on buildings in Libya. (Gadaffi: The Desert Mystic, 1993). Tremlett's account is corroborated by Libyans themselves, as readers will see when they consult the relevant documents in Part 11.

What the posted articles of the anti-interventionists do **not** tell us.

Because of the anti-interventionists' unsurprising decision not to balance their detailed examination of the Western past with a similar examination of Gadaffi's past, no one who has read their posted articles would know that Gadaffi personally ordered the destruction of Pan Am Flight 103, which exploded in mid-flight over Lockerbie, Scotland, in December 1988, killing all 259 persons on board and 11 on the ground. None would know that Gadaffi paid a total of US\$ 2.7 billion in compensation to the victims' families. None would know that Gadaffi had also ordered the destruction of a French airliner, UTA Flight 772, over the Sahara in September 1989, via a hidden bomb on board, which killed all 171 persons on board, or that Libya paid \$1.5 billion into a fund, in October 2008, to compensate the victims' families.

None would know that the Gadaffi régime's human rights violations were considered so serious by the Security Council that it adopted Resolution 1970 on 26 February 2011 which deplored ***“the gross and systematic violation of human rights”*** in Libya, **demanding an end to the violence** and decided to refer the situation to the ICC (**NB**: two weeks ago, the ICC's Chief Prosecutor announced that he had found conclusive evidence that Gadaffi, his son, Saif, and a senior member of the régime, had committed crimes against humanity and that he had submitted his findings to the ICC judges). No one reading the posted articles of the anti-interventionists would know that evidence of the **gravity** of the Libyan régime's human rights violations was so **overwhelming and so conclusive that all fifteen members of the Security Council, including Russia and China, voted unanimously** for Resolution 1970.

Nor would any of the readers of the articles on Libya posted on this site, know that it is precisely because of the seriousness of the Gadaffi régime's human rights violations that Resolution 1970 also imposed an arms embargo on Libya as well as a travel ban and an assets freeze on Qadaffi, his family, and a number of Government officials. (**NB**: Those Libyans subjected to a travel ban and the freezing of their assets abroad, are mentioned

by name in the annex to Resolution 1970). They include Gadaffi and **all** the members of his family, including his sons and daughters. The annex, together with the full text of Resolution 1970, can be consulted via the link provided in the relevant section of Part 11.

No one who has read the posted articles of the anti-interventionists would know that the principal reason why the Security Council adopted **Resolution 1973**, imposing a no-fly zone over Libyan airspace, was that **Gadaffi and his régime had completely ignored the Council's demand, formulated in Resolution 1970, that he put an end to the violence inflicted on the civilian population.** That Gadaffi's refusal to comply with the Council's demand that he cease committing civil rights violations was uppermost in the minds of Security Council members is clearly indicated in its positioning in the Resolution - the opening paragraph; which reads thus:

"The Security Council,

Recalling its resolution 1970 (2011) of 26 February 2011,

"Deploring the failure of the Libyan authorities to comply with resolution 1970 (2011)."

Resolution 1973 continues thus:

*"Expressing grave concern at **the deteriorating situation, the escalation of violence, and the heavy civilian casualties,***

"Reiterating the responsibility of the Libyan authorities to protect the Libyan population and reaffirming that parties to armed conflicts bear the primary responsibility to take all feasible steps to ensure the protection of civilians,

"Condemning the gross and systematic violation of human rights, including arbitrary detentions, enforced disappearances, torture and summary executions,

"Further condemning acts of violence and intimidation committed by the Libyan authorities against journalists, media professionals and associated personnel and urging these authorities to comply with their obligations under international humanitarian law as outlined in resolution 1738 (2006)..."

"Considering that the widespread and systematic attacks currently taking place in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya against the civilian population may amount to crimes against humanity.."

Since several of the authors of the posted articles claimed that NATO's military operations exceeded the terms of Security Council Resolution 1973, one must assume that they had actually read the Resolution. Since it is crystal clear that the central issue and preoccupation in both Resolution 1970 and Resolution 1973, was Gadaffi's civil rights violations and his refusal to cease committing them, it is astonishing (that is an understatement) that none of the posted articles of the anti-interventionists, **not a single one**, mentioned that central issue. The authors (all of them) simply airbrushed that central issue out of their articles because it would have invalidated their anti-imperialist narrative, which portrays Gadaffi as the victim in the Libyan conflict, whereas he is the villain of the piece, as the Security Council recognized **unanimously** in Resolution 1970.

No one reading the articles of the anti-interventionists would know that the Arab League, the Islamic Council, the African Union, the Gulf Cooperation Council, and the UN's human Rights Council, had all formally adopted similar resolutions condemning the Libyan Government's serious human rights violations. The web links to those resolutions can be found in Part 11. Nor would any reader know that Article 11 of the resolution adopted by the African Union's ministerial-level Peace and Security Council (26 April, 2011) **"Reiterates the AU's commitment to the respect for resolution 1973 (2011)**. None would know that the AU does not oppose NATO military action as such **but only in so far as such action targets Libyan Senior Officials and Libya's socio-economic infrastructure**. Article 11 *"urges all involved to refrain from actions, including military operations targeting Libyan Senior Officials and socio economic infrastructure*. The anti-interventionists have repeatedly and selectively cited the African Union's opposition to the then proposed no-fly zone (AU resolution of 10th March 2011) but neglected to inform their readers that, after the adoption of Resolution 1973, the AU changed its position and supported it.

None of their readers would know that, in Article 2 of the same resolution above, the African Union *"Expresses deep concern with the situation in the Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and strongly condemns the indiscriminate and excessive use of force and lethal weapons against peaceful protesters, in violation of human rights and International Humanitarian Law, which continues to contribute to the loss of human life and the destruction of property. Council stresses the need for the people of Libya to spare no effort in avoiding any further loss of life."* Nor that Article 3 *"Calls on the Libyan authorities to ensure the protection and security the citizens and also ensure the delivery and provision of humanitarian assistance to the injured and other persons in need;"* nor that Article 5 *"Underscores that the aspirations of the people of Libya for democracy, political reform, justice and socio-economic development are legitimate and urges that they be respected...."* (I draw Article 5, in particular, to the attention of the anti-interventionist writers who, in their posted articles, **questioned or dismissed the legitimacy of the insurgents' claims for democracy, political reform, and justice**). Readers can access the full text of the AU resolution in Part 11.

No one who has read the posted articles of the anti-interventionists would know that, in April 1973, Gaddafi suspended all existing laws and implemented *Shari'a* (Islamic law) - a decision that had momentous consequences for Libyan women. None would know that 100 lashes are the prescribed punishment (Law No. 70 of 1973) for those convicted of zina – which is defined in Libyan law as sexual relations between a man and a woman outside of a lawful marriage. None would know that, in addition to that draconian, medieval penalty, consensual sexual relations outside of wedlock are punishable by five years' imprisonment: *"Anyone who has sexual intercourse with another person with their consent shall be punished, as shall their partner, by up to five years' imprisonment."* (paragraph 4 of Article 407 of Libya's Penal Code).

None of their readers would know that the stipulated punishment for defamation - *had alqadhaf* – is flogging (Law No. 52 of 1974); or that the stipulated punishment for theft and *haraba* (highway robbery or rebellion) is amputation of the right hand (Law No.13). None would know that political dissent is illegal in Libya (Law 75 of 1973) or that, until recently, discussing politics with foreigners was a crime punishable by three years in prison. None

would know that Gaddafi employs systematic rape as a weapon of war in order to terrorize the insurgent population, **or that his régime provided its soldiers with ample supplies of viagra to sustain their flagging vigour so that they could rape the maximum number of the wives and daughters of the insurgent population, repeatedly.** None would know that the girls and women were raped in front of their fathers and husbands, or that the régime's soldiers also took girls and women out into the desert in groups, to rape them at will.

No one who has read the posted articles of the anti-interventionists would know that, before the people of Benghazi succeeded in forcing Gaddafi's armed forces out of the city last February, the régime's police and soldiers had abducted 1000 Benghazi citizens who have been missing since then. They are unlikely to be seen again. Neither would their readers have learnt that Qaddafi's security forces ruthlessly murdered 1,200 prisoners at Benghazi's Abu Slim prison in 1996, in cold blood, because they dared to protest prison conditions.

Targeted assassinations: Different strokes for different folks.

None of their readers would know that Gaddafi had an avowed policy of assassinating Libyan political dissidents and opponents of his régime, both at home and abroad. At least four articles posted on this website roundly denounced the United States for its assassination of Bin Laden, who has acknowledged responsibility for the deaths of almost 3000 American civilians on 9/11 and who had promised America more of the same. Three of those four authors strongly opposed NATO's military intervention in Libya to protect the civilian insurgent population from Gaddafi's army. However, none of those three authors (not a single one) has condemned Gaddafi for his targeted assassinations of political opponents abroad and in Libya - assassinations that the régime has not only admitted but has also widely publicized as a warning to other political dissidents. Readers will find relevant source documents in Part 11. In one of them, a Libyan cabinet minister boasted of the successful assassination of a named dissident abroad and, in another, they will find Gaddafi's public declaration of the existence of such a government policy.

Unlike Bin Laden, the Libyan dissidents who were targeted by Gaddafi had no blood on their hands; all they wanted was to enjoy the basic human and political rights that all of us in Caricom take for granted. **Yet the same anti-imperialists who denounced the targeted assassination of Osama Bin Laden have remained thunderously silent on Gaddafi's targeted assassinations. So have the other anti-interventionist writers.** Different strokes for different folks? **Those anti-interventionist writers would do well to emulate Walter Rodney who was, himself, a victim of targeted assassination. "His [Walter's] determination as a scholar-activist propelled him to argue that *transformation and true human development can only be achieved through the common struggle of all peoples to recognize the necessity for a single humanity.*"** (Wazir Mohamed, former Co-Leader of the Working Peoples' Alliance of Guyana).

http://www.guyanacaribbeanpolitics.com/wpa/rodney_wazirmohamed.html

African opposition to international intervention in Libya has been cited in some of the posted anti-interventionist articles, in support of their authors' anti-imperialist narrative. However, none of their readers would know that on 4 March, 2011, The Pan-Africanist International issued a Declaration that began with the following statement: "*We are*

*shocked and horrified by the reckless abandon and the extents taken by the Libyan authorities, including reports of the hiring of foreign mercenaries to kill and maim peaceful protesters by a leader who prides himself as being "democratic" in his own Green Book! **The International Solidarity Committee of the Pan-Africanist International stands firmly in support of the heroic people of Libya. We stand with them in this great hour of need! We urgently call upon the international community to do something now!***"

Instead of standing "*firmly in support of "the heroic people of Libya"*", as the Pan-Africanist International has unequivocally done, all the anti-interventionists (every single one of them) who posted articles on the Libyan crisis on this website, have ranged themselves on the side of Quadaffi. Moreover, they faithfully echoed Gadaffi's mantra that the Western powers have designs on Libya's strategic oil reserves, adopting a position diametrically opposed to that taken by the most prominent, the most authoritative, and the most geographically broad-based institutional representative of the African Left. Unlike the Pan-Africanist International, our region's anti-interventionists appear totally unmoved by the plight of the Libyan freedom fighters, if one is to judge by the absence of any reference at all in their posted articles - not a single one - to the latter's desperate struggle to obtain the most basic of political. Unlike the Pan-Africanist International, the anti-interventionists do not appear to be "*shocked and horrified by the reckless abandon and the extents taken by the Libyan authorities, including reports of the hiring of foreign mercenaries to kill and maim peaceful protesters...*" The sympathies of our region's anti-interventionists appear to be totally with Gadaffi whom they all depict in their articles as the victim, while royally ignoring the real victims in the Libyan crisis - "*the heroic people of Libya.*"

One of the several anti-interventionist articles, posted on this site in recent weeks, was written by a former Caribbean head of government who, half a century ago, had successfully launched an armed revolution to overthrow the dictator of his country - a dictator who was nowhere as ruthless and sanguinary as Gadaffi. The former Caribbean leader had been captured by government forces during a prior attempt to overthrow the dictator, but was subsequently pardoned and released from prison. No Libyan political opponent has ever survived capture by Gadaffi's forces. Astonishing as it may seem, in his posted article on the Libyan conflict that same former Caribbean leader did not once mention the plight of Libya's freedom fighters although they are waging the same struggle that he, himself, had waged more than a half century ago. As with all the other Caribbean anti-interventionists, it would appear that his sympathies lie with Gadaffi, whom he sees as a victim of imperialist aggression, rather than with the insurgents, as one would have expected of him, given their similar political trajectories.

Can the article writers who denounced the U.S for assassinating a self-confessed terrorist, who has the blood of thousands of innocent people on his hands, while remaining totally silent on Gadaffi's targeted assassinations of Libyan dissidents, defend themselves against the accusation that they failed "**to recognize the necessity for a single humanity**", to use Walter Rodney's own words? Targeted assassinations ought not to be condemned on a selective basis. Gadaffi's publicly admitted assassinations should be denounced and condemned with the same degree of indignation and moral outrage as Walter Rodney's, and Bin Laden's assassinations have been. The Pan-Africanist International had no doubt whatsoever who are the real victims in the Libyan conflict.

Unlike all the anti-interventionist authors of posted articles on this site who, to a man, have decided that Gaddafi is the victim in that conflict, the Pan-Africanist International had no hesitation in designating the real victims - "*the heroic people of Libya*" - as a result of which it took a decision to "*stand with them in this great hour of [their] need*". In stark contrast, the anti-interventionist authors have decided to stand, not with the heroic people of Libya but with their sanguinary dictatorial leader, Gaddafi, who had hired "*foreign mercenaries to kill and maim peaceful protesters*", in his great hour of need, now that the international community has finally taken action to enforce the two Security Council Resolutions that Gaddafi has ignored.

Finally, Gaddafi's despatch of hired assassins abroad, with a government mandate to assassinate named political dissidents who had found asylum in other countries is most definitely illegal. But it is by no means clear that Bin Laden's targeted assassination is illegal under international law. International law stipulates certain conditions that justify such assassinations and it does appear that those conditions obtained in Bin Laden's case. Under the relevant sub-heading in Part 11, readers will find links to three learned journal articles which examine the conditions that render targeted assassinations legal under international law. Since the three articles were published well before Bin Laden's assassination, the authors cannot be suspected of being motivated by Bin Laden's case.

Some anti-interventionists have given strong support to a proposal that has been circulating for some time (one that, unsurprisingly, has the support of Gaddafi), namely that NATO cease its bombardment of Gaddafi's forces, that the Libyan government and the insurgents call a ceasefire, and that direct negotiations commence between the two sides. The insurgents, quite justifiably, have rejected such an unequal proposal. Apart from knowing that Gaddafi cannot be trusted to respect either the ceasefire or the terms of any agreement that might be reached, they have wisely learnt from the experience of Palestine. Negotiations, which have been underway between Israel and Palestine for twenty years without any settlement in sight, have provided Israel with the necessary diplomatic and political cover to continue to expand its illegal settlements in the West Bank, with the barely disguised intention of transforming the situation on the ground in such a manner as to make a viable Palestine state impossible. Not surprisingly, Israel is very eager to keep negotiations going. Unsurprisingly, Palestine broke off negotiations last year and has refused to resume them, unless Israel halts all expansion of its illegal settlements, which the latter has rejected.

Similarly, Gaddafi has repeatedly refused the insurgents' demand that he withdraw his forces from their siege of insurgent cities, as a condition precedent for negotiations - a demand that Gaddafi has rejected, for exactly the same reasons that Israel rejected the Palestine demand to put an end to settlement expansion. Acceptance of such a demand would deprive Gaddafi of the diplomatic and political cover to continue his steady encroachment on insurgent-held territory, with the intention of gradually transforming the situation on the ground in his favour until a stage is reached where he could suddenly seize control of the insurgent areas and present the international community with a *fait accompli*. Cottoning on to Gaddafi's strategy, the National Transition Council (the insurgents' makeshift government) has wisely decided that a political settlement of the conflict would be impossible unless and until Gaddafi leaves, or is forced to leave, the country.

But, even more importantly, to propose that the international community leave Gadaffi and the insurgents strictly alone to negotiate their differences by themselves is to put both parties on the same moral footing. To do so would be to take a neutral stance, in the sense in which Bishop Desmond Tutu has employed that term: **"If you are neutral in situations of injustice, you have chosen the side of the oppressor. If an elephant has its foot on the tail of a mouse and you say that you are neutral, the mouse will not appreciate your neutrality"** (quoted in William P. Quigley, Ending Poverty As We Know It: Guaranteeing a Right to a Job at a Living Wage, 2003). The anti-interventionist writers *"have chosen the side of the aggressor."* in advancing or supporting such a "neutral" proposal, without making any mention whatsoever of Gadaffi's serial human rights violations; the two Security Council resolutions condemning Gadaffi for those violations; the Security Council's referral of Gadaffi to the International Criminal Court for investigation and eventual prosecution for having committed crimes against humanity; Gadaffi's persistent refusal to abide by those resolutions; the death and mayhem that Gadaffi's forces continue to inflict on the insurgent civilian population; or the existential threat the latter face as a result.

To make an analogy with a recent event that made world headlines, it would be like putting rich, white, powerful Dominique Strauss-Kahn (the accused rapist) on the same moral footing as the poor, black, powerless hotel maid (his victim). To go further, as the anti-interventionist writers have done, in respect of Libya's insurgents, and propose that the New York City police department and state judiciary should leave the two parties strictly alone to work out their "differences" by themselves, would not only be flagrantly choosing the side of the oppressor but it would also be literally and ruthlessly throwing the hapless victim to the wolves. That analogy is particularly apt, because, as readers will see from relevant source documents in Part 11, the régime's soldiers, acting on Gadaffi's orders, systematically raped a large number of women in Benghazi as collective punishment for Benghazi's opposition to the government's oppressive policies. Or, in Desmond Tutu's graphic analogy it would be like giving *carte blanche* to the elephant to put its foot on the tail of mouse.

The Libyan insurgents are genuine "Freedom Fighters". Their struggle against the Gadaffi régime is just as unequal and just as deserving of external/international support as the historic struggle that South African blacks waged against the apartheid régime and the historic struggle that American blacks in the southern states waged against their *jim crow* régimes. Indeed, the insurgents' struggle is remarkably similar, in many ways, to those two historic struggles. In all three cases, a downtrodden people enjoyed no democratic rights at all, not even the most basic ones; they could not vote, they were subject to arbitrary arrest, illegal imprisonment, and extra-judicial killings; and a more or less elaborate system of "laws", decrees, administrative regulations, and police practices were put in place to intimidate those three peoples and to stamp out any spark of revolt in them.

In all three peoples' "revolutions", one event or situation commanded international attention, instantly transforming a domestic issue into an international *cause célèbre*. In South Africa's black "revolution", it was the police massacre of peacefully demonstrating blacks at Sharpeville (21 March 1960) which killed 69 blacks and left over 180 injured; in the black civil rights "revolution", it was the destruction, by the Klu Klux Klan, of the 16th

Street Baptist church in Birmingham, Alabama (15 September, 1963) with a hidden bomb that killed four innocent teenage black girls in the act of worshipping their Lord; in the Libyan peoples' "revolution" it was siege of Benghazi (mid-February to mid-March 2011) and its imminent re-capture by Gaddafi's forces that prompted the Security Council to adopt Resolution 1973 (17 March) in record time, thus making it possible for the French air force to save the city in the nick of time. One thousand Benghazi protesters had been "disappeared" by Gaddafi's security forces before the people of Benghazi summed up the courage to drive them out of the city forcefully.

Those emblematic incidents in the three peoples' "revolutions" both increased the intensity of domestic protest actions and provoked external "intervention". Within a couple of weeks of the Birmingham church bombing, President Kennedy sent federal agents and U.S. marshals to Alabama, with a federal government mandate to protect black civil rights protesters from Governor George Wallace's repressive rule; within two years of the Sharpeville massacre, the United Nations General Assembly adopted its first resolution (6 Nov, 1962) condemning South Africa's racist apartheid policies and calling on all U.N. members to break off economic and military relations with the country. In 1973 the U.N. adopted another resolution which labeled apartheid a "*crime against humanity*." Those two landmark UN resolutions, subsequently reaffirmed and reinforced by other resolutions, launched an increasingly intensive campaign by the international community (to which I devoted almost three years of my professional life) with the objective of bringing apartheid to an end.

To argue, as the anti-interventionist writers on this site have done, that the international community should end its intervention in Libya and leave Gaddafi and the NTC to negotiate an agreement by themselves is no less shocking than if a similar argument had been made in respect of external intervention in the two other historic peoples' revolutions. In the American case, the U.S. federal government would have been urged to withdraw federal agents and U.S. marshals from Alabama and leave black civil rights protesters to negotiate their grievances directly with Governor George Wallace. In the South African case, the U.N., and the international community as a whole, would have been urged to drop all sanctions against the apartheid régime and leave South African blacks to negotiate their grievances directly with the apartheid government. One did not have to possess a university degree to have known, for certain, what the inevitable outcome of such a national/international hands-off policy on *jim crow* Alabama and apartheid South Africa would have been. One does not have to possess a university degree to know, for certain, what the inevitable outcome of such an international hands-off policy on Libya (despite its ICC indictment for crimes against humanity) would be.

