
Oil Politics and War in Libya: Arming of Rebels and the New Phase of Neo-Democracy Evaluated

Okechukwu, Groupson-Paul, Department of Political Science, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

Abstract: *This paper examines the conflict in Libya in the context of international politics in the role of alliances against the hate regime of Gadhafi. Under Islamic socialism, Libya embraced globalization – trade liberalization in the recent past, but, yet, its leader remained a threat to many. The findings revealed the over zealousness of actors to capture, control and appropriate the national wealth of Libya – the oil, under a hocus – pocus paradigm of Neo-Democracy. The hate expressions, premeditated acts, propaganda and blackmail formed part of the contour that escalated the conflict. This, thus call for questioning and, the re-examinations of the role of the International communities and the United Nations in the arming of rebels/insurgence and the sponsoring of violence in a sovereign state under any platform. For, if the destructions in Libya was due to a particular individual or groups interest, then, grave implications on the global World remains a time bomb vis-à-vis the new phase of Neo-Democracy.*

Keywords: Oil Politics, Neo-Democracy, War, Army of Rebels, Conspiracy, Libya.

1. Introduction

Libya, meshed in the continuum of the Arab world unrest in the present time, with long over stayed; and long endured people and society, that had lived under a benevolent dictator paradigm of the Gaddafi dynasty, that according Jones (2011:2) the cause of the unrest and war is a global problem requiring global monetary and economic reforms, that whose cause is the economic conditions, the primacy of material conditions of existence, and the distributions of wealth; the effect is sectarian, political, national division and unrest. Meaning that, Libyans could be likened to a people who live under a closed system, with over bearing pressure, that the authority is always checkmating and been able to contain the pressure for a while, even when

the pressure might have build up with time and at a certain point, the present, exceed the strength of the system, thereby causing it to crack.

This, being part of the situation we saw in Libya, that played out its own rhythm, but could that be the factor that created the sudden wake-up of the people after forty-two years ? Or is there a new factor of issues hinged on freedom and Neo-democracy - the western democracy, that arouse the venoms of the protesters, later turned rebels-insurgence to call for democratic reforms, whereas in reality, they are calling for better economic life on one hand, and on the other, they want open socioeconomic system that democracy and its pressure could be dissipated through elections and peaceful change of government. Although, democracy is only a means to an end (Dahl, 1954), even as the driving forces to the Libyan revolution cum war might have been centred on the above mentioned factors, economic factor with other issues like chronic high unemployment rate, poverty among others had combined with an inflation in food prices that are volatile mix. Though, surprisingly too, no one is talking about the economy with loud voice, but neo-democracy and freedom. Meaning that the real force propelling the unrest is beyond both the people and Col. Gadhafi combined. A feature that might have led to the civic class outburst, to agreeing with David Hume (cited in Cantrill, 1967:102) that we recall our sense of justice and sympathy, and permit injustice and enmity to take their place in driving home every act of frustration and deprivation with aggression.

Beside these, the tendency that there are other salient but powerful factors that might have mitigated this turn of event in Libya is not in any way ruled out. Such issues as a payback time to a long hysteria – enemy of the west, who the young leaders of the western extraction, hungry with broken economy, penniless with unimaginable bailout upon bailout, that the present economic status of their states never favoured their regimes are restless and wished re-colonising some states to become pennywise are possible. With sentiments driving them to remember with vividness and vengefulness, the acts of the old enemy of the west that swims in oil wealth in the Maghreb, with no debt record to them or any in the world, who was once the cause and

problem of their enormous squander in the past leading to the present wreckages of bailout and recessions – “the Gaddafi dynasty, must be revisited, they tortuously muted” (Friesen, 2011:4).

Furthermore, and just as the Arab adage puts it, the hand that you cannot cut, kiss it, and Gaddafi on the other hands is not a hand that they can kissed, but must be cut. Thus, the ploy and forces for oil politics and war in Libya was intensified. Against this folding event, the view of Jones (2011:2) is highly appreciated when he notes that rulers who learn from history and create a socioeconomic system that is open will achieve stability and continuity while those who fight against the socioeconomic laws may win some battles in the short term, but will lose the war. A notion that invariably amplified the western rulers desires under the robotic United Nations to arm the Libyan rebels cum insurgency in order to win the war by all means.