For Guy Rundle, European editor of the Australian magazine, *Arena* (an independent Australian publication of political, social and cultural comment) the Libyan peoples' revolution is the most authentic of all those that are currently transforming the Arab world. It is an opinion that I share: "*The Libyan revolution began as a roll-over from Tunisia and Egypt, connecting with a range of local labour, and other struggles, and caught fire in the Eastern city of Benghazi. From the start it was a real revolution, the first we've seen in this cycle, pushing not merely for change in the political arrangements, but upending social life, and demanding that the political system be rebuilt from scratch.*" (Revolution, intervention and solidarity -Libya and the 'anti-imperialist' left, Part

1).

One of the ideological tenets of the 'anti-imperialist' Left is that, by their very nature, imperialist countries, are incapable of doing any good. Consequently, if a people's revolution (in a country of the South) happens to obtain imperialist support, that revolution must necessarily be tainted, and its legitimacy, as well as that of its leaders, must be called into question. Blindly applying that ideological tenet, one of the anti-interventionist writers on this site cast doubt on the legitimacy of the insurgent leadership. Like most of the statements, propositions and arguments of the anti-interventionists, their narrative of "illegitimacy" is completely misleading. The source of the NTC's legitimacy was clearly set out in the first paragraph of the declaration it published, following its first meeting: *"The Council derives its legitimacy from the city councils who run the liberated cities, and who had been formed by the revolution of the 17th February to fulfil the revolutionary gains in order to achieve their goals."* (Founding Statement of the Interim Transitional National Council, 5 March 2011). The full text of that declaration can be accessed via the link provided in Part 11).

According to the above immutable ideological tenet, as an imperialist country Britain had no moral right to intervene in Sierra Leone in 2000, in order to help put an end to that country's brutal ten-year civil war, during which an estimated eighty per cent of the female population (including young girls and old women) were (gang) raped. It was Britain's military intervention that brought about the defeat of the sanguinary rebel forces. Unsurprisingly, as the Libyan insurgents did with France's military intervention, the Sierra Leone people not only welcomed Britain's military intervention but have also elevated Tony Blair, Britain's prime minister at the time, to the status of a national hero - a status that Nicholas Sarkozy has won among the Benghaziis for his country's intervention, in the nick of time, to save them from the tender mercies of Gadaffi. *"A decade after its civil war, Sierra Leone is still desperately poor but is grateful for Britain's intervention.....In the streets of Freetown at the time the graffiti read: "Queen Elizabeth for king!" and "Return to us our colonial mother!" Tony Blair remains more popular here than anywhere else on the planet....Several Sierra Leoneans said they would personally campaign for Blair to be the country's president."* (Sierra Leone: one place where Tony Blair remains an unquestioned hero) <http://www.visitsierraleone.org/Sierra-Leone-News/Daily/Sierra-Leone-one-place-where-Tony-Blair-remains-an-unquestioned-hero.html>

Perhaps the real Achilles' heel of ideologues everywhere is that their ideologies are a veritable straitjacket which allows them no wriggle room at all. They cannot deviate one iota from the ideological "party line" because the basic tenets of the particular ideology to which they happen to subscribe are immutable - they are cast in stone. That centrally important fact makes the reactions of ideologues to most issues both uniform and predictable. Such uniformity of reaction is strikingly illustrated in the articles on the Libyan conflict that the anti-interventionists posted on this website. They have reacted as one man (significantly, there were no women among them) to every one of issues discussed. The posted articles of the anti-interventionists could not have been more similar, in both content and form, if their individual narratives had been rehearsed together, prior to their posting, to make them word perfect, in ideological terms

Such ideological uniformity is impervious to geography. Thus, it comes as no surprise that,

like our Caribbean anti-interventionist writers, the Australian 'anti-imperialist' Left also questioned the legitimacy of the Libyan revolution and that of its leadership. I quote, below, Guy Rundle's response to the Australian 'anti-imperialist' Left, on that point because it is very pertinent:

*"Not only was it a mass uprising, but it quickly acquired leadership – a group that would in several days become the National Transitional Council, which would in turn establish forms of representation and delegation. Like most revolutionary leaderships the Council is a coalition of genuine revolutionaries, moderates who see no other way, opportunists and adventurers. Its leaders were some of Gaddafi's own ministers who had quickly defected, and they became its most vocal spokespeople. One wasn't filled with confidence about their pure-heartedness. Nor were they the only voice in the revolution. **But they were the ones who established a leadership structure capable of making the rebels a coordinated force, and they appear to have acquired legitimacy as people ceded to them.**"*

As if by concert, every one of the posted articles by the anti-interventionist authors "omitted" to mention that, from the very beginning of their active resistance to the violent onslaught Gaddafi had launched against them, the Libyan insurgents appealed to the international community to protect them from the Libyan dictator's exactions. Subsequently, they also demanded that NATO increase the intensity of their bombardments. In citing the inevitable collateral damage that NATO's aerial bombardment would cause to the civilian population, as a reason for opposing the military intervention, none of the anti-interventionist authors mentioned that, despite the several dozen insurgent lives lost from such collateral damage, the insurgents have continued to ask NATO' to step up its bombardment of the tanks and long-range artillery deployed against them by Gadaffi.

In making the above specious argument, Caribbean anti-interventionists apparently consider that they know better than the Libyan insurgents, themselves, what is good for them. Mustafa Abdul-Jalil, the head of the National Transitional Council, not only called upon the international community to intervene so as to protect them from the Gadaffi régime's murderous attacks on the civilian population but he also demanded that the intervention be immediate: *"It has to be immediate action. The longer the situation carries on, the more blood is shed. That's the message that we want to send to the international community. They have to live up to their responsibility with regards to this."*

Guy Rundle, scathingly dismissed a similar hypocritical argument that the Australian "anti-imperialist" Left has advanced, as one of the reasons for their opposition to the military intervention in Libya: *"What could be more condescending, more imperious than to decide whether a bunch of people really know what they're doing? The judgement, it has to be said, has a colonial air about it. It is redolent of older imperial powers (or Second International Marxists, come to that), deciding that colonised people might not be acting in their own best interests were they to go for immediate self-determination."* To my great disappointment, Noam Chomsky, whose indefatigable defense of worthy causes and oppressed peoples everywhere, I have always admired, appear to have also been chosen by the Gods to suffer the same fate as Medea. In view of the widely publicized NTC declaration and the many text and video documents that testify to the East Libyans desire for increased NATO involvement, it is the only explanation I can give for the astonishing

statement he made in the Newsnight interview, namely that, that *"the Libyan people do not want intervention"*, they want the West to leave them alone. (See the youtube in Part 11).

Conspiracy theories and theorists

In not even deigning to mention, in the articles they posted on this site, the popular revolution in Libya - a revolution which the facts on the ground, the weight of evidential information, and the declarations of Libya's freedom fighters themselves, overwhelmingly place in the same category and context as the other popular revolutions that are shaking up the entire Arab region - the anti-interventionist authors apparently consider it an insignificant event or, at most, one that is peripheral to the "real" issue, an imperialist conspiracy to control Libya's oil. In his book, Voodoo Histories: The Role of the Conspiracy Theory in Shaping Modern History (2009), David Aaronovitch argues that conspiratorial fantasy can have dangerous real-world consequences because of the large number of gullible people who are prepared to believe them. Moreover, as Aaronovitch points out, conspiracy theories that speculate on the motives and actions of *"secretive coalitions of individuals"* to explain historical or current events, are rarely supported by any conclusive evidence. That penetrating observation could have been made with our Caribbean conspiracy theorists in mind, for none of their fanciful arguments is supported by even the most vestigial evidence, let alone conclusive evidence.

According to Michael Barkun, the American political scientist, conspiracy theories, which were once limited to fringe audiences, have become commonplace in the mass media. (Culture of Conspiracy: Apocalyptic Visions in Contemporary America, 2003). It would appear that the arrival of the internet has accelerated that regrettable tendency, for it has provided every armchair conspiracy theorist with the opportunity to circulate the most far-fetched conspiracy theories to a virtually limitless audience. The Libyan conflict has proven a veritable godsend in that respect, if one is to judge from the number of conspiracy theorists (including our home-grown Caribbean conspiracy theorists) who have emerged from the woodwork to flood the internet with a tsunami of articles denouncing an imperialist conspiracy to control Libya's strategic petroleum reserves.

Discussing the possible influence conspiracy theories might have on world events, Bruce Cumings, an American historian, observed: *"But if conspiracies exist, they rarely move history; they make a difference at the margins from time to time, but with the unforeseen consequences of a logic outside the control of their authors: and this is what is wrong with 'conspiracy theory.'* **History is moved by the broad forces and large structures of human collectivities.**" (The Origins of the Korean War, Vol. II, The Roaring of the Cataract, 1947–1950, 1999).

In Libya, as in the entire Arab region, we see history being *"moved"* by broad democratic forces and *"large [popular] structures of human collectivities"*, in Benghazi, in Cairo's Tahrir square, in Tunisia, in Yemen, in Bahrein, in Syria and, to a lesser extent, in Morocco and Jordan. Those broad popular forces will eventually shake the foundations of the autocratic power structure in Algeria and Saudi Arabia. No informed, non-ideological observer considers the West to be the instigator of, or playing any but a peripheral role in, those broad Arab democratic movements. Indeed, the consensus of informed opinion, in the West as elsewhere, is that America and its Western allies were taken completely by surprise at the spontaneous region-wide pro-democratic explosions.

In their 'single-story' narrative, the Caribbean 'anti-imperialist' Left attributed, with more than a little justification, ulterior motives to the intervention of America and its Western allies. Those countries will, undoubtedly, attempt to harness "*the broad forces and large structures of human collectivities*" in Libya and the Arab region as a whole, with a view to having them serve Western interests, but even the most optimistic Western "imperialists" have realized that they have little chance of success in that respect. That is why America was so hesitant in its response to the Arab uprisings before finally deciding, lukewarmly and very selectively, to support the "*broad forces*" that have begun to reshape the Arab geopolitical landscape. Unsurprisingly, the Western powers have clothed, in humanitarian garb, whatever ulterior motives they might have.

But as Mark Bahnisch perceptively observed, "*while juridical concepts like the 'Responsibility to Protect' are not entirely innocent, nor can they always be discarded as bourgeois frippery. To abdicate the task of thinking about genuinely new events is to abdicate from history altogether – and to join the Francis Fukuyama of The End of History in remaining frozen and rigid in the face of political choices which are literally ones of life and death.*" As long as the Caribbean 'anti-imperialist' Left persist in riding their favourite ideological hobby horse - a grand imperialist conspiracy to control Libya's strategic oil reserves - **they will remain "frozen and rigid" on the other side of history, where they have dug themselves into a deep ideological hole.**

The issue of régime change

A favourite mantra of the Caribbean 'anti-imperialist' Left is that one of the not so ulterior motives of the Western powers is their desire and intention to bring about régime change in Libya. I am, and have always been, as severe a critic of Western imperialism as the doctrinaire Caribbean 'anti-imperialist' Left. Since the end of the Second World war, Western imperialist countries have brought about unwelcomed régime change in many countries in the South, whose leaders merely wanted to serve their own country's interests, rather than those of the West. Such "impertinence" was intolerable to the Western imperialist powers. Consequently, they did not hesitate to arrange a change of régime at the expense of those "impertinent" nationalistic leaders. However much I condemned those cynical Western actions at the time, I would wholeheartedly welcome régime change in Libya. If North Korea is left out of the running, Gadaffi's Libya would easily top the list of the world's most brutal, sanguinary régimes. I consider that régime change would be an unalloyed good for the Libyan people, the Arab region, and the world.

An argument which the Caribbean 'anti-imperialist' Left invariably associate with their accusation of régime change intentions, on the part of the Western powers, is that Security Council Resolution 1973 does not authorize régime change. That is very true, but the Resolution does authorize member states to "*take all possible measures*" to protect the lives and physical safety of the Libyan people. Like the Tunisians and the Egyptians realized, in respect of their own leaders, the Libyan insurgents have realized that neither they or their families would be safe as long as Gadaffi remains in power. Hence, they have decided that his departure (which would inevitably bring about régime change) is a condition precedent for any political solution. Yemeni and Syrian democratic activists seem to have reached an identical conclusion.

For almost three years of my professional life, I was engaged in the international community's efforts to bring about régime change in apartheid South Africa. Like Security Council Resolution 1973, the relevant U. N. Resolution that mandated the international community to put pressure on the South African government to end its apartheid policies, did not authorize régime change. But we all knew that that was the unpublicised objective of our international efforts, because it was crystal clear that as long as an apartheid regime remained in place, apartheid would not be ended. History has proven us right. Thus, unlike the Caribbean 'anti-interventionist' Left, we (those of us who actively engaged in the anti-apartheid struggle) found ourselves on the right side of History when that long-drawn out struggle was finally won.

In his essay on nationalism, George Orwell commented: *"The nationalist not only does not disapprove of atrocities committed by his own side, but he has a remarkable capacity for not even hearing about them"* (Notes on Nationalism, 1945). To paraphrase Orwell, the Caribbean 'anti-imperialist' Left, do not (apparently) disapprove of the blatant misrepresentations, misinformation, evidence suppression, and fact distortion practised by members of their own camp but they have a remarkable capacity for not even acknowledging them. None has yet done so.

In an address he delivered to the U.S. Senate in mid-May, Republican Senator John McCain called on a fellow Republican (former Bush Attorney-General Michael Mukasey) to publicly retract his false statements. Mukasey had recently claimed, in a published article, that it was evidence extracted from Guantanamo detainees by torture which had led to the discovery of Bin Laden's hiding place. In his address, McCain informed his fellow Senators: *"With so much misinformation being fed into such an essential public debate as this one, I asked the Director of Central Intelligence, Leon Panetta, for the facts. And I received the following information: "...In fact, not only did the use of 'enhanced interrogation techniques' used on Khalid Sheikh Mohammed not provide us with key leads on bin Laden's courier, Abu Ahmed; it actually produced false and misleading information."*

*"In short, it was not torture or cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment of detainees that got us the major leads that ultimately enabled our intelligence community to find Osama bin Laden. **I hope former Attorney General Mukasey will correct his misstatement. It's important that he do so because we are again engaged in this important debate, with much at stake for America's security and reputation. Each side should make its own case, but do so without making up its own facts.**"* (John McCain: Torture Played No Role In Locating Bin Laden's) <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JmQo91716TQ>

Mukasey's false statement was widely cited by the American Right, just as the misinformation in the articles posted on this site is likely to be widely quoted by uninformed Caribbean readers. I do not personally know any of the authors of the articles posted on this site, but I am sure that they are all well-meaning, honourable men. With so much misinformation being fed into such an essential debate as this one I hope that, after having consulted the wealth of documentary evidence in Part 11 which invalidate their narrative and demonstrate conclusively that their arguments are totally at variance with the facts, that they will do the right thing and publicly correct their misstatements.

However, most people find it very difficult to admit error, particularly if they have been as

emphatic, as dogmatic, as doctrinaire, and as categorical in their "misstatements", as these authors have been. If they fail to do the right thing, is there anyone among the Caribbean 'anti-imperialist' Left who has the moral courage to be the John McCain of his own camp and demand that the authors of the posted articles correct their misstatements? As McCain, whose politics I strongly oppose but whose integrity and decency in this matter I salute, applaud, admire, and strongly recommend to the anti-interventionist authors, declared: *"It's important that he [former Attorney-General Mukasey] do so because we are again engaged in this important debate....**Each side should make its own case, but do so without making up its own facts.**"* The Caribbean 'anti-imperialist' Left should certainly make their own case, but they should do so without making up their own facts.

Part 11: Annotated Reference Source of Documents and Factual Information

Table of Contents

The Green Book: A Window into Gadaffi's Personality, Philosophy and Politics (pp.29-31)

The role of Women in Gadaffi's Green Book philosophy and the fate reserved for them in Gadaffi's Libya (pp.31-33)

Rape employed as collective punishment and as a weapon of terror and war (pp.33-34)

Disastrous effect of Gadaffi's aggression on children and women (pp.34-35)

Gadaffi's opinion of Black People and the treatment they merit, as revealed in his Green Book philosophy and the actions of his régime (pp.36-37)

Anti-black racism in Libya (pp.37-38)

The reality behind Gadaffi's vaunted benevolent assistance to Black Africa (p.38)

Gadaffi's personality and psychological make-up (pp.39-40)

What Libyans really think of Gadaffi's Green Book and on being governed according to its precepts (pp.40-41)

The Insurgent leaders, their goals, programme and legitimacy of their government (pp.41-42)

The Gadaffi régime's Human Rights violations (pp.42-44)

The Gadaffi régime's systematic use of torture (pp.44-45)

Gadaffi's Targeted Assassinations of dissidents and opponents (pp.45-46)

The "missing" and "Disappeared" in Gadaffi's Régime (pp.46-47)

Gadaffi's use of mercenaries (p.47)

Insurgents accused of human rights violations (p.47)

Gadaffi's indiscriminate bombardment of the civilian insurgent population (p.48)

The siege of insurgent cities by Gadaffi's army (pp.49-50)

International reactions to Gadaffi's human rights violations - subdivided into Arab, African and other international reactions (pp.50-55)

Insurgent Libyan pleas for external assistance (pp.55-56)

Collateral and "non-collateral" damage examined, and compared (pp.56-58)

Geographically widespread nature of opposition to Gadaffi's régime (pp.59-60)

Reactions of insurgents and other Libyan opponents to Resolution 1973 and NATO's intervention (p.60)

Giving voice to the countless voiceless Libyan opponents of Gadaffi (pp.60-61)

The Unequal struggle of Libyan insurgents for their survival and freedom (pp.61-62)

The Hidden reality behind the Gadaffi Regime's vaunted socio-economic achievements (p.62)

The Armed Struggle in Libya (pp.62-63)

Negotiations, Ceasefires, Exit strategies (pp.63-65)

Defections from Gaddafi's camp (pp.65-66)

Political Rights and Freedoms in Gadaffi's Libya (pp.66-68)

Law and Justice in Gadaffi's Libya (pp.68-69)

Freedom of expression and Media censorship in Libya (pp.69-72)

Crimes against Humanity and War crimes (pp.72-74)

The reality behind Gadaffi's vaunted assistance to black Africa (pp.74-75)

Similarity of the Anti-apartheid, American civil rights and Libyan conflicts (pp.75-76)

The 'Anti-imperialist' Left deconstructed (pp.76-77)

Under what circumstances are targeted assassinations legal in international law?

(pp.77-78)

Postscript (p.79)

The Green Book: A Window into Gadaffi's Personality, Philosophy and Politics

The Green Book, Moammar Gadaffi (1975)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Green_Book

The Green Book Qadaffi's "Bible", is a compendium of his thoughts on society, politics, law, the economy, the place of women in society, his views on the nature of black people and the reason for their "backwardness" etc, which was first published in 1975. The book provides very revealing insights into the Libyan leader's personality, his philosophy, and his world view - insights that explain, to a great extent, Gadaffi's otherwise baffling behaviour throughout the course of the conflict. It was required reading for all Libyans. According to British author George Tremlett, Libyan children "*spend two hours a week studying the book*" as part of their curriculum; extracts are broadcast every day on television and radio; its slogans are found on billboards and painted on buildings in Libya; (George Tremlett, Gadaffi: The Desert Mystic, 1993). Tremlett's statement is corroborated by an American academic in a radio interview, a specialist on Libya, who has lived in the country and speaks Arabic. <http://www.npr.org/2011/03/03/134239733/Whats-In-Gadhafis-Manifesto>

In a 1979 interview with Italian journalist Oriana Fallaci, Qadhafi called his Green Book "the new gospel," (Lillian Craig Harris, Libya: Qadhafi's Revolution and the Modern State, 1986). Commemorating the 28th anniversary of the "Declaration of People's Power", the Libyan leader Mu'amar Qadhafi confirmed, on March 3, 2005, that Libyans are free to choose the way they practice their political power within the framework of the "Third International Theory". <http://www.pogar.org/countries/theme.aspx?cid=10&t=2>

I provide, below, links to the complete text of each of the three parts of the Green Book, together with a brief summary of some of their more important passages:

Part 1, The Solution of the Problem of Democracy: "The Authority of the People

<http://www.mathaba.net/gci/theory/gb1.htm> (full text)

The problem of governance, in Gadaffi's conception

"The problem of government (the failure to resolve the issue of authority) is the prime political problem confronting societies, a problem that no one has succeeded in answering conclusively and democratically." "All political systems in the world today are a product of the struggle for power between alternative forms of government. This struggle may be peaceful or armed. The outcome is always the victory of a particular governing structure - be it that of an individual, group, party or class - and the defeat of the people; the defeat of genuine democracy."