While this may be seen simply as part of the process of moving towards the new world order and part of the shift of power from the West to the East, one question that strikes the minds is – do the international community’s (40 countries) arming of the rebels to ousted a long time legitimate regime of Col Muammar Gadhafi in the name of establishing Neo-democracy in Libya the right actions? Is the oil politics antic not so obvious and glaring and a devastating paradigm towards re-colonising a sovereign state like Libya no matter the odds on the table? Should one agrees that the booting out of Gaddafi from a nation that is not in any way indebted to the outside world or neighbours is a good measure toward forcing such a state into indebtedness? What was the level of casualty against the protesters and people of Libya prior to the period of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) arms bombardment of Libya that should warrant the former killing innocent civilians under the watchful eye of the UN human rights propagandist that had remained silent while in supports of their masters’ oil – money seekers want to annex and control Libyan oil wells even when the war of forty nations against Gaddafi had not ended.

However, in evaluating these pieces, the inquiry will pay attention to the role and place of conspiracy theory and

possible frustration-aggression theory with adequate problematic issue underpinned.

2 Libya in the History

Libya, with a vast territory whose desert concealed a considerable oil and gas resources in huge quantity, is not new to international politics and the politicking in market values. Although, this territory combined with its present neighbours of Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia fall within the sphere of colonies that encouraged the German defeat of the French in 1871 and the consequent inevitability factors that sparked – off the first world war of 1914 to 1918 away from the European internal quagmires (Khadar, 2011:1-2).

With about 6.2 million population, the Libyan oil that gush out over 2 million barrel per day and another 3.5 billion natural gas per day accounts for over 35 billion dollars of every revenue alone, thereby making Libya one of the richest countries in Africa. According to Thudicey (2008:104), yes, Libya was not new to the antic of international politics and politicking in market value, simply because the then king Idris Al-Senoussi had between 1959 to 1969 traded-off most of the country's values, with oil, gas, and cobalt inclusive to the colonialist who he played the puppet-surrogates to. Benefitting from the sale of this oil were the Italians, the British and the Americans. King Idris had developed pro-western policies that saw the establishment of the British and American military bases at Tripoli before the sack of the monarch.

The Libyan Monarch, King Idris Al- Senoussi was overthrown on the 1st Sept. 1969 by a young military officer, Col. Mu'ammr Gadhafi. He was brought in via the winds of change sweeping through African continent by way of the military barrels. At the period, across the North African states in particular, starting from Egypt in 1952, Sudan in 1958, Algeria in 1962, 1965 amongst others (Okechukwu, 2009:73-74); Gadhafi found Gen Nasser exploit in Egypt as encouraging virtue worthy to emulate. He was inspired by this military sagacity of Nasser and thereafter declared himself as the spiritual heir to of Nasser (Khadar, 2011).

Against the general discontent, exploitation, corruption and lopsided economy that were encouraged by the western

imperialist, Col. Gadhafi in assuming power requested the closure of all foreign military bases, nationalized all the banks, oil firms with the confiscation of properties and allowed for indigenous control of the economy. The Italian, British American and other allies were the worst hit by this drive toward improving the lives of the citizenry that had been decimated and distorted under the imperial influence. The regime soon established a direct link with the then Soviet Union as his 'Green Book was published to declare Libya an Islamic – Socialist State. This Islamic socialism, otherwise called Jamahiriya socialism is a system of direct democracy, where he argued that power and democracy are what make the people unique and that peoples' power should be the centre of every governance. The irony of this pronouncement and its publication compared to what followed the regime's power-crazy drive, did not only made mess of the political idea of Islamic socialism, but it destroyed the basis of his coming to power eight years later.

Following this power dictatorship of Col. Gadhafi, Libyan at home was perpetually caged against any form of dissension against the government. The ideals of the Islamic socialism stated to dwindle and eventually became questionable when the once accepted leader involved in materialism and property acquisitions. Towards the crazy for more and possibly to attain fame, Gadhafi under pride and prestige engulfed himself in dirty and unexpected rackets with arsonist, kidnappers, murders, and men and women who were anti-human race, as he sponsored, aid and monitor annihilators world over. To the poor Africans, he became a benevolent dictator. He also indulges in sponsoring illegal regimes change as occurred in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Burkinafaso, Chad and Niger republics amongst others.