Western parliamentary institutions and processes rejected

Gadaffi follows up the above with a rather simplistic discussion of what he calls the prevailing "*conventional democracy*", that is to say, Western democratic systems, structures, institutions and their perceived failings. He concludes his discussion by rejecting all the principal institutions and processes of Western democracy - elected parliaments, election of constituency representatives by ballot voting, the political party

system, and majority rule - on the grounds that they lead to tyrannical dictatorship and undemocratic rule: *"The party is a contemporary form of dictatorship. It is the modern instrument of dictatorial government....The party is, fundamentally, based on an arbitrary authoritarian concept."* Gadaffi concludes that the net result of political party competition *"is, in fact, a defeat for the people, i.e., a defeat for democracy....THE GREEN BOOK presents the ultimate solution to the problem of the instrument of government, and indicates for the masses the path upon which they can advance from the age of dictatorship to that of genuine democracy."*

Gadaffi then proposes his conception of a truly democratic system - one that is based on **POPULAR CONFERENCES AND PEOPLE'S COMMITTEES**. Displaying no modesty whatsoever, Gadaffi gives a triple A rating to his invented system of democracy, which he called the Third International Theory: *"Popular Conferences are the only means to achieve popular democracy. Any system of government contrary to this method, the method of Popular Conferences, is undemocratic. All the prevailing systems of government in the world today will remain undemocratic, unless they adopt this method. Popular Conferences are the end of the journey of the masses in quest of democracy."*

Judicial systems and the rule of law rejected

In similar fashion, Gadaffi dismisses man-made laws and constitutions, declaring the latter *"a mockery"*: *"The law of society is an eternal human heritage that does not belong only to the living. Therefore, drafting a constitution or conducting a plebiscite on it is a mockery. The catalogues of man-made laws emanating from man-made constitutions are fraught with physical penalties directed against human beings, while tradition contains few such measures. Tradition lays down moral, non-physical penalties that conform to the intrinsic nature of humanity. Religion contains tradition and absorbs it; and tradition is a manifestation of the natural life of people. Its teachings comprise basic social guidelines and answers to the fundamental questions of existence."*

N.B. Those explicit views on law, political parties, constitutions, and religion have found concrete expression in Gadaffi's summary abolition of the country's Constitution, its laws, judiciary, and legal system and his introduction of the Islamic *sharia* as the law of the land.

"I could at any moment send them to the People's Court and the People's Court will issue a sentence of death based on this law, because execution is the fate of anyone who forms a political party," Gaddafi said in a speech on November 9, 1974 (article in the Oman Tribune)

<http://www.omantribune.com/index.php?page=news&id=85585&heading=Middle%20East>

One need not dwell here on how *sharia* law discriminates against women (a woman's testimony in court is worth only a quarter of that of a man etc.), nor on the inhumane penalties imposed on thieves (amputation of a hand), on female adulterers (stoning to death) etc. Below, readers can access source documents that will enable them to discover for themselves whether or not the various laws introduced by Gadaffi, in replacement of "man-made" laws and constitutions, *"are fraught with physical penalties directed against human beings."*

Press Freedom

Gadaffi declared, in his Green Book, that *"Democratically, private individuals should not be permitted to own any public means of publication or information"*, a view that became the

law of the land. Privately-owned media remain legally forbidden in Libya. On the matter of freedom of expression, generally considered to be a fundamental democratic right, the Green Book states: *"An individual has the right to express himself or herself even if he or she behaves irrationally to demonstrate his or her insanity."* From source documents provided below, readers will be able to ascertain to what extent the relevant law, in Gaddafi's Libya, is respected or not in practice.

Part 11, The Solution of the Economic Problem: "Socialism"

<http://www.mathaba.net/gci/theory/gb2.htm> (full text)

In this section, Gaddafi criticizes the capitalist economic system of private ownership of the means of production and its negative consequences for workers' wages and working conditions: *"Wage-earners are but slaves to the masters who hire them. They are temporary slaves, and their slavery lasts as long as they work for wages from employers, be they individuals or the state.....The ultimate solution lies in abolishing the wage-system, emancipating people from its bondage and reverting to the natural laws which defined relationships before the emergence of classes, forms of governments and man-made laws. These natural rules are the only measures that ought to govern human relations."*

Gaddafi then embarks on a very simplistic economic analysis of wages, labour, the means of production, and the relationship between the three, in the industrial sector, and, in respect of the agricultural sector, the relationship between the land, the farmer, and the means of production. *"Work for wages has failed to solve the problem of motivation for increasing and developing production. Whether it is a service or goods production, work for wages is continuously deteriorating because it is performed by unmotivated wage-earners."*

Following that frankly unpenetrating analysis, Gaddafi revealed his *"Solution of the Economic Problem."* It comes in a one-paragraph section, headed **Income**. *"Income is an imperative need for man. In a socialist society, it should not be in the form of wages from any source or charity from any one. In this society, there are no wage-earners, but only partners. One's income is a private matter and should either be managed privately to meet one's needs or be a share from a production process of which one is an essential component. It should not be a wage in return for production."* We shall see later how Gaddafi's *"no wage-earners, but only partners"* economic system is viewed by Libyan non wage-earning *"partners"* and how the socialist principle public ownership of property applies in practice.

Part 111, The Social Basis of the Third International Theory

<http://www.mathaba.net/gci/theory/gb3.htm>

I have selected, for comment only two of the several subdivisions in this section - those on Women and Blacks.

The role of Women in Gaddafi's Green Book philosophy and the fate reserved for them in Gaddafi's Libya

The section on women which, like much of the rest of Gaddafi's socio-political philosophy of governance, reads like the meanderings of an intellectually-challenged adolescent mind. After a quite ludicrous discourse on how menstruation renders women different from men (*"women menstruate every month or so, while men, being male, do not menstruate or*

suffer during the monthly period"), Gadaffi expounds his philosophy. He fulminates against abortion: *"Deliberate interventions against conception form an alternative to human life. In addition to that, there exists partial deliberate intervention against conception, as well as against breast-feeding. All these are links in a chain of actions in contradiction to natural life, which is tantamount to murder. For a woman to kill herself in order not to conceive, deliver and breast-feed is within the realm of deliberate, artificial interventions, in contradiction with the nature of life epitomized by marriage, conception, breast-feeding, and maternity. They differ only in degree."*

Gadaffi's views women as the "weaker" sex, **who should stick to the role in life for which their nature has destined them - maternity, motherhood, marriage, beautification and femininity.** Only in so doing would women be able to live free, unconstrained lives:

"A woman, whose created nature has assigned to her a natural role different from that of man, must be in an appropriate position to perform her natural role.... Abandoning their role, or even a part of it, only occurs as a result of coercive conditions and under abnormal circumstances. The woman who rejects pregnancy, marriage, beautification and femininity for reasons of health abandons her natural role in life under these coercive conditions of ill health. The woman who rejects marriage, pregnancy or motherhood because of work abandons her natural role under similar coercive conditions. The woman who rejects marriage, pregnancy or maternity without any concrete cause abandons her natural role as a result of a coercive and morally deviant circumstances. Thus, abandoning the natural roles of female and male in life can only occur under unnatural conditions which are contrary to freedom and are a threat to survival."

If the woman is forced to abandon her natural role regarding conception and maternity, she falls victim to coercion and tyranny. A woman who needs work that renders her unable to perform her natural function is not free and is compelled to work by need, and *"in need, freedom is latent"*:

"In view of his different nature and in line with the laws of nature, the male has played the role of the strong and striving not by design, but simply because he is created that way. The female has played the role of the beautiful and the gentle involuntarily because she was created so. This natural rule is just, partly because it is natural, and partly because it is the basic rule for freedom."

The following are excerpts from an Amnesty International report, concerning the human rights situation of Libyan women (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya Amnesty International submission to the UN Universal Periodic Review, November-December, 2010)

http://lib.ohchr.org/HRBodies/UPR/Documents/Session9/LY/AI_AmnestyInternational.pdf

"Law No. 70 of 1973 (on the Establishment of the Had of Zina and the Amendment of several Articles of the Penal Code) prescribes 100 lashes as a punishment for those convicted of zina – defined in Libyan law as sexual relations between a man and a woman outside a lawful marriage."

Re Gender-based discrimination

"Provisions that discriminate against women remain in Libyan legislation, especially with regard to marriage, divorce and inheritance. For instance, polygamy is still permitted, under judicial supervision, although the practice is believed to be limited.

Women have the same rights as men regarding the right to acquire, change or retain their nationality."

"As mentioned above, **consensual sexual relations outside of wedlock are criminalized in Libya**. This prohibition seems to apply to same-sex partners. Paragraph 4 of **Article 407 of the Penal Code states that "Anyone who has sexual intercourse with another person with their consent shall be punished, as shall their partner, by up to five years' imprisonment."** Also, Paragraph 4 of Article 408 states that "Anyone who commits an indecent act on another person with their consent shall be punished, as shall their partner, by imprisonment."

Rape employed as collective punishment and as a weapon of terror and war

"Gaddafi forces accused of rape" ([Youtube](#))

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QXr74CgRPFM>

A heart-rending video in which a female Libyan Gynaecologist recounts having treated one family in Benghazi where Gaddafi's soldiers raped a mother and her three daughters in front of her husband/their father.

"Rape used 'as a weapon' in Libya" ([Youtube](#))

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ISLz8Fv0eik>

Doctors report having found Viagra tablets and condoms in the pockets of dead pro-Gaddafi fighters, alleging that they were using rape as a weapon of war. They say they have been treating female rape survivors who were allied with pro-democracy forces.

"Gaddafi forces accused of rape" ([youtube](#))

<http://english.aljazeera.net/video/africa/2011/05/20115381016787271.html>

Many women in Libya say they have been sexually assaulted by troops loyal to the Libyan leader. There has been escalating violence, especially sexual assaults, against women in Libya. The accusations are levelled at forces of the Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi. Some women say they were taken to the desert in groups. Others say they were raped in front of their families. Opposition fighters say they have found Viagra pills in tanks and cars captured from the Gaddafi forces.

"Gaddafi's Mass Rape and Drugs Charges" **African Dictator- Reminding theWorld**

http://www.africandictator.org/?p=2357&utm_source=rss&utm_medium=rss&utm_campaign=gaddafi%25e2%2580%2599s-mass-rape-and-drugs-charges

It started out as an outburst last month at the UN Security Council by US Ambassador Susan Rice, who asserted that Gaddafi's troops had been armed with Viagra and told to rape women as part of their attempts to regain control of strife-torn Libya. At the time, evidence was scanty- and based on the testimony of one or two people, and Rice drew criticism for the outlandish claims. Now it would appear that she's been vindicated. Stories of large shipments of drugs meant to enhance sexual performance were delivered to Libyan forces, and no less an authority than Luis Moreno-Ocampo, chief prosecutor of the International Criminal Court is considering adding the charge of mass rape to the list he already has against Gaddafi, Gaddafi's son and his spy chief.

"But now we are getting some information that Gaddafi himself decided" to

authorize the rapes, *“and this is new,”* Moreno-Ocampo said. ***“It never was the pattern he used to control the population. The rape is a new aspect of the repression,”*** he said. *“Apparently, he decided to punish using rapes.”* The prosecutor said it was difficult to know how widespread the rape was but he had received information there were several hundred victims in some areas. **Groups of women have since come forward to back up these allegations, saying that they were kidnapped by Libyan forces and gang raped, with the intention being to use the brutality to “send a message” to rebel forces.**

"Rape in Libya: The Crime That Dare Not Speak Its Name", 10 June

http://news.yahoo.com/s/time/20110610/wl_time/08599207677500

The female doctors at one of the larger hospitals here can tell you stories - of **corpses of violated women stripped and strewn on the streets of front-line Ajdabiya**; of the women afraid to leave their homes in Brega; of **the 13-year-old Misuratah girl gang-raped by soldiers who burst into the family's living room, forcing her father to watch. “She kept screaming,” one doctor says. “Just screaming and screaming, ‘Daddy, don't look!’** The medics don't deny that others in the hospital may have treated rape victims. But they say the stigma of sexual assault runs so deep in Libyan culture that the raped are virtually forced into social exile, unable to wed, a humiliation to their entire family, choosing to remain silent rather than to give voice to the crime they have suffered.

"Gaddafi's Mass Rape and Drugs Charges" **African Dictator- Reminding theWorld**

http://www.africandictator.org/?p=2357&utm_source=rss&utm_medium=rss&utm_campaign=gaddafi%25e2%2580%2599s-mass-rape-and-drugs-charges

It started out as an outburst last month at the UN Security Council by US Ambassador Susan Rice, who asserted that Gaddafi's troops had been armed with Viagra and told to rape women as part of their attempts to regain control of strife-torn Libya. At the time, evidence was scanty- and based on the testimony of one or two people, and Rice drew criticism for the outlandish claims. Now it would appear that she's been vindicated. Stories of large shipments of drugs meant to enhance sexual performance were delivered to Libyan forces, and no less an authority than Luis Moreno-Ocampo, chief prosecutor of the International Criminal Court is considering adding the charge of mass rape to the list he already has against Gaddafi, Gaddafi's son and his spy chief.

“But now we are getting some information that Gaddafi himself decided” to authorize the rapes, *“and this is new,”* Moreno-Ocampo said. ***“It never was the pattern he used to control the population. The rape is a new aspect of the repression,”*** he said. *“Apparently, he decided to punish using rapes.”* The prosecutor said it was difficult to know how widespread the rape was but he had received information there were several hundred victims in some areas. **Groups of women have since come forward to back up these allegations, saying that they were kidnapped by Libyan forces and gang raped, with the intention being to use the brutality to “send a message” to rebel forces.**

Disastrous effect of Gaddafi's aggression on children and women

"Libya intervention comes too late for some" (**youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gwMn-3lhCf0>

Too late for Mohammed, a seven-year old boy who lies in a Benghazi hospital bed struggling for life, a victim of Gaddafi's bombardment of the civilian population (and for his mother and father also).

"Children bear brunt of Libyan conflict" (Youtube)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o-eej7mwc1E>

With the conflict raging on in Libya, education is suffering, especially in the rebel-held areas. From schools to universities, everything is shut. Some students and teachers are on the frontline in the battle against government forces. Al Jazeera's Omar Al Saleh has more from Benghazi.

"Libyan kids maimed by war remnants"

<http://english.aljazeera.net/indepth/features/2011/06/20116674436348565.html>

On May 31, 2011, UNICEF Communication Specialist Rebecca Fordham boarded the relief boat carrying two boys injured from explosive remnants of the war in Libya. She also participated in workshops to raise awareness and protect children from these horrific weapons of war in the conflict-affected eastern Libya. This is her first-hand account.

"The displaced children of Libya" (Youtube)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ql2Pqvdh4Xc>

Amid the military battles and the diplomatic wrangling, there are the children of the displaced. The children may not grasp the geopolitics of the situation - but they do want to go home.

"Benghazi family victims of Libya conflict" (Youtube)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sCveKSBenSI>

A young boy suffered a bullet wound to the chest and lungs as he and his parents tried to escape Gaddafi's forces when they entered Benghazi last Saturday. His young brother was wounded in the leg and his father died in hospital a day later. His mother remains critically ill.

"Unseen mental scars of war descend upon Libyan community in the opposition east", 17 April, http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/unseen-mental-scars-of-war-descend-upon-libyan-community-in-the-opposition-east/2011/04/14/AFMCX0iD_story.html

Across the region, children are dealing with night terrors and bed-wetting, and others develop acute stress disorders. Thuraya is convinced she's a political leader and a mother. Neither is true: **Since the 24-year-old's home came under fire and forces loyal to Moammar Gaddafi overran her town, she is no longer aware that she isn't married, has no children and lives at home with her parents.** Doctors at the Benghazi psychiatric hospital, where she has been committed, say **she has detached herself from reality to deal with the fear and stress** caused by the fight between Gaddafi's forces and rebels that has torn Libya apart."

"Libyan women fleeing Ajdabiya describe ordeal" (Youtube)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rPGqfgszMHA>

Women from Ajdabiya (?) who succeeded in fleeing to testifying that Gaddafi's forces taking young children and old people to be used as human shields to protect tanks. Children, women and entire families were abducted by Gaddafi's soldiers and taken to an unknown destination.

"The women of Benghazi" (**Youtube**)

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7SaSjAzz_6E

With their husbands, sons and brothers at the frontlines, the women of Benghazi are busy supporting them with meals and supplies, preparing thousands of sandwiches and warm meals daily.

Gadaffi's opinion of Black People and the treatment they merit, as revealed in his Green Book philosophy and the actions of his régime

The enslavement of black Africans:

"The latest age of slavery has been the enslavement of Blacks by White people. The memory of this age will persist in the thinking of Black people until they have vindicated themselves. This tragic and historic event, the resulting bitter feeling, and the yearning or the vindication of a whole race, constitute a psychological motivation of Black people to vengeance and triumph that cannot be disregarded."

N.B Gadaffi conveniently "overlooked" the Arab enslavement of black Africans, which began in the 10th century and continued, in some Arab countries, well into the 20th century. The Arabs were also major slave traders. According to a leading African historian some around 17 million Africans were "slave traded." Significantly, one of the three main Trans-Saharan slave routes ended in Gadaffi's country, Libya: **"as late as 1910 slave caravans were still arriving in Benghazi from Wadai (in Chad)."**

<http://allafrica.com/stories/201103211518.html>

Gadaffi's take on the reason why black peoples are "very backward"

"Black people are now in a very backward social situation, but such backwardness works to bring about their numerical superiority because their low standard of living has shielded them from methods of birth control and family planning. Also, their old social traditions place no limit on marriages, leading to their accelerated growth. The population of other races has decreased because of birth control, restrictions on marriage, and constant occupation in work, unlike the Blacks, who tend to be less obsessive about work in a climate which is continuously hot."

N.B Gadaffi managed to squeeze into that one paragraph (above), the three principal narratives of European racist ideology - their inherent backwardness of black people; their gargantuan sexual appetite and unrestrained sexual indulgence; and their innate laziness - every one of which he has factored into his philosophy and world view, with very predictable consequences both for black Libyans and African migrants. One need look no further for the reasons for Gadaffi's harsh, cruel treatment of African migrants. Montesquieu, the 18th-century French philosopher, was responsible for the European racist narrative that the "backwardness" of African and other non-European peoples was due to the torpor of the tropical climate in which they lived. In his book, *De L'Esprit des Lois*, ("The Spirit of Laws") Montesquieu declared that a tropical climate was so enervating that inhabitants of tropical countries display "no curiosity, no enterprising spirit, no generous sentiment." (Vol.1).

Re Gadaffi's remark about the "continuously hot" climate of Sub-Saharan Africa which has made Africans work-shy, it is worth pointing out that temperatures in Libya are much higher than those in Sub-Saharan Africa, as the following two documents show:

*"Libya consists almost entirely of hot, arid desert. Due to its lack of natural barriers, Libya's climate is greatly influenced by the desert to the south and the Mediterranean Sea to the north.....A scorching wind called the "ghibli"(a hot, very dry, sand laden wind) can raise the temperatures in a matter of hours to between 40 °C and 50 °C. **The hottest recorded temperature ever on earth was in Libya on September 13, 1922, which was 58 °C [136° Fahrenheit].**"* (Hottest Temperature on Earth, The Physics Factbook)
<http://hypertextbook.com/facts/2000/MichaelLevin.shtml>

"Sub-Saharan Africa experiences several different climate regimes. The most common are the tropical wet and dry, tropical wet, and tropical dry. Many areas of the continent are subject to recurring droughts." (Earth Observatory, NASA)
http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Experiments/PlanetEarthScience/GlobalWarming/GW_InfoCenter_Africa.php

Anti-black racism in Libya

"Migrants forced to fight for Gaddafi", 9 april, 2011

<http://english.aljazeera.net/indepth/features/2011/04/20114818291705627.html>

"Among the reports of atrocities occurring in Libya are claims from African migrants that they were abducted and forced to fight with Gaddafi's forces. Nearly all migrants from sub-Saharan Africa, who arrive at the desert refugee camp in Tunisia, have fled in fear of violent reprisals by Libyans who accuse them of being mercenaries. The extent to which Gaddafi's military has used foreign mercenaries, or press-ganged migrants into fighting, remains unclear."

"A former Nigerian police officer, who had worked in Libya for eight years as a technician, alleges he was abducted in mid-March at a military checkpoint in Tripoli, along with other men from Ghana, Mali and Niger, before being taken to a military centre. *"There was up to 100 people in the courtyard and military trucks were arriving and leaving with more people. They started beating people, I saw them shoot one Ghanaian in front of me. The atmosphere was very intimidating,"* he explained. *"They put us into a vehicle and we were driven into the desert. I saw an oil refinery, there was evidence of bomb strikes, burnt out vehicles and a strong smell. I think it was Ras Lanouf."*

A Ghanaian worker claimed to have been abducted by Libyan military when they stormed his house in Sirte. *"They asked us why we were trying to leave the country and that we must stay to fight for when the Americans come,"* he explained. *"We were taken to a police station and then to an underground hospital which they ordered us to clean."*

"Migrant workers flee Libya" (**youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WyQZ5EIJl6o>

Thousands of migrant workers from Egypt and sub-Saharan Africa are leaving Libya by bus, boat or plane to escape the deadly crackdown by Muammar Gaddafi's troops. At least 180,000 people have fled the country, and thousands more - especially from the Indian sub-continent - are still waiting.

Black Libyans

http://www.photius.com/countries/libya/society/libya_society_black_africans.html

"In Libya as a whole, dark-skinned people are looked down upon, the degree of discrimination increasing with the darkness of the skin."

"Achdam, Arabized Blacks of Libya"

<http://www.ethiopianreview.com/forum/viewtopic.php?f=2&t=26045>

"The Arabized Blacks of Libya (like those in other Middle Eastern countries) are called **Achdam**. In Libya, their present number is estimated to be circa 120,000 The Arabized Black live mostly in the southern provinces of Fazzan, a series of oases in the southwestern desert of Libya.

Akhdam women tell their stories of violence, injustice & poverty in Yemen

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-3MqjbkwVEI>

This a very revealing Youtube video which, though it graphically depicts Arab racism against the black female Yemenis, accurately reflects the very low social status of black Libyans and the racist discrimination, violence, and humiliation that is their daily lot.

Black Africans Caught in Libyan Arab Racism <http://www.mathaba.net/news/?x=626137>

"In Libya, it has never been the slogans of The Green Book any reality for the Africans, who read The Green Book before arriving in Libya and hoped to find a People's Paradise and learn from it. On arriving, even at The Green Book Centre, they are abused and turned away without even being given a copy of the book.... Clearly nothing has changed, and all around Tripoli for many years, non-Libyan Africans have continued to be exploited."

Uprising Revives Entrenched Racism Towards Black Africans

<http://allafrica.com/stories/201103211518.html>

"in Libya discrimination is common not only against migrant Black Africans, but also against darker-skinned Libyans, especially from the south of the country."

Black Africans in Libya live in fear (Youtube)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YNA8z5G-Xmk&feature=relmfu>

"Black Africans Caught in Libyan Arab Racism"

<http://www.mathaba.net/news/?x=626137>

The reality behind Gaddafi's vaunted benevolent assistance to Black Africa

"Why do Libyans want Gaddafi gone?" <http://www.libyafeb17.com/2011/02/why-do-you-libyans-want-gaddafi-gone-here-are-some-reasons/>

"Gaddafi waged pointless wars in Chad and Uganda where over 20,000 Libyans died. In addition, Gaddafi supplied chemical weapons to the late Somalian dictator Ziad Berri which caused thousands of deaths."

"Gadaffi's Systematic destabilization of Black Africa", 5 March 2011

<http://www.metro.co.uk/news/858166-revealed-colonel-gaddafis-school-for-scoundrels>

"Colonel Muammar Gaddafi is infamous for abuses he has inflicted on his own people but less well known is a campaign of carnage he inspired across Africa..." Flush with oil money, Gaddafi orchestrated a training campaign for students who became brutal warlords in Africa, a legacy which leaves the region unstable today..."

Gadaffi's personality and psychological make-up

Defiant Kadhafi orders uprising crushed (Jakarta Globe, 24 February 2011, with photo of Qaddafi reading from the Green Book on Libyan national TV

<http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/afp/defiant-kadhafi-orders-uprising-crushed/424386>

"A Quote from "Gadaffi's Demented Green Book"

<http://www.rebelnews.org/opinion/africa/682460-a-quote-from-gadaffis-demented-green-book>

The following is an excerpt from a very scathing opinion of Gadaffi's Green Book, expressed by a female Arab translator (nationality undisclosed) of the book.

*"I read and I translated Gadaffi's words below. I can only say that these are the words of a psychopath, and that his constitution and theories are worth less than the ink used to write them. I understand neither how this crazy person could lead Libya for decades, and how the Libyans accepted his green book as a constitution of their state, but I understand very well how and why the USA and other western countries supported Gadaffi and his criminality during the past 42 years. I am only astonished that the filthy collusion between the west and all the **pathocracies** in all Arab countries has taken so long to come out."*

"Is Gaddafi insane?" <http://www.abc.net.au/news/video/2011/03/02/3152582.htm>

This Youtube video interview provides a psychiatrist's assessment of Gadaffi's personality and mental state, as reflected in the Libyan leader's bizarre, erratic behaviour and public statements.

"What's In Gadhafi's Manifesto?", 3 March, 2011

<http://www.npr.org/2011/03/03/134239733/Whats-In-Gadhafis-Manifesto>

An American professor of government, author of A History of Modern Libya, who has lived in Libya appears to have arrived at a similar conclusion to those expressed above by the female Arab translator and the psychiatrist.

"Embattled but defiant". Inside Story, Aljazeera (**Youtube**)

<http://english.aljazeera.net/programmes/insidestory/2011/02/201122411472882736.html>

The Youtube contains an in-depth discussion of Gadaffi and his mental state, as revealed by his actions and public statements. One of the participants in the discussion is a former member of Gaddafi's inner circle, who had defected only the day before.

"Kadhafi lashes out", 11 March, *Magharebia*, a North African Arab website.

http://www.magharebia.com/cocoon/awi/xhtml1/en_GB/features/awi/features/2011/03/10/feature-01

*"Libyan forces launched renewed attacks on opposition forces in the strategic town of Ras Lanuf on Wednesday (March 9th) as Libyan leader Moamer Kadhafi addressed the nation, again blaming foreign forces for the violence. In a televised speech addressed to the youth of Zintan, **Kadhafi said the bloodshed was the result of a plot "to colonise Libya, humiliate the Libyan people and control their oil"**. Kadhafi also called on western countries to help Libya against what he claimed was an "al-Qaeda organisation in the country".*

N.B. One finds here, the two principal themes of Gaddafi's standard narrative - Libya's strategic petroleum riches (so beloved by the "single story" conspiracy theorists) and the al-Qaeda terrorism threat.

What Libyans really think of Gaddafi's Green Book and on being governed according to its precepts

"Libya and the U.S.: Qadhafi Unrepentant" (Mohamed Eljahmi, Middle East Quarterly, Winter 2006, <http://www.meforum.org/878/libya-and-the-us-qadhafi-unrepentant>)
Mohamed Eljahmi, an exiled Libyan, is very critical of Gaddafi's Green Book: *"He claimed that his rule was a "third international theory," an alternative to both communism and democracy.....He consolidated his governing philosophy into The Green Book." "In practice, his theory devastated civil society and destroyed both separation of powers and constitutionalism."*

"Gaddafi uses the second part of his Green Book to justify the confiscation of private businesses, nationalization of private property, and cap on the income of Libyan families. Libyan society, once tolerant, grew less so. In the third part Gaddafi undercuts the position of the "feebler sex" and berates black Africans whom he calls a lazy race liable to multiply without limit."

"Why do you Libyans want Gaddafi gone?" <http://www.libyafeb17.com/2011/02/why-do-you-libyans-want-gaddafi-gone-here-are-some-reasons/>
*"Libyan students were hanged in universities, sport auditoriums and public squares **simply for not adhering to the green book ideology."***

*"Battle for Libya: Uprising in Nalut" (youtube)
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NtqOV7i8ak8>
*"All the songs have to be about Gaddafi; all our reading has to be the Green Book"**

"East Libyans burn Gaddafi book, demand constitution", 2 March 2011)
<http://af.reuters.com/article/libyaNews/idAFLDE72127720110302?pageNumber=2&virtualBrandChannel=0&sp=true>

Several hundred protesters burned copies of Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi's "Green Book" in the eastern city of Benghazi on Wednesday, an act of contempt unthinkable just three weeks ago....Protesters chanted, waved signs and danced as they tossed copies of the book, which outlines the ideas behind Gaddafi's "Third Universal Theory," onto a large fire, sending thick plumes of smoke and ash into the air. *"We hate this book because it is useless,"* said Moataz Hadad, 25, a medical intern. He added that, like all Libyan students, he was forced to study the book but ridiculed its content.

"Destroying Gaddafi's Green Book in Misrata" Libya 22.02.11 (Youtube)
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YksUY_3isks&feature=related
Anti-government demonstrators smashing a monument of Libyan leader Moamer Kadhafi's Green book in Tobruk, near the border with Egypt

"Libya's deadly 'day of rage' ", 18 february, (Youtube)
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UJUUtKHofSM>

"GHADAFI GREEN BOOK IGNORED" (Youtube)
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4wYNIA9ziIA>

LIBYA Nefusa Revolution □ City of Nalut Green Book Down / □□□□□ (Youtube)
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MVzL1Di5qtA>

"Hundreds of Libyans torch Kadhafi's 'Green Book" (Al-Hdhod article, 28 April)
http://en.hdhod.com/Hundreds-of-Libyans-torch-Kadhafi-s-Green-Book_a6067.html
BENGHAZI- Hundreds of angry Libyans set fire to copies of Moamer Kadhafi's "Green Book" on Canada, demanding the ruler's overthrow on the anniversary of his declaration of a *"republic of the masses."* Waving Libyan flags and chanting slogans calling for Kadhafi's departure, angry young men and veiled women torched hundreds of copies of the political treatise in the eastern city of Benghazi, controlled by regime dissidents...They threw pictures of the Libyan leader onto the smouldering ash and carried placards saying *"No for extremism," "Yes for the freedom of the press" and "Yes for the constitution" as women ululated on the sidelines"*

The Insurgent leaders, their goals, programme and legitimacy of their government
On 5 March, 2011, a couple of days after its establishment, the National Transitional Council issued the Founding Statement of the Interim Transitional National Council (TNC
<http://ntclibya.org/english/founding-statement-of-the-interim-transitional-national-council/>
The final paragraph set out the NTC's goals and demands, in very clear terms: *"Finally, even though the balance of power is uneven between the defenceless protestors and the tyrant regime's mercenaries and private battalions, we will rely on the will of our people for a free and dignified existence. Furthermore, we request from the international community to fulfil its obligations to protect the Libyan people from any further genocide and crimes against humanity without any direct military intervention on Libya soil."*

N.B Compare the above clear-cut demand for external assistance from with Noam Chomsky's claim (in his interview on BBC Newsnight Programme) that, because of the history of Western action in the region and the great resentment felt by Arab peoples for Western support of Arab dictatorial régimes, the Libyans do not want Western intervention - they simply want the West to leave them alone!

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/newspoint/9418922.stm>

(Chomsky's interview with Noam Chomsky)

"Libya leaders recognise opposition government" (Youtube)
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0874KmOUMiM>

Delegates from 25 Libyan councils have declared their support for the Transitional National Council, Libya's opposition party. The leaders who were elected under Muammar Gaddafi's rule have been meeting in the United Arab Emirates, marking the first time delegates from the western and southern regions including tribal figures have met to discuss Libya's future.

"Religious controls lifted in Benghazi", 19 May 2011 (Youtube)
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uAzT1s62AFs>

In the rebel-held eastern city of Benghazi the opposition's version of governance

is in full swing. Al Jazeera's Tony Birtley reports on the city where reforms are already being put into action. Gaddafi closely exercised control of religion observance, including Islam, which he regarded as a possible rival to his absolute control in Libya. He reportedly even bombed mosques in its exercise of such control.

The Gaddafi régime's Human Rights violations

"Libya: Uncovering Cruelty Of Former Regime" (youtube)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J3OrjniSWFw&feature=relmfu>

"Massacre In Zawiyah" (youtube)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aSzZCZf2HxU&feature=related>

"Evidence of Libya torture emerges" (youtube)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EQ0KQABYXgE&feature=relmfu>

"Civilians Murdered by Gaddafi Dead in Mass Graves" (youtube)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Rnx4OyUz3EY&feature=related>

"Video Shows Libya Army Executions" (youtube)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R1kx2KdVoQ&feature=related>

"Libya civil war and massacre in Tripoli and Benghazi" (youtube)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OXIbff9HZFQ&feature=related>

"Fierce Gun Fight in the streets of Benghazi in Libya" (youtube)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hyMY8yjlzMc&NR=1>

Graphic video shows the brutality of the Libyan regime (youtube)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Gbdcsr6L374&feature=related>

"Praying Libyans being Shot at by Gaddafi's Forces" (youtube)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zUVMY3Ws68E&feature=related>

"Gaddafi bombing his own people in the Arrajmah area of Benghazi" (youtube)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QcNn2XwxU2k&feature=related>

"Gaddafi's Tank Crushes Car with People Inside" (youtube)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FZgLT8ZaCyl&feature=related>

"Civilians tortured, dozens executed under Gaddafi rule"

<http://www.omantribune.com/index.php?page=news&id=85585&heading=Middle%20East>

"Students' demonstrations were put down violently. **Political opponents were arrested and imprisoned, or simply disappeared.** Police and security forces rounded up academics, lawyers, students, journalists, Trotskyists, communists, members of the Muslim Brotherhood and others considered "*enemies of the revolution*", Human Rights Watch says. **Gaddafi warned anyone who tried to organise politically they would face repression.**

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya Amnesty International submission to the UN Universal Periodic Review , November-December, 2010

http://lib.ohchr.org/HRBodies/UPR/Documents/Session9/LY/AI_AmnestyInternational.pdf

Excerpts:

"The legacy of grave human rights violations that took place particularly in the 1980s and 1990s continues to cast a shadow over Libya's human rights record. **Such violations included arbitrary detention; torture or other ill-treatment; enforced disappearances; extrajudicial executions; and deaths in custody as a result of torture or other abuses.** The Libyan authorities have failed to adequately address the killings of up to 1,200 prisoners in June 1996 in Abu Salim Prison. Most killings took place the day after a riot took place sparked by appalling prison conditions and the denial of medical treatment and family visits. **Official recognition that any disturbances took place came only eight years later, when Libyan leader Mu'ammr al-Gaddafi acknowledged to an Amnesty International delegation in February 2004 that killings did take place.**"

"**To date, no full, independent, impartial investigation has been conducted into the events, and no perpetrators have been brought to justice.** In September 2009, the authorities announced that a committee had been established to investigate the incident; but no public details on its mandate or the outcome of its investigation have been made available. **In 2008 and 2009, some 12 years after the incident, the Libyan authorities started informing a large number of families that their relatives had been killed in Abu Salim Prison, offering them financial compensation on condition that they renounce their rights to seek a judicial remedy.** The Libyan government also provided family death certificates which failed to list the cause of death."

"**The Libyan authorities have also failed to adequately investigate unresolved cases of enforced disappearances and physical liquidation of political dissidents in Libya and abroad believed to have been carried out by agents of the state in past decades.**"

The following excerpts are from an article in the Oman Tribune:

<http://www.omantribune.com/index.php?page=news&id=85585&heading=Middle%20East>

"According to information available to Amnesty International, in recent years, **courts have continued to sentence people to corporal punishments including amputation of the right hand and flogging.**" "According to Amnesty International, which had visited the country in 1988, the government instituted *"mass arbitrary arrest and detention, 'disappearances,' torture, and the death penalty."* "In what critics call probably the **bloodiest act of internal repression, more than 1,000 prisoners were shot dead by security forces on June 28 and 29, 1996 in Abu Salim prison**" according to Human Rights Watch (http://www.hrw.org/legacy/english/docs/2006/06/28/libya13636_txt.htm) which had visited the country in 1988, the government instituted *"mass arbitrary arrest and detention, 'disappearances,' torture, and the death penalty."*

"For years Libyan officials denied that the killings at Abu Salim had ever taken place. **The first public acknowledgement was in April 2004 when Gaddafi said killings had taken place there, and that prisoners' families had the**

right to know what took place. To date there has been no official account of the events at Abu Salim prison."

"Qadhafi's death squads terrorize the population." (Mohamed Eljahmi, Libya and the U.S.: Qadhafi Unrepentant, Middle East Quarterly, Winter 2006). <http://www.meforum.org/878/libya-and-the-us-qadhafi-unrepentant>

"Moammar Gadhafi: A tyrant by any definition", 27 April, 2011
http://www.casperjournal.com/news/opinion/my_turn/article_73d16b76-89db-579f-a4f1-2ec94e8758ce.html

The Deputy Secretary-General of the National Front for Salvation of Libya Mohammed al-Abdalla: *"Gadhafi, gradually, as he took power, used force and he used brutality."* He explained saying that Libyan students in the 1970s, who marched, demonstrated and demanded rights in Benghazi and Tripoli and other places **were publicly hung.....He executed, in probably the most brutal massacre that we saw, 1,200 prisoners in the Abu Salim prison who were unarmed. They were already in jail; he executed them in less than three hours."**

The Gaddafi régime's systematic use of torture

"Gaddafi forces intimidate rebels" (Youtube)
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s6o7c-Ev8n4>

Video appears to **show soldiers loyal to Muammar Gaddafi beating pro-democracy fighters who they had detained.**

"**Libya Striking hard against protests**", 22 February 2011,
http://www.ejc.net/magazine/article/libya_striking_hard_against_protests_eu_demands_end_of_violence/

Gaddafi's son, **Saif al-Islam Gaddafi**, made an appearance Sunday evening on national television and menaced the protesters, announcing the army would enforce security at any price. He called the uprising a separatist movement that threatens the integrity of the country and **defended the shooting of protesters**, whom, he claimed, were acting under the influence of drugs and attacking Libyan security forces. He also added that the number of fatalities provided by non-governmental human right watches are imaginary. Finally, Saif announced that the army maintains its in control of the the country.

"Ajdabiya: Survivors speak of extreme atrocities"(Youtube)
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c9R5_7n8umk

"Evidence of Libya torture emerges" (Youtube)
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EQ0KQABYXgE>

As opposition groups in Libya take over areas outside of the capital, state prisons and military buildings are being searched. In Benghazi, **the opposition says they have unearthed equipment used by the government to torture dissidents, while more and more allegations of cruelty towards political prisoners are emerging.**

"Gaddafi forces accused of torture" (Youtube)
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U3KvoByWyO8>

Libyan anti-government soldiers are reportedly being tortured and executed in an underground prison in Gaddafi's hometown of Sirte, according to one prisoner who since escaped.

"Civilians tortured, dozens executed under Gaddafi rule"

<http://www.omantribune.com/index.php?page=news&id=85585&heading=Middle%20East>

An article published in the Oman Tribune, an Arab Gulf state newspaper, provides some examples of Gaddafi's serial human rights violations (abuse, torture and killings) since he seized power in 1969

Gaddafi's Targeted Assassinations of dissidents and opponents

Referring to exiles, in a 1982 public address, Gaddafi declared: *"It is the Libyan people's responsibility to liquidate such scums who are distorting Libya's image abroad."* Gaddafi asserted in June 1984 that killings could be carried out even when the dissidents were on pilgrimage in the holy city of Mecca. ("Qaddafi, terrorism, origins of the U.S. attack on Libya", Brian Lee Davis, 1990)

"Gaddafi employed his network of diplomats and recruits to assassinate dozens of critics around the world. Amnesty International listed at least 25 assassinations between 1980 and 1987" (The Middle East and North Africa 2003 (2002).

(Gaddafi still hunts 'stray dogs' in UK, The Observer, 28 March 2004)

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2004/mar/28/politics.libya>

Excerpts:

"Libyan dictator Colonel Muammar Gaddafi is continuing to target political exiles in Britain - the so-called 'stray dogs' of his brutal regime - and has refused to remove a million-dollar bounty on the head of his most prominent opponent in this country.

Libyan dissidents living in Britain have condemned the 'indecent haste' with which Tony Blair flew to meet their country's leader last week without first insisting on democratic reform and the lifting of restrictions on legitimate political opposition to the dictator.

Ashur Shamis, a journalist who has lived in Britain since the 1960s, has been named by the Libyan Ministry of Justice and Public Security as one of the country's six most wanted men. His picture and colourful details of his alleged crimes have been posted on the ministry's website with **a reward of a million dollars 'to anyone who assists in apprehending him and handing him over to trial before the Libyan courts to be tried for the crimes he has committed'.**

Last week the Libya Human and Political Development Forum sent a letter to Blair saying it was understandable that the Prime Minister would wish to reward Gaddafi for complying with demands to scrap his programmes to develop nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. But the dissidents launched a powerful attack on the decision to visit Gaddafi without first demanding serious human rights reform.

The letter (from the **Libya Human and Political Development Forum**), which was received by Downing Street before the Prime Minister left for Tripoli, states: **"Many victims of Gaddafi's repressive and blatantly terrorist policies and crimes will view such indecent haste to reconcile with vile dictators with a great deal of justifiable cynicism. These victims include thousands of Libyan and non-Libyan mothers,**

sons, daughters and wives whose relatives were killed in cold blood, imprisoned, or disappeared without trace."

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya Amnesty International submission to the UN Universal Periodic Review , November-December, 2010

http://lib.ohchr.org/HRBodies/UPR/Documents/Session9/LY/AI_AmnestyInternational.pdf

"The Libyan authorities have also failed to adequately investigate unresolved cases of enforced disappearances and **physical liquidation of political dissidents in Libya and abroad believed to have been carried out by agents of the state in past decades.**"

"Libya and the U.S.: Qadhafi Unrepentant", Mohamed Eljahmi, Middle East Quarterly, Winter 2006). <http://www.meforum.org/878/libya-and-the-us-qadhafi-unrepentant>

Excerpts:

"Since 1980, when he ordered the liquidation of dissidents—"stray dogs"—at home and abroad, Libyan agents have killed political dissidents, both real and perceived. In December 1993, Libyan agents kidnapped former Libyan foreign minister and dissident Mansur Kikhia, one month before he was to receive U.S. citizenship. Abdel Salam Jalloud, Qadhafi's former second-in-command, justified the assassination of dissidents, saying, *"Many people who fled abroad took with them goods belonging to the Libyan people ... Now they are putting their illicit gains at the disposal of the opposition led by Sadat, world imperialism, and Israel."*

"Libyans in the United States have not been immune to Qadhafi's rampage. In 1980, while the Libyan government still maintained an embassy in Washington, a Libyan agent attempted to assassinate dissident Faisal Zagallai, a doctoral student at the University of Colorado, Boulder. The bullets left Zagallai partially blinded." (**New York Times**, Aug. 20, 1981).