Furthermore, as the saying goes tell me who your friend(s) is and I will tell you who you are! Was the case of Gadhafi. He fraternized with the Arab extremist and anti human groups, who kill in the name of God, hate in the name of God and destroyed in the name of God. A clandestine totem that had been used by villain men to cause confusion in the society and the world in general. According to Jones (2008), Khadar (2011), HRW (1988) Amnesty International (2000), Anderson (2011) and Abaza (2001) amongst others, Gadhafi's wealth and the country's

status must have driven his craze to antagonize the same people he pledged to protect in 1969. Khadar (2011) while viewing the idea of Gadhafi dialoguing with the tribes men and at the same time brutalized them was one of the undoing of the regime twenty years after. Agreeing with thus contention, Abaza (2011) noted that what actually cleared the doubts of all suspicions against the regime was its anti – west, with anti – American rhetoric by the Libya leader in particular, being pronounced as one of the unbecoming character of a man who claimed to be a – masses oriented leader. To worsen the issue was the event that took place at the peak of cold war, when Gadhafi severed the relationship with USSR (Khadar, 2011). A contradiction that pride, wealth and prestige helped his ignorance of ‘pay day coming’ to believe so much in himself.

Across the Mediterranean, the United States and its allies in Europe fingered Gadhafi as being responsible for the terror attack in 1985; the aiding of the 1988 Scottish airline bombing which claimed the lives of all the crews and passengers. This heinous attacks and other mindless sentiments of Gadhafi, coupled with his anti – American propaganda, the then U.S. President Ronald Regean in 1986 launched attack on the Gadhafi compound in Tripoli while the master minder of the Lockeribe bombing Mohammed Meagrahi was jailed for life. Gadhafi – Libya was declared a terrorist and a rogue state by the western world. Gadhafi on the other hand, not relenting engaged in multibillion dollar nuclear energy plant meant to produce weapons of mass destruction (Alain, 2011:18).

However, the events of 2003, to which the US and its allies invaded Iraq made Col. Gadhafi to down – played his intentions of building weapons of mass destruction. Against the fate of Saddam Hussein, Gadhafi adopted the Arab proverb “the hand that you cannot cut, kiss it”, by dismantling all the nuclear plants. He encouraged open of the economics system and by 2004; Libya welcomed many world leader – friends and former foes to attend the first ever international trade fair that was solely organized to boost investment opportunities of the king of the maghrebs. According Khadar (2011:4) and Alain (2011:6) Gadhafi’s metamorphosis was adjudged a miraculous situation. This is

because a rogue state has been rehabilitated and has even been raised to the rank of a friendly state (Clausder, 2007:15). The white house, in its characteristic manner according to Merriden (2008), 'Libya has taken an important step and it follows that it has begun to do what it takes to join the international community'. In the words of Khadar (2011) the man the west booed, harassed, vilified and called mad dog of mad Libya was now seen as a political realism, respectable man that one can invite and cajole... Thus, in line with the trade liberalization processes, opening up and complete globalization policies in full implementation, Gadhafi was advised by the west to toe Neo-democracy to which he also set the stage going on that area before the unfortunate incidence. Although, the process was slow as he would have prayed that the successor comes from his lineage prior to the unrest in the Arab world to which Libya was never an exception.

3 Conceptual Basis of Argument

This piece adopts conspiracy theory with little a digression into frustration – aggression theory to explaining to the world why the western leaders spearheaded by French President Nicholas Sarkozy, American President Barack Obama and the British Prime Minister David Cameron amongst others wants Col Muammar Gadhafi to go by all means. Conspiracy theory being the most destructive scheme in the politics of the plot to destroy; the politics of confirmation of an accused that must be destroyed and cheap blackmail against an accused among others was used to condemn Gadhafi while frustration-aggression theory was used to incite the citizenry against their leader, as the Arab World was misled to destroyed Col. Gadhafi.

Thus, Libya, with a huge wealth and stable system under a benevolent – dictator, whose people never complained except the fact that it was closed to the predators and vultures, who actually since 2004 after the trade liberalization and opening up scheme of globalization and, to which the investment friendly banner was hosted, had never had a fair share of the essence of removing all the trade barriers in Libya, hence they needed a Judas to help

them to expose the ills of the so long a quiet country. In the words of Khadar (2011:1-2) Libya with lavished incomes could become a major business centre, even a financial hub in the maghreb if not checkmated by the west and, or possibly allowed to partake in the politics of oil dealings among others. In the development that follows, this work will vividly look at the conspiracy theory in its merit with a slight mentioning of the frustration-aggression theory by the way and, as affecting the Libyans in the linkage.

3.1 Conspiracy Theory

According to American Heritage Dictionary (2004:257) conspiracy is the act of seeking to explain a disputed case or matter as a plot by a secret group or alliance rather than an individual or isolated act. Meaning that conspiracy theory tends to explain an event as being the result of an alleged plot by a covert group or organization or more broadly the idea that important political, social or economic events are the products of secret plots that are largely unknown to the general public.

The scholars of this school like David Pipes (1998), Milton W. Cooper (1991), David Icke (2004), Michael Barkun (2003), Harry G. West (2003), Todd Sanders (2003), Young Katherine K. (2010) and Frank P. Mintz (1985) among others had argued that conspiracy theory are based on the notion that complex plots are put into motion by powerful hidden forces. Agreeing with this view Barkun (2003:3) holds that a conspiracy theory is a belief which explains an event as the result of a secret plot by exceptionally powerful and cunning conspirators to achieve a malevolent end. He clearly points out that conspiracy theories are often presented as special, secret knowledge unknown or unappreciated by others. It is a scheme in which the masses are the brainwashed herd, while the conspiracy theorists in the know can congratulate themselves on penetrating the plotters' deception.

In support of the contention above, Young (2010:275) argued that not all conspiracies are imagined by paranoids. Instead events had show that every real conspiracy has had at least four characteristics features: groups, not isolated individuals, illegal or sinister aims, not ones that would

benefit society as a whole; orchestrated acts, not a series of spontaneous and haphazard ones; and secret planning, not public discussion. Pipes (1998:15) agreeing with Young also noted that there are five assumptions distinguishing the conspiracy theorist from more conventional patterns of thought: appearances deceive, conspiracies drive history; nothing is haphazard, the enemy always gains, power, fame, money and sex account for all. In yet another postulation, but with contrast, Chomsky (2002:17) asserts that conspiracy theory is more or less the opposite of institutional analysis, which focuses mostly on the public, long-term behaviour of publicly known institutions, as recorded in, for example, scholarly documents or mainstream media reports, rather than secretive conditions of individual.

Arguing from a different of view point, Mintz (1985:4) submits that the notion of conspiracy was popularized by the academic group. He argued that it devotes belief in the primacy of conspiracies in the unfolding of event or history. Furthermore, given this popular understanding of the term conspiracy theory, it can also be used illegitimately and inappropriately, as a means to dismiss what are in fact substantial and well – evidenced accusations. The legitimacy of each such usage will therefore be a matter of some controversy (Young, 2010:282).

Although, it is evidence that throughout human history, political and economic leaders genuinely have been the cause of enormous amounts of death and misery, and they sometimes have engaged in conspiracies while at the same time promoting conspiracy theories about their targets (Mintz, 1985:6). The humanistic psychologists in agreeing with this notions aptly state that even if the cabal behind the conspiracy is almost always perceived as hostile there is, often, still an element of reassurance in it, for conspiracy theorists, in part because it is more consoling to think that complications and upheavals in human affairs, at least, are created by human beings rather than factors beyond human control.

However, when reviewing the contention of Barkun (2003), Mintz (1985) and the view of the Humanistic Psychologists, it is evidence if strongly suggested that there are linkage of the events that unfolded in Libya with the antics of the western leaders' determination to do away with

the perceived eternal enemy – Col Muammar Gadhafi by all means. The view of Mintz (1985) also show case the fact that the conspiracy against Gadhafi apart from been a well structured, has also caused enormous amount of death and misery on the average Libyan citizen, not only on those killed by NATO air strike but also those who were sick and remained unattended to; those hungry and might have died of misery; and, those died of traumatisation and shocks owing to the firing powers of war. This, thereby making the assertions of the humanistic psychologists to hold water as pointedly noted that some western cabal were behind the conspiracy since they had perceived Gadhafi as an eternal enemy. Meaning that, it is in a bid to sustain the conspiracy theory of the western leaders against Gadhafi that the crisis was given a human face. Thus, the idea to inciting the Libyans citizenry against their leader, which actually established the taproot of the unrest through the embodied sentiments of Frustration – Aggression theory.