The "missing" and "Disappeared" in Gaddafi's Régime

"Families wait for Missing" 24 May (**Youtube**)

<http://edition.cnn.com/video/#/video/world/2011/05/24/wedeman.libya.misrata.take.n.cnn?iref=allsearch>

Ben Wedeman reports on the families of Misrata's missing, whose number now surpasses 1,000 - husbands and fathers "disappeared" (abducted) by Gaddafi's soldiers.

"More than 1,000 Libyans missing from Misurata", 5 June

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle-east/more-than-1000-libyans-missing-from-misurata/2011/05/30/AGmuw2IH_story.html

Rebel forces cleared Misurata of the last of Moammar Gaddafi's army last month, but the full extent of the onslaught is just becoming clear. As well as the dead and the damage, there are the hundreds of disappeared. At an office set up to investigate these cases, men milled about offering family members forms to list the names and details of those who disappeared. **On May 30, a total of 1,174 people had been registered as missing.**

Baaya Issa, 90, described how **his four sons, six grandsons and a cousin disappeared when they returned to collect possessions from their home** after the rest of the family fled to a safer area of the city. Soon after the men arrived at the house, Gaddafi's troops entered the area. Days later, **Issa heard from a neighbor who had witnessed Gaddafi's troops raid homes nearby.... Others witnessed their relatives being taken hostage.**

Her head wrapped in a black flowered scarf, **Aisha Ramadan wept as she described the day that troops stormed her modest home, taking her four adult sons and her daughter's husband. Ramadan said she pleaded with the soldiers not to take her youngest son, Mohammed, 17. 'Take everybody, but leave me Mohammed. He is too young,' she told them. "But they didn't answer me. They just took my sons and left."**

Gadaffi's use of mercenaries

Libyan Pilot: Eyewitness to Gaddafi's African Mercenaries. Feb. 2011 (**Youtube**)
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TXCXHuZBTZw&feature=related>

A Libyan pilot, interviewed by an Aljazeera reporter, **confirmed reports that Gaddafi has recruited armed forces from unidentified African countries to crush the uprising.** (An English transcription of the interview appears below the video)

Is Gaddafi turning to foreign mercenaries? 28 April, 2011

<http://www.trust.org/alertnet/news/is-libyas-gaddafi-turning-to-foreign-mercenaries/>

The head of the working group on mercenaries for the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights said evidence of the use of mercenaries was growing increasingly convincing.

Citing reports from Libyan exile groups, the Paris-based International Federation for Human Rights said it believed Gaddafi was relying on up to 6,000 foreign fighters to cling to power, 3,000 of them based in the capital Tripoli. The IFHR said foreign fighters came from many countries including Chad, Mali, Nigeria and Zimbabwe as well as Liberians who had fought for Charles Taylor, the former president now on trial for war crimes in neighbouring Sierra Leone. Sudan's government said Darfur rebels long hosted by Gaddafi were also involved, a charge the rebels denied."

"When Libya, but no longer Gadhafi, diplomat Ibrahim Dabbashi came out to take questions, Inner City Press asked him which countries the mercenaries used by Gadhafi come from. He mentioned Algeria, Tunisia and Ethiopia -- highlighted by NGOs as non ICC members -- as well as Chad, Niger, Kenya and Guinea. So some mercenaries could be prosecuted by the ICC, and not others, under language demanded by the US Mission to the UN. Watch this site." <http://www.innercitypress.com/usun1merc022611.html>

Insurgents accused of human rights violations

"Libya rebels urged to stop arbitrary arrests", 7 June (**youtube**)
<http://english.aljazeera.net/video/africa/2011/06/201167105014256286.html>

Human Rights Watch has urged Libya's rebel Transitional National Council to stop arbitrary detentions of civilians, who they suspect of supporting Muammar Gaddafi.

The group says at least one prisoner has died after being tortured

Gadaffi's indiscriminate bombardment of the civilian insurgent population

"Bombs fall on Libya's Ras Lanuf" (**youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VgzIkUC7ZG0>

As battles rage across Libya, dozens of people have been killed after Colonel Gaddafi's forces launched a fresh wave of air strikes on rebel groups. "Airstrikes in Brega, Libya"

"Libyan aircraft bomb Ras Lanuf" (**youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SFeu8jhUWOA>

Libyan military aircraft piloted by officers loyal to Muammar Gaddafi, the embattled leader of the country, have bombed targets in the rebel-held oil town of Ras Lanuf. The attacks are the latest in a series of counter-offensives by Gaddafi's military against anti-government forces, which also include members of the military who refuse to recognise Gaddafi's authority

"Airstrikes in Brega" (**youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hVCQnteO12s>

As Libyan air force pilots still loyal to Gaddafi **drop bombs on the oil-rich town of Brega** in the north of the country, armed Gaddafi opponents encircle his loyalists in the center of the town. Al Jazeera's Tony Birtley describes the situation from just outside the town in the north-east of the country.

"Heavy shelling of Misurata continues" (**youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eFVsKLE-400>

"Qatar airlifts seriously injured Libyans" (qatar's participation)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-ef6C4kjpwo>

Some of those injured during the fighting in Libya are being airlifted out of the country for urgent medical treatment. The first of the emergency humanitarian flights landed in the Qatari capital on Saturday. Al Jazeera's Alan Fisher reports from the capital, Doha. (03 April 2011)

"Frustration mounts in Ajdabiya" (**youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NCQP1x7s-CA>

NATO has been bombing pro-Gaddafi forces on an almost daily basis but they've been unable to stop the shelling of rebel-held centres in east and west Libya.

"Fight continues for western Libyan port" (**Youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YR2cqGFw9sE>

The devastation caused by Gadaffi's army's long-range artillery indiscriminately bombing the civilian population. The city's inhabitants are calling for more action from NATO, not less.

"Funerals held in Libya's Ajdabiya" (**youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sl34jEICYgl>

Mourners have been paying their respects to the opposition fighters who died in air raids on the Libyan towns of Brega and Ajdabiya. Six men were killed when Muammar Gaddafi's forces attacked Ajdabiya.

The siege of insurgent cities by Gaddafi's army

"Gaddafi loyalists besiege Zawiyah; civilian casualties reported", 8 March, 2011

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/03/07/AR2011030701703.html>

Rebel officials in Zawiyah, 27 miles west of Tripoli, said **dozens of people have been killed and hundreds wounded, including women and children**. On Monday, eyewitnesses said loyalist troops backed by 40 tanks rolled into the city. After seven hours of lethal urban warfare, rebels said they managed to repulse the assault, although at a heavy cost in lives. On Tuesday, they said **the city, suffering from severe shortages of medicines and food, was coming under heavy mortar fire**. "They are not yet rolling in with tanks like yesterday, **but they are shelling us from a distance of three to four kilometers**," said Mohamed Magid, an opposition spokesman in Zawiyah. Electricity, telephone and Internet service in the city have been cut, he said. **"They are hitting civilian buildings; there are civilian casualties**," Magid said, sounding desperate as he spoke on a satellite phone. **"We need help"**.

"Foreign medics face siege in Libya's Nalut" (**youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RZ4I9Lrjt0U>

Communities in the western Nafusa Mountain range of Libya are under siege by Muammar Gaddafi's forces. The town of Nalut was reportedly bombarded with grad rockets on Thursday. A team of medical professionals from all over the world had the chance to leave before the siege, but they chose to stay. In solidarity with the Libyan people, they are treating both civilians and soldiers.

"Misurata civilians under siege" (**Youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qNxUIEWR8mY>

Snipers on roof tops in Misrata. **A doctor's témoignage** and a report of a 12-year old girl wounded in the back by one of Gaddafi's snipers.

"Misurata stays resolute despite suffering", 31 May (**youtube**)

<http://english.aljazeera.net/video/africa/2011/05/201153135512856764.html>

Stoic residents insist Muammar Gaddafi must go despite enduring months of siege. Residents in Libya's Misurata endure as months of unending siege continue to take its toll on the population, but the people remain unmoved in their resolve to see Muammar Gaddafi go.

"Battle scars rebel-held Misurata", 23 May, 2011 (**Youtube**)

<http://english.aljazeera.net/video/africa/2011/05/201152352512810173.html>

Signs of deadly battle for Libyan rebel holdout are everywhere, from scarred buildings to roadside rockets. From Grad rockets to heavy machine guns, troops loyal to Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi unleashed a massive assault on Misurata, the country's third-largest city and the most significant rebel holdout in the west.

"Towns in Libya's west running out of food", 1 June (**Youtube**)

<http://english.aljazeera.net/video/africa/2011/06/201161715150157.html>

"Cruise ship of hope sails for Misurata"; 28 May

<http://english.aljazeera.net/indepth/features/2011/05/2011528144520326964.html>

A commercial ferry carries residents, medical supplies and food to the besieged Libyan city.

Aid ship dodges shells to evacuate civilians from Libya's besieged Misurata, Thursday May 5, 2011, http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle-east/aid-ship-dodges-shells-to-evacuate-civilians-from-libyas-besieged-misurata/2011/05/04/AFMGgpqF_story.html

"An aid ship dodged Libyan government rockets and shells as it evacuated hundreds of migrant workers and wounded civilians from the besieged port city of Misurata on Canada, but **it was forced to leave behind hundreds of others who were desperate to leave.**

The Red Star 1, operated by the International Organization for Migration, finally docked to deliver humanitarian assistance and evacuate civilians, **after waiting since Canada because of shelling and mines that were laid in the harbor by forces loyal to Libyan leader Moammar Gaddafi.**

"Sealift Extends Lifeline to a Rebel City in Libya", 22 May 2011

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/23/world/africa/23smuggling.html?_r=1&hpw

"There have been many reasons for the rebels' success in Misurata, where they recently drove the Qaddafi forces out of the city and seized the One of them is this: a determined and surreptitious sealift by a small fleet of Libyan boats. As long as Misurata's armed men held on to their city, the nation's third largest, the Qaddafi government could never credibly say that the war was a contest between east and west, and propose that the country, divided by history and tribal allegiances, be split.

International reactions to Gaddafi's human rights violations

U.N. Security Council Resolution 1970 (26 February 2011)

[http://daccess-dds-](http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/245/58/PDF/N1124558.pdf?OpenElement)

[ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/245/58/PDF/N1124558.pdf?OpenElement](http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/245/58/PDF/N1124558.pdf?OpenElement)

Security Council Resolution **unanimously** adopted Resolution 1970 o condemning Gaddafi's régime for its gross human rights violations referred the régime to the ICC for investigation on charges of having committed crimes against humanity, imposed a travel ban on Gaddafi, the members his family and certain designated senior government officials, and a freeze on their external assets. Annex 1 and Annex 11 of th Resolution contain the names of Libyans who are banned from travel abroad and whose external financial assets are frozen

U.N. Security Council Resolution 1973 (17 March 2011)

[http://daccess-dds-](http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/268/39/PDF/N1126839.pdf?OpenElement)

[ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/268/39/PDF/N1126839.pdf?OpenElement](http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/268/39/PDF/N1126839.pdf?OpenElement)

Excerpts:

"Deploring the failure of the Libyan authorities to comply with resolution 1970 (2011)

Expressing grave concern at the deteriorating situation, the escalation of violence, and the heavy civilian casualties,

"Reiterating the responsibility of the Libyan authorities to protect the Libyan *population and reaffirming that parties to armed conflicts bear the primary responsibility to take all feasible steps to ensure the protection of civilians,*"

"Decides to establish a ban on all flights in the airspace of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in order to help protect civilians;"

'Authorizes Member States that have notified the Secretary-General and the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, acting nationally or through regional organizations or arrangements, **to take all necessary measures to enforce compliance with the ban on flights imposed by paragraph 6 above, as necessary**, and *requests* the States concerned in cooperation with the League of Arab States to coordinate closely with the Secretary General on the measures they are taking to implement this ban, including by establishing an appropriate mechanism for implementing the provisions of paragraphs 6 and 7 above."

"HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL PASSES RESOLUTION ON LIBYA IN SPECIAL SESSION";, 25 February 2011

[http://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B9C2E/\(httpNewsByYear_en\)/E445CBD7BC346E66C1257842006827E0?OpenDocument](http://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B9C2E/(httpNewsByYear_en)/E445CBD7BC346E66C1257842006827E0?OpenDocument)

"The Human Rights Council this afternoon adopted a resolution on the human rights situation in Libya. Resolution S-15/L.1, adopted by consensus without a vote, calls on the Libyan government to, among other things, **immediately release all arbitrarily detained persons, stop attacks against civilians, cease intimidation, persecution and arbitrary arrests of individuals**, ensure the safety of all civilians including citizens of third countries, cease blocking internet and telecommunications networks and to respect the popular will, aspirations and demands of the people.

Arab reactions

"GCC seeks no-fly zone as Libya battle rages" (**Arab News**)

<http://arabnews.com/middleeast/article306320.ece>

The Secretary General of the six-member **Gulf Cooperation Council**, ... was sending fighter jets to **Libya** to help enforce the U.N. **resolution**.

"Gulf states back Libya no-fly zone"

<http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/AleqM5jRu1VXz2KQyUHoqOAAUYFhCgRCkg?docId=CNG.49104d077a72cbffefe9d3689e92793.ba1>

"Libyan Rebels, Gulf Cooperation Council Seek No-Fly Zone"

<http://theworldnet.info/en/2011/03/libyan-rebels-gulf-cooperation-council-seek-no-fly-zone-president-obama-nato-discuss-the-possibility-how-do-you-make-a-no-fly-zone/>

"EU, GCC express common positions on Libya, Yemen and urge Iran to play a constructive role in the region"

<http://www.wam.org.ae/servlet/Satellite?c=WamLocEnews&cid=1289993181085&p=1135099400124&pagename=WAM%2FwamLocEnews%2FW-T-LEN-FullNews>

"GCC Chief Praises SC's Resolution concerning Libya

<http://www.bna.bh/portal/en/news/450193>

"Gulf Cooperation Council says UN resolution on Libya "positive"

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Newsfeed/Article/128464719/201103190801/Gulf-Cooperation-Council-says-UN-resolution-on-Libya-positive.aspx>

"Libya: A great resolution"

<http://www.asharq-e.com/news.asp?section=2&id=24577>

"Countries, such as France, Italy, Norway, **UAE, Qatar**, and others announced that they are **joining the forces that are enforcing this no fly zone and that they are going to be concerned with carrying out precise tasks that include attacking the airports and the anti-aircraft equipment and even the warplanes that violate the embargo.**"

"This UN resolution has come at an appropriate and vital time, even if it is a little bit late, but it is beneficial and emphasizes that the whole world has clearly agreed today that the regime of Gaddafi should come to an end and that Libya should be immediately liberated from this odd situation.

Some Arab countries, particularly the Gulf Cooperation Council member states and Lebanon, have done well by their relentless and determined efforts with the international community, Europe, and the United Nations to expedite adopting this awaited **resolution in spite of the presence of international parties that reject this step or that are hesitant toward it in a way that confused others and threatened the issuance of the resolution.** Some Arabs who adopted this effort have shown a noteworthy responsibility and leadership and have taken the initiative in a way that forced the world to respect their opinion and to go with them, in addition, of course, to the size of the humanitarian problem and the scenes of killing and destruction that forced the world to adopt this moral and humanitarian stand."

"Analysis: Arab League backs no-fly zone in Libya" ([youtube](#))

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AOMHvdZE5G0>

The Arab League's decision lays the groundwork for foreign powers to consider a no-fly zone over Libya. The league also reportedly decided to recognise a rebel council as the representative of the Libyan people.

The Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC): Communiqué on the Alarming Developments in Libyan Jamahiriya - Final Communiqué Issued By the Emergency Open Ended Ministerial Meeting of the OIC Executive Committee on the Alarming Developments in Libyan Jamahiriya, 19/03/2011

http://www.democraticunderground.com/discuss/duboard.php?az=view_all&addresses=102x4778731

Selected excerpts:

"Expressed grave concern at the current situation in Libya, condemned the use of military aircraft, mortars and heavy weaponry against civilians and called upon the Libyan authorities to immediately end the military operations targeting civilians."

"Welcomed UNSC Resolution 1973 that calls for the establishment of a ban on all flights in the airspace of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in order to help protect civilians, cease hostilities and facilitate the delivery of humanitarian assistance in Libya and requested Member States to contribute to the implementation of this resolution"

"Qatari military advisers on the ground, helping Libyan rebels get into shape", 13 May
http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle-east/qatari-military-advisers-on-the-ground-helping-libyan-rebels-get-into-shape/2011/05/11/AFZsPV1G_story.html

"The United States, European allies and other nations have dispatched representatives to the Libyan opposition's ruling council. **But on the ground here, credit for helping to get the rebel army into shape goes to military advisers from the tiny Arabian Peninsula emirate of Qatar.** Qatar was the first Arab country to formally recognize the political legitimacy of the rebel council in Benghazi and **the first to provide military assistance, sending six Mirage fighter jets to help NATO enforce the no-fly zone in March. Qatar also helped the rebel leadership sell oil to help finance the fledgling administration.** Now, it is alone in providing military training to the rebels, officials say."

"UAE Said To Have Changed View On Libya Deployment Due To Bahrain"

<http://online.wsj.com/article/BT-CO-20110322-705280.html>

Reason why the UAE backed away:

"Gulf Arab States Defend Military Action in Libya" 22, March, 2011

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703858404576213951994054080.html>

"The organization that represents the conservative Arab Gulf states Monday defended military action in Libya by the U.S. and its allies, saying it doesn't constitute "intervention. ***"What is happening now is not intervention, it is protecting the people from bloodshed," said Abdel Rahman bin Hamad Al Attiyah, the secretary general of the six-nation Gulf Cooperation Council. "These operations are to stop bloodshed in Libya," Mr. Al Attiyah added.***"

NB The Secretary-General of the Arab League subsequently criticized the air strikes as being outside the mandate of the recent United Nations resolution that authorized military action to protect Libyan civilians from the forces of Col. Moammar Gadhafi. (The GCC members are Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Oman and Bahrain). **Qatar became the first Arab nation to join international action against Col. Gadhafi, saying it was sending fighter jets to Libya to help enforce the U.N. resolution.**

"Gulf Arab States Defend Military Action in Libya" 22, March, 2011

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703858404576213951994054080.html>

"The organization that represents the conservative Arab Gulf states Monday defended military action in Libya by the U.S. and its allies, saying it doesn't constitute "intervention. ***"What is happening now is not intervention, it is protecting the people from bloodshed," said Abdel Rahman bin Hamad Al Attiyah, the secretary general of the six-nation Gulf Cooperation Council. "These operations are to stop bloodshed in Libya," Mr. Al Attiyah added.***"

African reactions

The hidden reality behind Gaddafi's much vaunted efforts to promote Pan Africanism

Black Africans In Libya Cry Out For Help! (panafricanistinternational.org, Fri, 04 Mar 2011)

<http://www.modernghana.com/news/318974/1/black-africans-in-libya-cry-out-for-help.html>

"There is no need to allow this to draw a wedge between the democratic forces who are in charge of **the on-going struggle to free themselves from the longest ruling dictator in the world. Gaddafi's only olive branch to Pan-Africanism has been under the**

condition that we crown him as our “King of Kings”. So we are not confused at all, and can understand why the good people of Libya would want to get rid of him. But the People's Revolution in Libya, unlike the ones in all the other Arab countries which have so far enjoyed our unalloyed solidarity, is being dangerously diluted with politically toxic and and extremely alarming systematic and sporadic attacks on black African migrants living in Libya."

"Black Africans In Libya Cry Out For Help!" (panafricanistinternational.org, **Fri, 04 Mar 2011**)

<http://www.modernghana.com/news/318974/1/black-africans-in-libya-cry-out-for-help.html>

"The effect of the use of “foreign mercenaries”, if true, has completely poisoned the budding Libyan Revolution. **The real weapon that has been unleashed by Gaddafi is not those miserable mercenaries, but the reduction of the dignity of the Libyan Revolution into an insane xenophobic tantrum.** The people of Libya who have aided these Africans to escape, without even asking to be paid, need to be mentioned and thanked and to balance the perspectives, and encourage such positive tendencies still found within the Libyan communities and individuals who do not see all black Africans as mercenaries.