3.2 Frustration—Aggression Theory

This theory is a product of relative deprivation, emanating from either misrule or mismanagement or otherwise. Scholars of this school are the likes of Keith, A. (1946), Lewis Coser (1956), David Hume (1961), Richard Synder (1957), Gurr Ted Robert (1974) and Cantril Hadley (1967) among others. These scholars argued that men's circumstances changes. However, and what they have learned does not always prove suitable for deriving satisfaction from the changed circumstances, thence, they become frustrated, because there are relative deprivation knocking at their door steps.

Agreeing that incompatible goals, apart from the acts of frustration and deprivation generates conflicts in several ways, Cantril (1967) argued that when we sense conflict between the significance that we bring to a situation and which have worked in the past but seem to have no corresponding role in the present, then emerged a situation of unsatisfied desires, thereby allowing frustration to sets in and, if the tension or conflict that goes with it is not checked, but remains fundamentally unpleasant, of which if

not avoided or overcome and therefore released in expressive non-realistic way, violence eruption.

According to Gurr (1974:22) men rebel when their expectations from the state are not met; when they fail to get satisfaction due to change in circumstance; the frustration men gets and relative deprivation that causes the sense of conflicts among the parties is established. Keith (1946) in support of this notions, argued that destructive behaviour might explain yet another fundamental property of human organism, of which when men are exposed to noxious stimuli to which they cannot avoid, then they might through an innate disposition strike out. The striking out may or may not reduce the frustration, but it seems to be an inherently satisfying response to the tension built up through frustration. Coser (1956) in the same vein noted that aggression and violence were often noted to be the most available measures of releasing tension arising from frustration. Thus, aggression, being both physiological and psychological evidence found in such a situation, helps to extend the tension already built. The basic frustration – aggression theory, he further noted, that the greater the frustration, the greater the quantity of aggression against the source of frustration. Hume (1961) reiterated that these principles operate in wide range of individual behaviour, including the action of those rebelling against their political community. Thus, he concluded by saying that these informed our sense of justice and sympathy, and permit injustice and enmity to take their place in driving home every act of frustration and deprivation with aggression. Meaning that when there is no collective value of satisfaction, that men, society may be disposed to violence. Furthermore, in a society that there are absence of value expectations, value capabilities and value opportunities among others, the frustration – aggression relationship might provide the potential for collective violence.

In view of the above two considered theories of conspiracy theory and frustration – aggression theory being used – or combined in the interplay to ousted the former Libyan strong man, Col. Muammar Gadhafi out of power, it is pertinent to note that the involvement of both can only be accepted with necessary evidence being laid down to drive home the point that it is the conspiracy theory in particular

that encouraged and inspired the Libyan citizens to stage the protest and unrest that led to the rebellion/war in the period under study, owing to long and unhealed pains of frustration, characteristics of bad leaderships.

These contentions agreeing with Jones (2011:1), that if the system in a country is close, it might be able to contain the pressure for a while, but the pressure will build up with time and at a certain point it will exceed the strength of the system thereby causing it to crack. In another instance, when people go under pressure in life, be it economic or otherwise, they might seek support from the people close to them who might be greater than them as frustration sets in (Badran, 2011:10). When such reasons are considered in term of the situation of things in Libya for near – forty-two years, to which the people never protest or revolt and according to Berlusconi (2011) the Libyans love Gadhafi as I was able to see when I went to Libya. It is powerful people who have decided to give life to a new era by trying to oust Gadhafi. This instance and other sentiments that follows probably may justified the notion that it is conspiracy theory that informed or waked up the element of frustration – aggression against the Gadhafi regime.

To ascertain the degree of evidence to conspiracy theory against Gadhafi by the western allies as lead by Nicholas Sarkozy of France, Pottenger and Friesen (2011:1) argued that under the responsibility of protect: the war in Libya was launched but there was no confirmation whatsoever from pentagon that Gadhafi fired on his own people from the air. Meaning that if the war in Libya was fought on the pretext and unjustifiable actions that Gadhafi was killing civilian and the NATO and the United States had the responsibility to come to the rescue of the innocence, then if such a measure is intended to spread falsehood in order to enhance the projection towards getting a targeted enemy, then it is a share conspiracy to committing action against Gadhafi.

In yet another fact that exposed the US and its allies on the conspiracy against Gadhafi, Ruff (2011:4-6) argued that if the USA defence secretary and chief joint of staff (Robert Gates and Marshall Mullen) claim ignorance of the event in Libya, then the question is who is the real war

criminal. Gadhafi or Obama – Sarkozy amongst others. For in the words of Gates (2011), I would notes that the UN Security Council resolution provides no authorization for the use of armed forces. There is no unanimity within NATO for the use of armed force. If this statement were actually true, then, it exposes not only the level of conspiracy and premeditated act of sovereignty violations but also the degree of dirty and awfulness of the International community. Such action also explicates the manner of naivety and greed of using cheap blackmail by the US – NATO mission group to get at their common enemy on the course for their invasion of Libya.

To further state in clear term the element of conspiracy in the invasion, Friesen (2011) noted that despite the fact that Robert Gates and Marshal Mike Mullen relied on the western press report and falsehood, without any confirmation of whether Gadhafi was actually firing at his people, the questions of reasoning is, what happened to the casualty record since before the NATO's arrival, the victim of the unrest number stood at 305 people, but after the invasion the death toll rose to 5,000 people. These numbers are mostly of the NATO air strike. Another question again that struck the mind is who are the real killers of the civilians? What and where is the UN human rights group? What is the western interest in Libya? Contradicting the western interest, Gates (2011) reiterated that we are in the same realm of speculation, pretty much, as everybody else. I haven't seen anything that would give us a better read on the number of rebels that have been killed than you have. He further contended that whether Gadhafi would be prepared to leave voluntarily or not, unless some form of force, whether it is rebels or the ultimately the UN sanctions or western intervention. Meaning that the suspicions, conspiracy and the inciting of the people against Gadhafi was a pure USA diplomacy, since according to Ramsay (2006:65) the idea that more recently the United States has become the home of conspiracy theories because so many high – level prominent conspiracies have been undertaken and uncovered since 1960s, become a real fact, just as it is also adduced that their conspiracy theory would survive only by having some agents to incite the masses as was done by

the C.I.A. agents who was actually enrolled into CIA syndicates by Gadhafi but was in turn used against him.

4 The Hocus—Pocus of Neo-Democracy and Oil Politics in Libya: The Western Interest

The politics of regime change paradox in the Arab world in recent time was not only an eye opener, just as Barack Obama in the Egyptian uprising muted “that we are inspired by the event in Egypt...the government should respect the will of the people...”, whereas unknown to the onlookers the unfolding event in the Arab world is targeted at core – perceived enemies of the west. But it is a common knowledge that the west cannot openly encourage armed rebellion in a state where they will in turn end-up been the only sole arms dealer, monitor and disarmmentee. Hence, every action, criticism, support and sympathy must be hinged on popular governance-democracy. Whether it is a government slated on the more you look, the less you see syndrome, even if it is by way of landslide riggings to actualise the interest of the west. This might be one the reason why Obama repeatedly request that the peoples’ wish be obeyed – Neo-democracy of the western model must be enthroned.

In time past, it is a fact that the United Nations in decrying the level of poverty of development and instabilities in the third world countries in particular, as occasioned by long years of military misrule in its 32nd general assembly that it was opined that from 1995 upward to the present that no military rule will be allowed into the general assembly or tolerated unless such state embraced Neo-democracy (Okechukwu, 2009:82). The idea was generally welcomed by all the countries still under military rule and those relinquishing autocratic rule. In the light of this and within that period many African states’ dictators were encouraged to metamorphose into civilian rule. An act Ojewole (1997) saw as a kind of democratic succession in Africa that is coded soldiers – politicians. This is because they started off as career military officers and later succumbed to the ultimate aphrodisiac of power, with bazooka in their hands

and presidential palace in sight. These soldiers shot their way to power.