"The Kadaffi puzzle in Africa", **Japhet M. Zwana, Caribbean Life**
http://www.caribbeanlifeneews.com/stories/2011/3/2011_03_16_zwana_kaddafi_puzzle_in_africa.html

"Why have African leaders been so mum on the behavior of Muammar Kaddafi, who is slaughtering his people callously and in defiance of world opinion? This taciturnity was underlined in a statement that appeared in the Zimbabwe Telegraph (March 1, 2011) written by Moses Chamboko. He opined, **“Unashamedly, African leaders have literally gone on leave while their beloved but lunatic brother in the North is busy butchering innocent and unarmed civilians mercilessly. Like the proverbial ostrich, from Cape to Cairo, leaders buried their heads in the sand, hoping a miracle would deliver them and their dear brother from the monumental disgrace.”**

Communique of the 261st Meeting of the Peace and Security Council
(23rd February 2011)

<http://au.int/fr/sites/default/files/PSC%20Communique%20on%20the%20situation%20in%20Libya.pdf>

1. Takes note of the statements made by the Commission and the Permanent Representative of the Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya;
2. **Expresses deep concern with the situation in the Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and strongly condemns the indiscriminate and excessive use of force and lethal weapons against peaceful protestors, in violation of human rights and International Humanitarian Law, which continues to contribute to the loss of human life and the destruction of property. Council stresses the need for the people of Libya to spare no effort in avoiding any further loss of life...**
3. **Calls on the Libyan authorities to ensure the protection and security of the citizens and also ensure the delivery and provision of humanitarian assistance to the injured and other persons in need;**
5. **Underscores that the aspirations of the people of Libya for democracy, political reform, justice and socio-economic development are legitimate and urges that they be respected....**

Communique of the 275th Meeting of the A U Peace and Security Council
<http://allafrica.com/stories/201104270994.html>

The Peace and Security Council of the African Union (AU), at its 275th meeting held on 26 April 2011, held at ministerial level, adopted the following decision on the situation in Libya:

5. Underscores, once again, **the legitimacy of the aspirations of the Libyan people for democracy, political reform, justice, peace and security**, as well as for socio economic development, and the need to ensure that these aspirations are fulfilled in a peaceful and democratic manner

11. Reiterates the AU's commitment to the respect for resolution 1973 (2011). In this regard, Council stresses the need for all countries and organizations involved in the implementation of Security Council resolution 1973 (2011) **to act in a manner fully consistent with international legality and the resolution's provisions, whose objective is solely to ensure the protection of the civilian population. Council urges all involved to refrain from actions, including military operations targeting Libyan Senior Officials and socio economic infrastructure**, that would further compound the situation and make it more difficult to achieve international consensus on the best way forward;

Black Africans In Libya Cry Out For Help! (panafricanistinternational.org, Fri, 04 Mar 2011)

<http://www.modernghana.com/news/318974/1/black-africans-in-libya-cry-out-for-help.html>

The Pan-Africanist International was among the first international organisations that cried out as soon as the first violent attack on unarmed protesters occurred: “We are shocked and horrified by the reckless abandon and the extents taken by the Libyan authorities, including reports of the hiring of foreign mercenaries to kill and maim peaceful protesters by a leader who prides himself as being “democratic” in his own Green Book!...*The International Solidarity Committee of the Pan-Africanist International stands firmly in support of the heroic people of Libya. We stand with them in this great hour of need! We urgently call upon the international community to do something now!*” (

"Setback to Gaddafi's African dream" (24 February 2011)

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y_6wl_BqaX8

Muammar Gaddafi, the Libyan president, has always promoted himself as one of Africa's great leaders touting a vision of progress and wealth for the entire continent. Now, **after a week of violence in Libya, the African Union has condemned his actions against the pro-democracy movement.**

Insurgent Libyan pleas for external assistance

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle-east/qatari-military-advisers-on-the-ground-helping-libyan-rebels-get-into-shape/2011/05/11/AZsPV1G_story.html

"But in Benghazi, rebels continue to press for more advisers and heavy equipment. As Bani, the military spokesman, put it, “everyone and everybody that is going to come here to help get rid us of this tyrant is welcome.” (Qatari military advisers on the ground, helping Libyan rebels get into shape, 13 May)

"Libyan opposition appeals for aid", 9 June

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle-east/libyan-opposition-appeals-for-aid-as-us-allies-look-to-plan-for-post-gadhafi-era/2011/06/09/AGmbt1MH_story.html

Libya's main opposition group appealed for urgent infusions of cash from foreign nations to help support the rebellion against Moammar Gadhafi....the finance minister of the opposition Transitional National Council lamented that the international community still did not understand the needs of the Libyan people after months of violence.

"Assault on Misurata: How much longer can it go on?" (Youtube)

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LS-tdXN_ETU

No one is safe in Misurata. A direct hit in the middle of a residential area. People are repeatedly calling for more NATO action: **"Why can't NATO do more?"**

Collateral and "non-collateral" damage examined, and compared

"Libya government fails to prove claims of NATO casualties", 6 June (youtube)

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/libya-government-fails-to-prove-claims-of-nato-casualties/2011/06/06/AGlluYKH_story.html

The baby girl lying on a hospital bed was presented as a victim of a NATO airstrike, proof that the alliance was killing rather than protecting Libyan civilians. But as journalists crowded around her bed, a handwritten note was passed to a Reuters reporter by a member of the hospital's medical staff. *"This is a case of road traffic accident,"* it said in English. *"This is the truth [sic]."*

Nearly three months into NATO's bombing campaign, Moammar Gaddafi's government churns out daily propaganda about the alliance supposedly inflicting civilian casualties. Last week, it said that 718 people had died from mid-March to late May and that 4,067 had suffered significant injuries. **But it has failed to show foreign journalists more than a handful of dead or wounded people.** Indeed, when reporters are taken on official trips, what they see suggests that NATO is being accurate and careful.

"Libya says NATO airstrike killed Khadafy's youngest son, 3 grandkids", 1 May 2011

<http://thelibyanwar.com/libya-says-nato-airstrike-killed-khadafys-youngest-son-3-grandkids/>

In the early hours of Saturday, Khadafy had called for a cease-fire and negotiations with NATO but refused to surrender power. Even as he spoke, alliance warplanes struck a government complex in the capital....The eastern city of Benghazi, the de facto capital of the opposition, erupted with celebratory gunfire and explosions as news of the NATO bombing broke. Young men took to the streets, waving their arms in the air and displaying the flag of the opposition. **When one young man was asked about the killing of Khadafy's grandchildren, he responded: "What about our children? He's killing our children."**

"As Libya Buries Victims, Hints of Deception" (youtube)

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/15/world/africa/15libya.html?hp>

According to officials, the nine coffins, with bodies wrapped in the green of Islam, were

those of the dead Muslim clerics. **But some mourners offered differing counts. Two men whispered that their uncles, among those being buried, were soldiers, and one of those said the man concerned had been dead for weeks.** Another identified one of the dead as a driver.

There was a man who said that he was in the guesthouse when it was attacked, and **that 7 of the group of 16 he had led to the Brega gathering from Sirte, Colonel Qaddafi's hometown, had been killed, 4 of them imams.** The man, who identified himself as Attiya Ali Ahmed, 25, appeared to have suffered no injury in the attack. He said that the gathering had been called for a public reading of the Koran and to rally morale in Brega against the rebels, and that **he had seen no sign of any military activity in or near the guesthouse.** And he warned reporters to accurately convey his account. *"The Koran does not permit anything but the truth,"* he said.

"Libyans bury 9 after NATO airstrike", 15 May.

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/libyans-bury-9-after-nato-airstrike/2011/05/14/AFOnSg3G_story.html

Libyans buried nine bodies Saturday in a dusty cemetery along Tripoli's Mediterranean shore, in a ceremony that raised as many questions as it answered. The Libyan government said the men were Muslim religious leaders killed early Friday morning in a NATO airstrike in a guesthouse in the eastern Libyan town of Brega. If true, that would represent the largest loss of civilian lives in a NATO strike since the allied operation began.

Accounts at the funeral, which drew about 500 people, suggested that not everything the government said was accurate. At least one of the dead was an oil field engineer, not a religious leader, according to a family member. The government had also said that the group was a peace delegation en route to the rebels' de facto capital of Benghazi and that 11 imams had been killed. But a Koran teacher who said he was part of the group said it was not a peace delegation. Instead, he said, its members had traveled to Brega, an oil port 482 miles east of Tripoli, at the behest of the country's Islamic affairs department to demonstrate on state television that the war-torn city was controlled by government forces.

"Libya Stokes Its Machine Generating Propaganda", 6 June

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/07/world/africa/07libya.html?hpw>

With no way of stopping the airstrikes, it seems as though the hidden power of the government's intelligence and security agencies has been turned to persuading world opinion — above all, opinion in the NATO countries carrying out most of the airstrikes, the United States, Britain and France — that the strikes' main victims, and often the intended targets, are civilians, and not military, as NATO has said.

But so far, the Qaddafi effort has fallen far short. Rather, the pattern reporters have seen on officially guided bus trips, often in the middle of the night, is of strikes that have been eerily precise, with the targets mainly military encampments or command-and-control "modules," like the Bab al-Aziziya command compound in central Tripoli. Civilian damage, where there has been any, has been mainly in the form of blast and shockwave impact on nearby buildings. Where civilian buildings have been hit, they appear to have been empty, and linked in some way to the military targets. Sightings of civilian casualties have been

rare, though not for want of official endeavor. But 11 weeks into the airstrikes, the government minders' credibility, at least among foreign reporters, has worn perilously thin.

"Nato Crosses the Line, Kills Children"; 1 May 2011

<http://amiddleeastblog.blogspot.com/2011/05/nato-crosses-line-kills-children.html>

"The youngest son of Moammar Gaddafi was killed in a NATO airstrike on his home Saturday evening, along with three of Gaddafi's grandchildren.

"Libyans bury 9 after NATO airstrike", 15 May

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/libyans-bury-9-after-nato-airstrike/2011/05/14/AFOnSq3G_story.html

"Libyan rebels in a fight they don't control", 2 June

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle-east/libyan-rebels-in-a-fight-they-dont-control/2011/05/30/AGHyRnGH_story_1.html

"Analyst Omran Senussi, 29, a former civil engineer, said he and his team are always concerned about the safety of civilians and rebel fighters. **Since NATO strikes began in mid-March, there have been at least two "friendly fire" incidents, which killed more than a dozen rebel fighters.**

"Deadly mistakes in the battle for Libya" ([youtube](#))

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QOmr2znqZTc>

The NATO strike that hit a pro-democracy convoy outside of the eastern town of Brega **killing at least 10 people may have been a mistake. Although the population in the country's east is prepared to forgive the mistake, there is less sympathy in other parts of Libya.** Such incidents may have just given Muammar Gaddafi's spokespeople propaganda ammunition. Al Jazeera's Laurance Lee reports from Benghazi. (02 April 2011).

"Non-Collateral" Damage caused by Gaddafi's bombardment of civilians

"Timeline of the Libya conflict", 17 May, 2011 <http://english.aljazeera.net/video/>

Estimated **several thousand killed and 400, 000 displaced** since the Libyan crisis began, 3 months ago - (the vast majority being civilians among the insurgent population).

"Thousands of Libyans continue to flee fighting" ([youtube](#))

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CFcf1Gu7QFA>

The International Criminal Court says 327,000 people have been displaced by the fighting inside Libya.

"Death toll rises in Libyan unrest" ([youtube](#))

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EwmlYXnnvmE>

Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi is confronting the most serious challenge to his rule in 42 years. Government forces have been unleashed onto protesters in the eastern city of Benghazi, **where one hospital official put the death toll at 200 .**

N.B The small number of casualties from collateral damage caused by NATO's military action cited above **is exceeded by the death toll caused by Gaddafi's forces that was recorded by one hospital in Benghazi.**

Geographically widespread nature of opposition to Gaddafi's régime

"Libya: The battles that raged on when no one was looking" **(Youtube)**

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B0bhiD8KphA>

"The opposition against Gaddafi runs right through Libyan society"

"Libyan Resistance Fighters Make Presence Known in Tripoli" **(Youtube)**

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bdajx9I-9Nk&feature=related>

"In Tripoli, support for Gaddafi is shallow", 1 June

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle-east/in-tripoli-support-for-gaddafi-is-shallow/2011/05/31/AGH1PmFH_story.html?hpid=z3

Monday saw the biggest protest in the capital in nearly three months, when about 1,000 people gathered for the funeral of two rebel activists killed in a clash with security forces. It was the third peaceful protest in Tripoli in the past week but the first to be filmed and independently verified.

"TRIPOLI - NEW, PUBLIC, MASS ANTI-REGIME PROTEST" - 30/05/ **(Youtube)**

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2p8JlQpLfs>

TRIPOLI - THE PEOPLE SPEAK OUT - PART 1 **(Youtube)**

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tOAR9kFRGjg&feature=related>

TRIPOLI - THE PEOPLE SPEAK OUT - PART 2 **(Youtube)**

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A42aJ_0I2dU&feature=related

TRIPOLI - THE PEOPLE SPEAK OUT - PART 3 **(Youtube)**

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UcosgeF5YpU&feature=related>

"Battle for Tripoli continues" **(youtube)**

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4Mu-zp_yCCo

The embattled Libyan regime of passed out guns to civilian supporters, set up checkpoints and sent armed patrols roving the terrorised capital on Saturday. Some of Libya's security forces reportedly have given up the fight.

"Voices of Tripoli: Part One" **(youtube)**

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R86U4HiWI40>

(Tripoli opponents testify that they pray for the safety of the foreign pilots who are bombing command centers in the city)

in Tripoli, speaking out against Libya's longterm leader Muammar Gaddafi is a dangerous business, with reports of horrific violence meted out to those who have told media operatives of their support for the opposition. With the movement of journalists in Libya's capital city heavily restricted, these voices often go unheard.

"Gunfire, new clashes in Tripoli as government offers money, pay hikes" **(youtube)**

"These people have no mercy," the caller added. "We have known them for 42 years."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/02/24/AR2011022402884.html>

Gunfire erupted in at least three neighborhoods of the Libyan capital of Tripoli Friday, as opponents of Moammar Gaddafi tried to revive their protests against his regime in spite of a massive security clampdown.

"Battle for Libya: Update from Nefusa Mountains" (**Youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wdByalonVkY>

Gadaffii tried to bribe the people (one million dinars) if they remained faithful to him. They refused. *"Hearts and minds strategy failed here"*.

Reactions of insurgents and other Libyan opponents to Resolution 1973 and NATO's intervention

"Benghazi cheers UN no-fly zone" (**youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jip9gXW4gDI>

Pro-democracy supporters were jubilant at the news of the draft resolution being passed. In the opposition-held stronghold of Benghazi, huge crowds were seen waving flags and cheering as fireworks filled the air.

"In Libyan Rebel Capital, Shouts of Thanks to America and the West", 28 May

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/29/world/africa/29benghazi.html?_r=1&hpw

"Thank you, thank you," he said (the driver of a car in Benghazi). "America No. 1." Americans and, for that matter, all Westerners are treated hereabouts with a warmth and gratitude rarely seen in any Muslim country....People smile and go out of their way to say hello to them, and are almost shockingly courteous.

TRIPOLI - CHEERING FOR NATO - 24/05/2011 (**Youtube**)

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VUys_sztVFM&NR=1

TRIPOLI - THE PEOPLE SPEAK OUT - PART 1 (**Youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tOAR9kFRGjg&feature=related>

"Fighting continues across Libya", 2 June (**youtube**)

<http://english.aljazeera.net/video/africa/2011/06/201162105013363204.html>

Rebels fighting Gaddafi's forces in remote mountain region feel abandoned by NATO. NATO's raids are helping some rebels in their push west, but others feel they have been abandoned in the mountains.

Giving voice to the countless voiceless Libyan opponents of Gadaffi

"We can no longer live under Gaddafi's evil subjugation" (Mohamed Abdulmalek, Libyan exile and chairman of Libya Watch - a U.K based human rights group, 21 February)

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/feb/21/no-longer-live-gaddafi-evil-subjugation>

"Accounts of unprovoked sniper attacks on peaceful demonstrators, the use of violent foreign mercenaries as a means of crowd control, live ammunition being shot into crowds of protesters, and the media blackout that tried (unsuccessfully) to prevent the world from finding out, has brought about new focus and attention to the plight of the Libyan people and to the reaction of their inhumane leader."

Take What's Yours, (**youtube**) posted by a Libyan insurgent

<http://www.libyafeb17.com/2011/02/video-take-whats-yours/>

Libya and the U.S.: Qadhafi Unrepentant, Mohamed Eljahmi, Middle East Quarterly, Winter 2006). <http://www.meforum.org/878/libya-and-the-us-qadhafi-unrepentant>

"What did Saif really say?" <http://www.libyafeb17.com/2011/02/what-did-saif-really-say/>
An insurgent analysis of the widely-publicized TV statement by Gaddafi's high-profile son, Saif, defending his father's rule and warning of the likelihood of civil war if the insurgents continue to fight for their freedom.

The Hidden reality behind the Gaddafi Regime's vaunted socio-economic achievements

Evidence from Libyans

" Why do you Libyans want Gaddafi gone?" February 21 (article posted on the insurgent website, Libyans Forever in Unity. From Benghazi to Fezzan)
<http://www.libyafeb17.com/2011/02/why-do-you-libyans-want-gaddafi-gone-here-are-some-reasons/>

Selected excerpts:

"Civil infrastructure, healthcare and the education system have failed beyond disbelief in the last 40 years."

"Private Libyan citizens yearly spend on average 5 billion dollars in Tunisia, Jordan and Egypt out of their pockets for medical treatment, because they have completely lost trust in the Libyan health care system."

"The HIV infection breakout in Benghazi. Over 500 children were effected because the sterilization equipment were malfunctioning."

Evidence from a Bulgarian nurse who worked in Libya

Nurses held in Libya 'were tortured' ([youtube](#))
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0zTvAsShaLM&feature=relmfu>

The Unequal struggle of Libyan insurgents for their survival and freedom

"Protesters turn soldiers in Benghazi" ([Youtube](#))
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W9TvMXRa0Nw>

Demonstrators said that all they wanted was peace and social justice. One woman's lone protest at the beginning of the protest". This was where people were brought to be tortured and perhaps killed. The unequal nature of the battle - not to armed forces fighting each other, but a heavily armed, well-trained professional army, with the most modern sophisticated weapons, fighting untrained civilians who were forced to take up arms to defend their lives and liberty.

"Libyan rebels' volunteer army", 25 May ([youtube](#))
<http://english.aljazeera.net/video/africa/2011/05/2011525651322855.html>

"Teachers, engineers, students volunteer to fight in deadly battles, but receive little training. Many of those fighting pro-Gaddafi forces on the frontline are volunteers. They are teachers, engineers and students, with little military training, and they have to learn about

combat while engaging in it."

"Libyan rebel fighters train on the job", 19 May, 2011

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l5qM_3qSpOw

" Opposition fighters in Libya are simulatneously fighting regime soldiers and receiving basic military training."

"Libya's Forgotten frontline" 18 May, 2011.

<http://blogs.aljazeera.net/africa/2011/05/18/libyas-forgotten-frontline>

Ninety per cent of the the Az Zawiyah Brigade, which has been at the forefront of the conflict since the beginning of this revolution are volunteers, some retired army officers who returned to service, but the vast majority those who at the beginning of the year were civilians going about their normal lives. Morale in the unit remains high."

The Armed Struggle in Libya

"Battle For Zawiyah" (**youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u0DkOhBiVnk&feature=relmfu>

"Dramatic video of fighting aftermath in Libyan airport" (**youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S2IXxbceUw8&feature=related>

"Libyan aircraft bomb Ras Lanuf" (**youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Sfeu8jhUWOA&feature=related>

"EXCLUSIVE: Libya, the Brega battle" (**youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Rh7saii40CE&feature=related>

"LIBYA- Machine Gun Battle Up Close on the Ground Footage" (**youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ano11RLzmm8&feature=related>

"Libya: Video Of Bloody Battle To Hold Brega" (**youtube**)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q9KzeqVExQI&NR=1>

"The fight for Ajdabiya continues", <http://www.libyafeb17.com/2011/03/the-fight-for-ajdabiya-continues/>

"Al Jazeera's report on the battle near Ajdabiya" <http://www.libyafeb17.com/2011/03/al-jazeeras-report-on-the-battle-near-ajdabiya/>

"Libya rebels fight for border control" 25 May

<http://english.aljazeera.net/video/africa/2011/05/20115265512666551.html>

Opposition fighters in western Libya are still fighting battles with government troops, and one such fight is for control of the Wazin border crossing with Tunisia.

"With battle pushed back from their city, residents of Misurata begin to rebuild", 29 May

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle-east/with-battle-pushed-back-from-their-city-residents-of-misurata-begin-to-rebuild/2011/05/28/AGBoAfDH_story.html

In downtown Misurata, the detritus of war litters the streets. Buildings are shattered, cars

are burned out and roads remain blocked by shipping containers filled with sand. For three months, this city was the scene of bloody street battles, as Libyan leader Moammar Gaddafi's forces fought for control. But residents took it back, block by block, street by street, and a few stores and coffee shops have tentatively reopened their bullet-scarred doors. Fighting continues on three fronts outside the city, and the bodies of rebel fighters are brought to hospitals each day. But rockets no longer rain down on homes, and the city is trying to get on its feet again.

"Libyan rebels wrest town from Gaddafi forces", 5 June ([youtube](#))

<http://english.aljazeera.net/news/africa/2011/06/20116514019240484.html>

Rebels reportedly seize control of northwestern town of Yafran as fresh explosions rock capital.

"Libyan rebels set sights on Tripoli", 5 June

<http://english.aljazeera.net/video/africa/2011/06/20116674013624647.html>

In Libya, the frontline of the fighting continues to be fragmented and constantly shifting. Despite this, the opposition is organising itself and making significant advances in the west.

"Libyan rebels move closer to Tripoli", 4 June ([youtube](#))

<http://english.aljazeera.net/video/africa/2011/06/2011641451317542.html>

In the mountains south of Tripoli, opposition troops are making a bold push to the capital of Libya.

"Heavy fighting on the streets of Misurata" ([Youtube](#))

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f2oHFCfU9LE>

Nearly two months since they first claimed to control Misurata, pro-democracy forces are still battling government soldiers there. Now, the fighting has moved from open ground in the outskirts to urban warfare in Libya's third largest city. Gun battles raged along its main supply route and at the port, civilians fled to the relative safety of Benghazi, the rebels' stronghold.

"Report from Misurata" ([Youtube](#))

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aK0ONZTfL9g>

Negotiations, Ceasefires, Exit strategies

"Libyans see no room for negotiations" ([youtube](#))

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VF-ZzyOT93o>

Ordinary Libyans, and those families worst affected by the fighting on the front lines, are in no mood to compromise to end Libya's crisis. **People in Benghazi are angered by the talk of negotiations; they continue to stand resolute in their call for Gaddafi and his entire family to leave power.**

"Libyan rebels reject Gaddafi's truce offer", 31 May 2011 ([youtube](#))

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/libyan-rebels-reject-gaddafi-truce-offer/2011/05/31/AGGbhNFH_video.html

"Battle for Libya: Government rejects opposition ceasefire offer"

<http://english.aljazeera.net/news/africa/2011/04/201141134110527219.html>

A Libyan government spokesman has termed the conditions set by the opposition for a ceasefire "mad", and **asserted that troops loyal to Muammar Gaddafi, the Libyan leader, will remain stationed where they are.** *"They are asking us to withdraw from our own cities. If this is not mad then I don't know what this is. We will not leave our cities,"* Mussa Ibrahim, the government spokesman, said on Friday. Earlier, **the opposition had said it would agree to a ceasefire as long as Gaddafi pulled his military out of opposition-held cities and allowed peaceful protests against his government.**

Mustafa Abdul-Jalil, head of the opposition's interim governing council based in Benghazi, said that the rebels' condition for a ceasefire *is "that the Gaddafi brigades and forces withdraw from inside and outside Libyan cities to give freedom to the Libyan people to choose and the world will see that they will choose freedom"*.

"Libya offers to pull army out of cities if rebels do the same", 20 May, 2011

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/libya-offers-to-pull-army-out-of-cities-if-rebels-do-the-same/2011/05/19/AFNtHU7G_story.html

The Libyan government said Thursday that it would pull its army out of cities if rebels did the same. The government's offer, which the spokesman described as going further than it had before, was made on the condition that NATO stop its attacks on Libyan military targets, and **it remained unclear Thursday evening how viable the proposal was. In March, the Libyan government declared a cease-fire but continued fighting. Rebel forces have also been cautious about agreeing to cease-fires.**

"Gaddafi vows to fight to end amid NATO raids"

<http://english.aljazeera.net/news/africa/2011/06/20116716385680354.html>

Gaddafi has vowed to fight to the end in a speech broadcast live on state television. *"We only have one choice: we will stay in our land dead or alive.... We will not kneel! We will not surrender."*

"Zuma to offer Gaddafi 'exit strategy' ", 25 May

<http://english.aljazeera.net/news/africa/2011/05/20115259220999993.html>

South African president Jacob Zuma will visit the Libya next week, for talks officials say will focus on an "exit strategy" for the country's embattled leader.

"Russia agrees to mediate Gaddafi exit", 27 May 2011

<http://english.aljazeera.net/news/africa/2011/05/2011527114252533477.html>

Moscow changes tack at the G8 meeting in France, saying Gaddafi has 'forfeited legitimacy' to rule Libya. As the Group of Eight [G8] meeting in France comes to an end, Russia has agreed to mediate Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi's exit. Sergei Ryabkov, the Russian deputy foreign minister, told reporters that *"Gaddafi has forfeited legitimacy"* and that Russia is ready *"to help him go"*. Soon after, Mikhail Margelov, Moscow's special representative on Africa told reporters that **his country is ready to negotiate Gaddafi's departure.**

Libya 'ceasefire talks under way', 28 May

<http://english.aljazeera.net/news/africa/2011/05/2011528143329921352.html>

Abdelati al-Obeidi, the Libyan deputy foreign minister **hints at ongoing secret talks between UK and Gaddafi's government to end the fighting**. Secret channels are being opened between the government of Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi and the UK over a possible ceasefire, sources have told Al Jazeera.

"Libya's prime minister calls for cease-fire", 27 May 2011

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/libyas-prime-minister-calls-for-cease-fire/2011/05/26/AGEKiJCH_story.html

Libya's prime minister called for a cease-fire Thursday, saying for the first time that the government would be willing to talk to the rebels, but the White House immediately rejected the offer as not credible. The Libyan government has called for a cease-fire several times since a NATO bombing campaign began in mid-March, **but it has in the past refused to acknowledge the Transitional National Council — the rebels' de facto government — as a legitimate negotiating partner**.

"Libyan opposition offers ceasefire" ([youtube](#))

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u_q_nUvwlfsc

"Ceasefire offer rejected in Libya" ([youtube](#))

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=i37rUFj0Uwk>

Rejected by the govt. Condition laid down by insurgents - **Gadafi's forces must leave the cities and lift the siege of cities**.

"Libya Contact Group to meet in Abu Dhabi", 9 June

<http://english.aljazeera.net/news/africa/2011/06/20116982134498144.html>

Conference to discuss what post-Gaddafi country will look like as pressure continues to mount on the Libyan leader.

Defections from Gaddafi's camp

"Scores defect' from Gaddafi's army", 31 May

<http://english.aljazeera.net/news/africa/2011/05/20115308196965572.html>

Eight high-ranking officers and 120 military officials "abandon" armed forces amid growing pressure on Libyan leader. More than 100 military officials and soldiers have defected from Libya's armed forces in recent days, according to a group of eight military officers, as pressure mounts on leader Muammar Gaddafi to step down. who defected from Gaddafi's side in recent days. *"What is happening to our people has frightened us,"* said one officer, who identified himself as General Oun Ali Oun. *"There is a lot of killing, genocide ... violence against women. No wise, rational person with the minimum of dignity can do what we saw with our eyes and what he asked us to do."*

"Defections, protests hit Libyan regime", 31 May

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle-east/defections-protests-hit-libyan-regime/2011/05/30/AGLGJzEH_story.html

Eight Libyan army officers, including five generals, appeared at a news conference arranged by the Italian government, saying they were part of a group of 120 military officials and soldiers who had defected in recent days. *"What is happening to our people has frightened us,"* one of the defecting officers, who identified himself as General Oun Ali Oun, told reporters, according to news agencies. ***"There is a lot of killing, genocide . . .***

violence against women. *No wise, rational person with the minimum of dignity can do what we saw with our eyes and what he [Gaddafi] asked us to do."*

"Defections, protests hit Libyan regime", 31 May

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle-east/defections-protests-hit-libyan-regime/2011/05/30/AGLGJzEH_story.html

South African President Jacob Zuma met Libyan leader Moammar Gaddafi Monday but appeared to make no breakthrough in his attempt to broker a peace deal, **as the regime was hit by a wave of high-level defections and the reemergence of protests in the capital.**

"Libyan delegates resign their postings", the World Today, 22 February 2011

<http://www.abc.net.au/worldtoday/content/2011/s3145522.htm>

"The Libyan delegation to the United Nations resigned overnight - accusing the Government of genocide against its own people and there are more reports today of defections from the Libyan military. Libya's deputy ambassador to the UN, Omar Al-Dabashi told the BBC, the United Nations must intervene to protect the Libyan people. OMAR AL-DABASHI: *"The information that we are receiving from the people in Tripoli is the regime is killing whoever go out to the streets. They have, he has his mercenaries everywhere in the streets and whenever any demonstrator appears they just kill them."*

At a press conference in New York, the deputy ambassador also urged the international community to take action. OMAR AL-DABASHI: *"The first thing is to impose a no fly zone on all the cities of Libya so that no arms suppliers and mercenaries will arrive to the regime. The second thing is to have, to establish a safe passage from the borders of Tunisia and the borders with Egypt, so that the medical supplies will arrive to the main cities in Libya, Tripoli and Benghazi."*

.Meanwhile two Libyan pilots have landed their Mirage fighter jets at an airport in Malta - seeking political asylum. It's understood they were senior colonels who'd been ordered to bomb protesters in Libya's second biggest city, Benghazi, but they'd refused and decided instead to defect.

Political Rights and Freedoms in Gaddafi's Libya

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya Amnesty International submission to the UN Universal Periodic Review , November-December, 2010

http://lib.ohchr.org/HRBodies/UPR/Documents/Session9/LY/AI_AmnestyInternational.pdf

Excerpt:

"The death penalty is prescribed for....activities that amount to the peaceful exercise of the rights to freedom of expression and association. For instance, **the death penalty can be imposed for forming, joining, financing or supporting groups based on a political ideology opposed to the principles of the al-Fateh Revolution of 1 September 1969**, which brought Mu'ammarr al-Gaddafi to power, and for "encouraging that by whatever means" (Article 3 of Law No. 71 of 1972 on the Criminalization of Parties). A number of articles of the Penal Code also prescribe **capital punishment for those who call "for the establishment of any grouping, organization or association proscribed by law"** (Article 206), and **for those who spread "theories or principles aiming to change the basic principles of the Constitution or the fundamental structures of the social**

system" (Article 207)."

"Hundreds of individuals accused of offences "against the state" remain arbitrarily detained in Libya. They include individuals suspected of belonging to Islamist armed groups in Libya or abroad and those critical or deemed to be critical of the political system. Some are detained without charge or trial or after being convicted in proceedings that grossly violate international standards for fair trial. Others continue to be detained after finishing serving their sentence imposed by courts or despite being cleared of all charges. For instance, Mahmoud Mohamed Aboushima remains detained in Abu Salim Prison, despite being cleared of charges of belonging to the LIFG by the High Court on 17 July 2007."

"Libya and the U.S.: Qadhafi Unrepentant (Mohamed Eljahmi Middle East Quarterly, , Winter 2006) <http://www.meforum.org/878/libya-and-the-us-qadhafi-unrepentant>

"Dissent is illegal under Law 75 of 1973, which denies Libyans freedom of expression...the regime often executed dissidents publicly, with the executions are rebroadcast on state television channels. Participants have disappeared after Congress discussions. On October 19, 2002, security forces arrested my brother, Fathi Eljahmi, after he spoke out for political and democratic reforms at the local Basic People's Congress." Gaddafi's Revolutionary committees resembled similar systems in communist countries. Reportedly 10 to 20 percent of Libyans worked in surveillance for these committees, a proportion of informants on par with Saddam Hussein's Iraq or Kim Jong-il's North Korea. The surveillance took place in government, in factories, and in the education sector. Gaddafi declared that *"execution is the fate of anyone who forms a political party"*

"Programme of Governance in the Arab Region" (POGAR)
<http://www.pogar.org/countries/theme.aspx?cid=10&t=2>

Excerpts

"Associations engaging in political activity are illegal in Libya. Further, political activity is defined by Articles 2 and 3 of Law 71 of 1972 as **any activity based on a political ideology contrary to the principles of the Al-Fateh Revolution of September 1, 1969**. This law has typically been used to disband Islamist political organizations, as in 2002 when 86 professionals and students were sentenced to jail for their membership in the Libyan Islamic Group; in that case, two of the leaders were sentenced to death"

"In general, there are no independent organizations in Libya, and **the existence of such organizations would be considered contrary to the revolution, and therefore illegal**. Law 20 of 1991 on the Promotion of Freedom sanctions the death penalty for anyone whose continued existence would lead to the disintegration of Libyan society. It states that the People's Congresses are the sole means for Libyan citizens to exercise self-determination"

Libya : General Overview (Openarab.net - The Initiative for an Open Arab Internet)
<http://old.openarab.net/en/node/362>

"The general situation with respect with law and the judicial system in Libya is very difficult to understand since Gaddafi's "revolutionary legitimacy" gives him the right to regard his own personal ideas as constitutional reference which can replace both the Constitution

and the Constitutional Court (10). **In this unique context, any legal situation can always be subject to change.** Further complicating this situation is the fact that there are no clearly assigned responsibilities for the authorities charged with supervising and controlling the internet...**The Libyan law forbids partisan action to the extent that it is considered "treason against the homeland" and is punishable by death."**

"Why do you Libyans want Gaddafi gone?" <http://www.libyafeb17.com/2011/02/why-do-you-libyans-want-gaddafi-gone-here-are-some-reasons/>

"The abolishment of the Libyan constitution (compiled by a team of leading international jurists) which symbolized the smooth birth of Libyan independence and its national sovereignty as voted for by the general assembly of the UN. Gaddafi continued to rule Libya without a constitution until the present day."

Law and Justice in Gaddafi's Libya

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya Amnesty International submission to the UN Universal Periodic Review , November-December, 2010

http://lib.ohchr.org/HRBodies/UPR/Documents/Session9/LY/Al_AmnestyInternational.pdf

Excerpts:

"The minimum guarantees of fair trial in proceeding in front of the People's Court were not respected, **including the right to be tried within a reasonable time; the right to be informed of the charges; the right to adequate defence; the right to legal counsel of one's own choosing; and the right of appeal in front of a higher tribunal.** Furthermore, **"confessions" extracted under torture or duress were used as evidence in proceedings in front of the People's Court...**Mustafa Abdeljalil, the Secretary of the General People's Committee for Justice, publicly criticized the lack of respect shown to the rule of law in Libya by security agencies. In January 2010, he told the General People's Congress that **there were over 300 individuals imprisoned without any legal basis.** Several months earlier, he lamented to Oea newspaper that **"We have more than 500 defendants acquitted, who have not been released on security justifications.**

"Individuals accused of offences "against the state" face trial in front of the State Security Court or other special courts. **They are often not aware of the exact charges facing them before being brought to the courts, where they see their court-appointed lawyers for the first time in violation to their right to adequate defence.** Evidence extracted under torture or duress has been used to convict such individuals in breach of Libya's obligation under the Convention against Torture."

"A number of laws passed since the 1970s have introduced corporal punishment, including Law No. 70 of 1973 (on the Establishment of the Had of Zina and the Amendment of several Articles of the Penal Code). **It prescribes 100 lashes as a punishment for those convicted of zina – defined in Libyan law as sexual relations between a man and a woman outside a lawful marriage.** Other Libyan laws prescribing corporal punishments include: Law No. 52 of 1974 on had alqadhaf – defamation – which provides for flogging. **Law No. 13 of 1425 on theft and haraba (amended by Law No. 10 of 1369) 2– highway robbery or rebellion – states that a person convicted of theft is to be punished by having the righthand amputated.** For the crime of haraba, the death penalty is

prescribed if there has been a killing, or cross amputation (right hand and left foot)."

"Programme of Governance in the Arab Region" (POGAR)

<http://www.pogar.org/countries/theme.aspx?cid=10&t=2>

"The 'Code of Honor' of March 1997 institutes a system of collective punishment for wrongdoing, whereby families, towns and municipalities are held responsible for the actions of individuals in their midst and are subject to punishment such as the dissolution of the local People's Congress or the denial of government services, including utilities, water, infrastructure projects."

"Gunfire, new clashes in Tripoli as government offers money, pay hikes",

<http://www.ongo.com/v/465152/-1/C8FFDB3EA29A5F3B/clashes-spread-closer-to-tripoli-us-consults-allies-on-libya-options>

The following chilling testimony from a Benghazi citizen confirms that the Gaddafi régime has actually put into practice that heinous medieval system of collective punishment for citizens the régime deems guilty of the nebulous crime of "wrongdoing":

"Everybody's suspicious, worried, afraid, because we have families," said the caller [from Benghazi], a trader who said he did not dare go out to protest. Gunshots could be heard over the telephone line. **"We are 10 percent afraid for ourselves and 90 percent afraid for our families. They won't just shoot us, maybe they will get revenge on the whole household, the whole family, even the whole street. These people have no mercy,"** the caller added. *"We have known them for 42 years*

"Why do you Libyans want Gaddafi gone?" <http://www.libyafeb17.com/2011/02/why-do-you-libyans-want-gaddafi-gone-here-are-some-reasons/>

"Law number 4 caters for the confiscation of private and commercial property, practically passing such stolen properties to the members of his family and of its so called revolutionary committee members who are in charge of security. The burning down of the land registry building in Tripoli to destroy any reference of legal ownership of property."

"Libya and the U.S.: Qadhafi Unrepentant", (Mohamed Eljahmi, Middle East Quarterly, Winter 2006). <http://www.meforum.org/878/libya-and-the-us-qadhafi-unrepentant>

"There are no judicial checks and balances. The judiciary is ill-defined, allowing regime elites to use multiple security forces to harass ordinary Libyan citizens. Revolutionary committees run prisons with little or no documentation of the inmate population or of such basic data as crime and sentence. Revolutionary committees dispense justice, targeting, in particular, participants of the Basic Peoples' Congresses who voice opposition to the state's agenda.

Freedom of expression and Media censorship in Libya

"Libya Words to Deeds" <http://www.hrw.org/en/node/11480/section/11>

Excerpts:

"The government still monitors and controls all content, and it allows no unsanctioned criticism of its work or personalities. Private media is not allowed....a review of the main newspapers, the state-run television and the state-run press agency JANA during Human

Rights Watch's visit in April-May 2005, as well as subsequent monitoring of these media outlets' websites, reveals a largely subservient and uncritical press that glorifies the government and Mu`ammar al-Qadhafi. The media addresses sensitive topics like police abuse or improved relations with the United States **only after they have been identified as acceptable for debate, often by al-Qadhafi himself. Criticism of the Jamahiriya system is unknown.**"

"In addition, the government has imprisoned journalists and others who have expressed critical views. As documented above, the Internal Security Agency arrested and continues to detain Fathi al-Jahmi, after he gave interviews critical of al-Qadhafi to the international media. In January 2005 Internal Security Agency forces arrested an Internet writer named `Abd al-Raziq al-Mansuri, apparently due to his critical postings to a website based in the U.K "

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya Amnesty International submission to the UN Universal Periodic Review , November-December, 2010

http://lib.ohchr.org/HRBodies/UPR/Documents/Session9/LY/Al_AmnestyInternational.pdf

Excerpts:

"Severe restrictions on the rights to freedom of expression, association and assembly remain in law and practice. Such rights are criminalized in Libyan legislation, and peaceful critics of the Libyan political system have been convicted on vaguely worded charges such as "attempting to overthrow the political system" or "spreading false rumours about the Libyan regime". Public forms of expression, including within the Peoples' Congresses and most of the print and broadcast media, are tightly controlled by the authorities. Article 1 of Law No. 76 of 1972 on Publications allows freedom of expression, but only insofar as it falls "within the framework of the principles, values and objectives of society". **Along with Law No. 120 of 1972 and Law No. 75 of 1973, Law No. 76 of 1972 imposes severe restrictions on the freedom of the press, effectively preventing the formation of independent newspapers.** The state also owns virtually all national broadcast media.

Libya : General Overview (Openarab.net - The Initiative for an Open Arab Internet)

<http://old.openarab.net/en/node/362>

Article no.178 of Law no.71/1972 stipulates that Libyans who publish any information which defames the country or undermines confidence in it abroad, shall be sentenced to life imprisonment. This is the general framework that governs publishing procedures and by extension the attitude of the government towards the internet. In spite of the absence of any legal framework that identifies the mechanisms for censoring and blocking websites, the Libyan authorities impose censorship on the opposition websites. In some cases, the websites are completely destroyed. All Libyan opposition websites that come to the attention of the authorities are blocked inside Libya and cannot be viewed without Proxy software. If someone tries to view these pages in an internet café, they will be expelled and could be reported to the security services. The security agencies have recently imported Russian internet experts in order to tighten its grip on the Internet navigation

"South Africans say Gadhafi himself gave them 'misinformation' on dead journalist", 20 May, 2011 http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/south-africans-say-gadhafi-himself-gave-them-misinformation-on-dead-journalist/2011/05/20/AFJbJe7G_story.html

"South Africa's top diplomat charged Friday that **Libyan leader Moammar Gadhafi fed South Africa misinformation about a journalist whose death in the north African country weeks ago has just been confirmed.** South African foreign minister Maite Nkoana-Mashabane told reporters that **Libya still has not come forward with the truth.** Anton **Hammerl's death was confirmed Thursday by journalists who saw him shot and killed by Gadhafi's forces in early April.** Colleagues of the South African journalist, held by Libyan forces from the day of the shooting until this week, had been afraid to speak of his death until they were safely out of Libya."

"We kept getting reassurance and misinformation throughout," Nkoana-Mashabane said. Referring to Gadhafi, she said the assurances came "at one stage from himself, yes, to say that they are all alive and that they are well. Mr. Hammerl's death is a very unfortunate act, and the government and the people of South Africa condemn the perpetrators of this heinous action," the minister said.

"Programme of Governance in the Arab Region" (POGAR)
<http://www.pogar.org/countries/theme.aspx?cid=10&t=2>

Excerpt

"The press is controlled and the government owns the broadcast media. People are able to receive news from satellite television. There is a state-run daily newspaper, Al-Shams. Local Revolutionary Committees publish several smaller newspapers. The official news agency is the Jamahiriya News Agency (JANA). The Law on Publications, No. 76 of 1972, as modified by Law 120 of 1972 and Law 75 of 1973, govern the operation of the press, reserving all rights to publish to two public entities, the General Corporation of Press, Professional Unions and Syndicates and Ad-dar Al-Jamahiriya."

"Why do you Libyans want Gaddafi gone?" <http://www.libyafeb17.com/2011/02/why-do-you-libyans-want-gaddafi-gone-here-are-some-reasons/>

"**The peculiar unwritten law of forbidding the mention of the names of any Libyan official by the national media accept those of himself and immediate members of his family.** In football no names of players were allowed to be mentioned except that of his son because Gaddafi regarded stardom as a political crime."

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/south-africans-say-gadhafi-himself-gave-them-misinformation-on-dead-journalist/2011/05/20/AFJbJe7G_story.html

"**The Committee to Protect Journalists said journalists covering the fighting in territory controlled by Gadhafi have been particularly at risk,** but that the front line has been fluid, making it difficult for reporters to stay in relatively safe areas. CPJ Mideast specialist Mohamed Abdel Dayem said more than a dozen journalists, including U.S. freelancer Matthew VanDyk, are missing in Libya. Others include Libyan reporters or Libyans who worked as assistants to foreign journalists. Abdel Dayem said it has been especially difficult to get information about the missing Libyans. Hammerl is the fifth journalist killed in Libya since fighting began in February, according to CPJ."

"Al Jazeera staffer killed in Libya"

<http://english.aljazeera.net/news/africa/2011/03/2011312192359523376.html>

An Al Jazeera cameraman has been killed in what appears to have been an ambush near the rebel-held city of Benghazi in eastern Libya. Ali Hassan Al Jaber was returning to Benghazi from a nearby town after filing a report from an opposition protest when unknown fighters opened fire on a car he and his colleagues were travelling in. *"This is an extension of the campaign against Al Jazeera, and Al Jazeera Arabic particularly - because everyone here watch Al Jazeera Arabic. Their work has been heroic, and it has been a great shock to lose a colleague."*

Crimes against Humanity and War crimes

"The United Nations referral to the International Criminal Court of the massacres of unarmed civilians committed by the Libyan régime".(Heading of UN Press release following the Security Council's adoption of Resolution 1970 (26 February 2011):

IN SWIFT, DECISIVE ACTION, SECURITY COUNCIL IMPOSES TOUGH MEASURES ON LIBYAN REGIME; Situation Referred to International Criminal Court.

<http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2011/sc10187.doc.htm>

Excerpt:

*"Deploring what it called **“the gross and systematic violation of human rights”** in strife-torn Libya, the Security Council this evening **demanded an end to the violence and decided to refer the situation to the International Criminal Court** while imposing an arms embargo on the country and a travel ban and assets freeze on the family of Muammar Al-Qadhafi and certain Government officials.*

*"In their explanations of vote, Council members **welcomed the unanimity of the action** and expressed solidarity with the people of Libya, hoping that their **“swift and decisive”** intervention would help bring them relief."*

"Gaddafi investigated by ICC over promoting rape as war policy", 8 June

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/jun/08/gaddafi-investigated-icc-rape-policy>

Moreno-Ocampo orders investigation after witnesses confirm government buying containers of Viagra-type drugs . The chief prosecutor of the International Criminal Court is likely to add rape to the [war crimes](#) charges against Colonel Muammar Gaddafi on the back of mounting evidence that sexual attacks on women are being used as a weapon in the conflict.

Luis Moreno-Ocampo told reporters at the UN building in New York that **there were strong indications that hundreds of Libyan women had been raped in the Libyan government's clampdown on the popular uprising, and that Gaddafi himself had ordered the violations as a form of punishment.** The prosecutor said there was even evidence that the government had been handing out doses of Viagra to soldiers to encourage sexual attacks. Moreno-Ocampo said that rape was a new tactic for the Libyan regime. *"That's why we had doubts at the beginning, but now we are more convinced. Apparently, [Gaddafi] decided to punish, using rape."*

"Gaddafi's Mass Rape and Drugs Charges" **African Dictator- Reminding theWorld**

http://www.africandictator.org/?p=2357&utm_source=rss&utm_medium=rss&utm_campaign=gaddafi%25e2%2580%2599s-mass-rape-and-drugs-charges

It started out as an outburst last month at the UN Security Council by US Ambassador Susan Rice, who asserted that Gaddafi's troops had been armed with Viagra and told to rape women as part of their attempts to regain control of strife-torn Libya. At the time, evidence was scanty- and based on the testimony of one or two people, and Rice drew criticism for the outlandish claims. Now it would appear that she's been vindicated. Stories of large shipments of drugs meant to enhance sexual performance were delivered to Libyan forces, and no less an authority than Luis Moreno-Ocampo, chief prosecutor of the International Criminal Court is considering adding the charge of mass rape to the list he already has against Gaddafi, Gaddafi's son and his spy chief.

“But now we are getting some information that Gaddafi himself decided” to authorize the rapes, *“and this is new,”* Moreno-Ocampo said. ***“It never was the pattern he used to control the population. The rape is a new aspect of the repression,”*** he said. *“Apparently, he decided to punish using rapes.”* The prosecutor said it was difficult to know how widespread the rape was but he had received information there were several hundred victims in some areas. **Groups of women have since come forward to back up these allegations, saying that they were kidnapped by Libyan forces and gang raped, with the intention being to use the brutality to “send a message” to rebel forces.**

"International court prosecutor finds grounds for charges against Gaddafi forces", 3 May
http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/international-court-prosecutor-finds-grounds-for-charges-against-gaddafi-forces/2011/05/03/AFPOLFiF_story.html

There are “reasonable grounds” to charge Moammar Gaddafi's security forces with having committed war crimes and crimes against humanity during their crackdown on Libyan protesters, according to the chief prosecutor for the International Criminal Court.

The prosecutor, Argentine lawyer Luis Moreno-Ocampo, has said in a report to the U.N. Security Council that his investigators have established preliminary but “credible” estimates that at least 500 to 700 civilians have been shot to death by government forces. Moreno-Ocampo said he intends in the next few weeks to submit his first application for arrest warrants against officials “most responsible for crimes against humanity” in Libya since Feb. 15. The abuses, he noted, are ongoing."

Security Council Refers Libya to ICC (Human Rights Watch)

<http://www.hrw.org/en/news/2011/02/27/un-security-council-refers-libya-icc>

"The United Nations Security Council's unanimous resolution (170?)referring Libya to the International Criminal Court (ICC). The resolution adopted on February 26, 2011, referred the crisis in Libya to the ICC, imposed travel bans on key Libyan leaders, and froze their assets. The UN General Assembly is expected to consider a resolution this coming week to suspend Libya from the Human Rights Council, following last week's condemnation of Libya at a special Human Rights Council session"

"Libya: Crimes against humanity", 21 May 2011 (**Youtube**)

<http://english.aljazeera.net/programmes/frostovertheworld/2011/05/2011521143658986432.html>

Will the International Criminal Court's charges against Muammar Gaddafi and key officials bring justice for Libyans?

"This week the International Criminal Court (ICC) asked for warrants for the arrest of Muammar Gaddafi, the Libyan leader, his son Saif, and his intelligence head for what the

prosecution describes as the "widespread and systematic attacks on civilians" resulting in deaths. But does such a move do anything to help Libyan civilians in practice, or do such legal proceedings prove to be a hindrance? Will it improve the situation in Libya? What would such intervention mean to Libyans? Is the ICC obsessed over crimes that are taking place in Africa, or is targeting African leaders a way of leveling the odds?

Sir David Frost is joined by Philippe Sands, an international lawyer, and David Rieff, an author and activist from New York, to discuss the ICC's move."

"Libya's deputy ambassador at UN calls on ICC to prosecute Gaddafi", February 21, 2011
<http://www.sudantribune.com/Libya-s-deputy-ambassador-at-UN,38071>

"The Libyan deputy ambassador to the United Nations called on the prosecutor of the International Criminal Court (ICC) Luis Moreno-Ocampo **to investigate what he described as genocide and crimes against humanity committed by Muammar Gaddafi during the ongoing unrest in the country.** Graphic videos and images of disfigured bodies in Libya are flooding the Internet and YouTube. Eyewitnesses say that in many parts of the country corpses are lying on the streets while hospitals are struggling to keep up with the flow of dead bodies and injured people.

The reality behind Gaddafi's vaunted assistance to black Africa

"Gaddafi's Systematic destabilization of Black Africa", 5 March 2011

<http://www.metro.co.uk/news/858166-revealed-colonel-gaddafis-school-for-scoundrels>

"Colonel Muammar Gaddafi is infamous for abuses he has inflicted on his own people but less well known is a campaign of carnage he inspired across Africa and Latin America."

Revealed: Colonel Gaddafi's school for scoundrels 'Gaddafi's World Revolutionary Center (WRC) near Benghazi, Libya, became, as scholar Stephen Ellis noted in his 2001 book, *The Mask Of Anarchy*, the "Harvard and Yale of a whole generation of African revolutionaries", many of them the continent's most notorious tyrants.' The desert training camps taught weapons and intelligence techniques, with doses of ideology from Gaddafi's Green Book. 'Courses lasted from a few weeks to more than a year, depending on the level of specialisation and rank one had,' says Farah.

"Gaddafi also intervened militarily in the Central African Republic in 2001. The president he protected, Ange-Félix Patassé, signed a deal giving Libya a 99-year lease to exploit all of the country's natural resources, including uranium, copper, diamonds and oil.' 'Another recruit, Foday Sankoh of Sierra Leone's Revolutionary United Front (RUF), would be standing trial in the same court for similar crimes had he not died of natural causes.'

Compaoré, the current president of Burkina Faso, is another WRC graduate.

In 1987, troops loyal to him assassinated his best friend, president Thomas Sankara, to pave the way for him to take power. Compaoré sent troops and resources to back both Taylor's insurgency in Liberia and the RUF in Sierra Leone. A 2002 United Nations investigation found Compaoré played a significant role in arming them in violation of a UN arms embargo."

How the mighty are falling: The beginning of the end of impunity for the world's once all-powerful thugs, Economist, 5 May 2011,
http://www.economist.com/node/9441341?story_id=9441341

"Justice may also be catching up with Hissène Habré, Chad's former president. After living in exile in Senegal for the past 17 years, he is now facing trial before a special war-crimes court set up by the Senegalese government earlier this year on the orders of the African Union. It was only after Belgium had threatened to try Mr Habré under its "universal jurisdiction" law that African leaders decided to abandon their tradition of mutual protection and vote for his prosecution by one of their own."

Similarity of the Anti-apartheid, American civil rights and Libyan conflicts

"Klan Bombing of Birmingham Church 1963"

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q-MuWDsv5pg&feature=related>

The similarities with the terrible human rights violations inflicted by the Gadaffi's régime on Eastern Libyans is remarkable. Why should people on the left condemn the one crime but ignore the other?

"We Were There - Birmingham 1963"

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aFqEma-Wgvc&feature=related>

"Alabama blacks allegedly broke the law because they dared to demonstrate peacefully for their rights - exactly what the Benghazi and other Eastern Libyans have done, no more. They also broke the law by doing so, e.g. the Law that made dissent unlawful. The 16th street church bombing by forces loyal to Wallace was no different, qualitatively, that Gadaffi's long range artillery bombing of the civilian population. Both targeted unarmed, civilians for daring to protest peacefully: both wanted to keep the target population in subjugation."

Sharpeville ([youtube](#))

<http://www.sahistory.org.za/pages/governance-projects/sharpeville/menu.htm>

"From a massacre to freedom" ([youtube](#))

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pSocDxxvxNw>

A 92-year old black South African woman remembers the Sharpeville massacre. Injured in South Africa's Sharpeville massacre half a century ago, Mamai Moloso stayed away from her hometown for decades, as the protest movement aiming to topple apartheid grew. The 92-year-old recently returned, but feared further persecution when the police knocked on her door. Little did she know, however, the officers weren't there to escort her anywhere other than to her new home, given to her by the government.

The Sharpeville massacre, 21 March 1960 <http://www.blackpast.org/?q=gah/sharpeville-massacre>

"On March 21, **an estimated 7,000 Africans gathered in front of the Sharpeville police station to protest against the restrictive pass laws.** Nearly 300 police officers arrived to put an end to the peaceful protest. As they attempted to disperse the crowd, a police officer was knocked down and many in the crowd began to move forward to see what had happened. Police witnesses claimed that stones were thrown, and in a panicked and rash reaction, the officers opened fire into the crowd. Other witnesses claimed there was no order to open fire, and the police did not fire a warning shot above the crowd. **As the thousands of African tried to flee the violent scene, police continued to shoot into the crowd. Sixty-nine Africans were killed and 186 were wounded with most shot in**

the back. "

"The Sharpeville Massacre awakened the international community to the horrors of apartheid. The massacre also sparked hundreds of mass protests by black South Africans, many of which were ruthlessly and violently crushed by the South African police and military. On March 30, the South African government declared a state of emergency which made any protest illegal. The ban remained in effect until August 31, 1960. During those five months roughly 25,000 people were arrested throughout the nation. The South African government then created the Unlawful Organizations Act of 1960 which banned anti-apartheid groups such as the Pan Africanist Congress and the African National Congress."

"The South African's government's repressive measures in response to the Sharpeville Massacre, however, intensified and expended the opposition to apartheid, ushering in three decades of resistance and protest in the country and increasing condemnation by world leaders. With the election of Nelson Mandela as President of South Africa in 1994, the apartheid system ended. Symbolically in 1994, Mandela signed the nation's first post-apartheid constitution near the site of the 1960 massacre."

The 'Anti-imperialist' Left deconstructed

Imperialist help given to past revolutions

Guy Rundle, "Libya and the anti-imperialist left 2 – ideology, audacity and politics"

<http://blogs.crikey.com.au/thestump/2011/03/17/libya-and-the-anti-imperialist-left-2-ideology-audacity-and-revolution/>

"Contrary to the absolute judgements of the AI (Anti-imperialist) left, there are plenty of cases where drawing in imperial powers to help make a revolution meets with success – from the Bolsheviks' intensive involvement with the Germans, then courting of the English, then the Germans again, before setting up a bunch of capitalist 'zones' with US capital in 1921-2, to the monarchist French involvement in the American revolution, Tito's active involvement with the Allies in WW2, the Irish attempt to get French and German help in 1793 and 1914 respectively, Bose drawing on Japanese help to form the Indian National liberation army in the 1940s, and one could go on."

Geo-strategic difference between Libya in 2011 and Iraq and Afghanistan

Australian sociologist, Mark Bahnisch, "The Left battles ideology while Libyans fight for democracy", <http://www.abc.net.au/unleashed/45256.html>

"There is, in all truth, very little in common between Iraq in 2003 and Libya in 2011. In Libya, violent and deadly battle has been joined, and an oppressed people has risen up. The request for military assistance is really much more a properly political request than a question of humanitarianism. As such, it requires a response, and Rundle is right to say that demand polarises those who do not respond affirmatively and those prepared to, whatever the tactical niceties or potential risks of action."

Geo-strategic Difference between Libya and Syria (ref to Bahrein & Yemen)

"Doomsday scenario' if Syria fails" (May 2)

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/unrest-in-syria-threatens-regional-stability/2011/05/01/AF3OQtUF_story.html

"The toppling of the presidents in Tunisia and Egypt precipitated a tumult of revolutionary fervor that promises to transform the Middle East, but the potential collapse of the Syrian regime could wreak havoc of a very different kind. In Syria, the fall of President Bashar al-Assad would unleash a cataclysm of chaos, sectarian strife and extremism that spreads far beyond its borders, threatening not only the entrenched rulers already battling to hold at bay a clamor for democratic change but also the entire balance of power in the volatile region, analysts and experts say."

"Syria's minority Shiite Alawite government overseeing a majority Sunni population, its strategic location and its web of alliances including the radical Hamas and Hezbollah movements, regime change could look a lot more like it did in Iraq than in Egypt — and the ramifications could prove even more profound."

"If the regime collapses you will have civil war and it will spread throughout the region," engulfing Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and beyond, said Hilal Khashan, professor of political science at the American University of Beirut. "A collapse of the Syrian regime is a doomsday scenario for the entire Middle East."

"Many believe that is why the international community, including the United States, has offered such a tempered response to the bloodshed in Syria, the latest Arab country to be swept up in the unrest roiling the region. NATO warplanes are bombing Libya to protect civilians there, but there have been no calls even for Assad to step aside, despite an increasingly violent crackdown by the Syrian military in which at least 550 people have died. On Sunday, hundreds of people were detained as the military swept through towns and villages raiding homes in search of those who participated in recent protests, human rights groups said."

"Sierra Leone: one place where Tony Blair remains an unquestioned hero"

<http://www.visitsierraleone.org/Sierra-Leone-News/Daily/Sierra-Leone-one-place-where-Tony-Blair-remains-an-unquestioned-hero.html>

"A decade after its civil war, Sierra Leone is still desperately poor but is grateful for Britain's intervention.....In the streets of Freetown at the time the graffiti read: "Queen Elizabeth for king!" and "Return to us our colonial mother!" Tony Blair remains more popular here than anywhere else on the planet....Several Sierra Leoneans said they would personally campaign for Blair to be the country's president."

Under what circumstances are targeted assassinations legal in international law?

Legality of Targeted Killing, 22 January, 2010, (Kazi Anwarul Masud, South Asia Analysis Group) <http://www.southasiaanalysis.org/%5Cpapers37%5Cpaper3682.html>

Regardless of the debate constancy remains on targeted killing of political leaders during war time if they become part of the command and control structure of the warring parties. Professor Louis Rene Beres (of Purdue University) argues that (a) no crime without punishment is a sacred principle of international law; (b) where known perpetrators of crimes can not be punished through normal judicial remedy (i.e. extradition and prosecution) the criminals have to be punished extra-judicially , and assassination may be the least injurious form of such punishment; (c) **the right of self defense as codified in article 51 of the UN Charter and customary right of anticipatory and pre-emptive attack could include assassination as a distinct law enforcing measure.**

Justification sought in assassinating foreign leaders must have the two essential invariant that they must be terrorists and their crimes can not be remedied through normal judicial process."

"Assassination" <http://www.enotes.com/genocide-encyclopedia/assassination>

"Under most circumstances, international law prohibits state-sponsored assassination. The United Nations Charter prohibits the aggressive use of force by one state against another. The Charter also prohibits interfering in the territory or affairs of another state. Chapter I of the Charter requires that all states must "settle their international disputes by peaceful means" and must "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force". When a state sponsors the assassination of the leader of another state, it violates this basic rule of international law."

"However, there are two important exceptions to this rule. First, state-sponsored "targeted killings" may sometimes be legal during times of war. *Under the law of war, two states that are at war with each other may kill soldiers in the opposing army. The killing of enemy soldiers is not considered illegal assassination because during a war soldiers are said to have a legal "privilege" to kill their enemies. This privilege extends to military leaders, whos are often considered fair game as "command-and-control" targets. In some cases, government officials may be fair targets if they are part of the military chain of command.*"

"The second exception to the general prohibition against state-sponsored assassination is the exception for self-defense. Article 51 of the United Nations Charter grants states an "inherent right" to self-defense if an armed attack against them occurs. If assassination is used as self-defense it may be legal under international law. The self-defense exception does not require that the state be at war, but the assassination must meet the definition of a legitimate act of self-defense."

"Time to Kill? State Sponsored Assassination and international Law", World International Community Experts, 12 February 2004 <http://world-ice.com/Articles/Assassinations.pdf>
ASSASSINATION: THE USE OF LETHAL FORCE

"International law permits the use of lethal force in two cases.¹ These are broadly (i) law enforcement measures and (ii) in self defence. The second category of legitimised lethal force is under the "self defence" provision in Article 51 of the U.N. Charter. Both categories of lethal force are problematic in attempting to justify an assassination. A collateral noteworthy point is that either category may enjoy U.N. Security Council endorsement. "

"The second possibility of using lethal force (as assassination) is under the "self defence" provision in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.² Under Article 51, a state enjoys an inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a member of the U.N. By this reasoning 'lethal force' is a response to "war" and not a "mere crime". The labeling of the assassination target as being involved in "armed conflict" raises the issue of humanitarian law protecting the right to life. The state sponsoring the assassination is also required to comply with the "Caroline Incident" rules as the use of force must be "necessary", it must comply with notions of "proportionality", and it must minimise civilian casualties. So too must other elements of humanitarian law be complied

with."

Postscript

When one cuts through all the ideological, geopolitical, and sophistic chaff, the net result of all the arguments I have seen put forward by those who oppose NATO's action in Libya, if indeed they were to be heeded, would be:

(1) Qaddafi remains in power with his capacity, intact, to wreak doomsday vengeance on hapless Libyan citizens who merely desire to enjoy some of the political rights and freedoms that Caricom nationals have long taken for granted;

(2) The insurgent population would be put to the sword in an immense bloodbath, the proportions of which those of us who have some knowledge of what Qaddafi has actually done to his people in the past, can only imagine.

When we make proposals for people who face life-threatening situations, especially when we insist on applying more or less rigid principles or standards in so doing, we have the moral duty to envisage the possible or probable consequences of such proposals on the people concerned. If any one still has illusions about the ruthless character, the unbalanced mind, and the amoral nature of the individual under discussion, a look at Qaddafi's "bible" (his (in)famous "Green Book"), the contents of which he reaffirmed on national TV a few weeks ago as the rules by which Libyans would continue to be governed, should have the effect of a cold shower.