Against this development and by the end of 1994 many African leaders has transformed from military rule to civil democratic governance. The system, Neo-democracy, in Africa, Ake (1994:15-18) argued, that the west have laboured so much on their own interest to bringing the system solely for the democratization of the disempowerment in Africa. This is because it goes beyond the transformation of the state and related conditions as they are only interested in what they will gain from the system rather than the development of the indigenous people and society. In support of the above notion, Okafor (2004:1-2) asserts that neo-democracy (liberal democracy) in its *salvafic* mission in Africa could be seen as a failure; because it is like a baby sitter which watches hand-Akimbo as Africa degenerates. Thus, going by this contention as far back as the onset when the same west asked the African leaders to transform from military dictatorship to neo-democracy compliance of the west so that they could last on the throne, they thought it not wise also at then to advise the surrogates that in democracy nobody stays longer than the time allowed. But today, and since then, that the so called allies had been hallucinating on diminishing returns paradigm, to which there had been no change in the political system or development of the states, thereby confirming the earlier assertion of (Ake, 1994) that it is only for what they (west) will gain that the idea of neo-democracy was introduced. For since then, they never complained until now that the west are extremely-economically bankrupt and broke and, are looking for whom to re-colonised that they now thought it right to say that some of the African leaders had overstayed on the throne of their states. And to which the regime of Muammar Gadhafi that was already toeing the line of Neo-democracy was fingered as devious and inhuman. These kinds of value judgment are not only naive, but mischievous with intent towards economic milieu re-colonisation.

Due to the fact that Col Gadhafi to this effect was not only affected because of ignorance's to understanding the present order even when the west through Tony Blair, the former British prime minister acknowledged that Gadhafi is a political realist. Recounting why it shouldn't have been

Gadhafi in this unipolar world, controlled solely by America, after all the processes that had been put in place, Khader (2011:2) noted that Gadhafi metamorphosis was seen as miraculous, whereas in reality it is the result of a simple geopolitical calculation to which the U.S reigns in masterly fashion, and to which Libya does not stand its ground and the American neoconservatives would want to skin him alive if refused to make some changes. Hence, Gadhafi in showing how serious he was puts an end to his weapons of mass destruction programme while paving way for the establishment of the western patterns of democracy. He reconciled with the west and throws open his country air and land space for investors. This fit was seen in 2004 when he embraced the western globalization system with opening up, trade liberalization, removal of all known trade barriers to foreign investment and bilateral trade treaties. The Libyan international trade fair was much talked about. To international commentators, Gadhafi's transformation has brought respect and prestige to the Libyans as life has been given new relief.

However, according to Khader (2011), and Ruff (2011) danger is not completely unfounded. This is because Gadhafi had not handed over the oil wells and gas sources into their hand for control. Their firms (Shell BP, Texaco, Total, Elf Aquine and others) were still been treated as second tier investors. Italy, South Africa, Russia and Japan companies were still in full control of the marketing of the Libyan oil and wealth. Secondly, Gadhafi does not owe any debt in the world and her external reserve is over two hundred billion dollars. At the same time some of the western countries owed the country some substantial amount of dollars. Thirdly, Gadhafi is so slow about embracing a comprehensive tenets of Neo-democracy, probably because his son Serf-Al-Islam is been prepared for such position under the British tutelage for his Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) come 2012, when the country had planned for elections. A terrifying condition that many were not in agreement with, but impatient in seeing Gadhafi not been sincere in upholding his words. Furthermore, the fear of the retention of the same family dynasty is not rule out. Thus, the refusal by some was seen as a good course to making sure that

Gadhafi goes, coupled with a close economic direct investment may be sustained, hence, according to Ashton (2011) Gadhafi was persuaded to nominate trusted and preferably former allies as agents of C.I.A. to which he obliged, but unknown to him that the same men would be used against him in the later days as earlier stated that danger is not completely unfounded. This is because, according to Ashton (2011) revolutions sometimes have the tendency of unlocking darker political forces but hopefully the move towards Neo-democracy in a country where it can help to reinforce the positive aspects rather than the negative is very vital to the west interest.

Afterall, the British – Lord Palmerston’s famous quote about the motivations behind British foreign policy, ‘we have no eternal allies, and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interest are eternal and perpetual, and those interest it is our duty to follow (Encyclopedia Britannica, 1992:411), was rekindled as the war rages on in Tripoli. The irony of the conspiracy theory also saw these groups who called themselves friends of Libya to turn out to honour the name Libya where it turned out also find that Libya has a lots and lots of them indeed. Of course, it always help if they join to get a couple of billion in oil reserves knocking about, which makes the whole friendship thing a bit more cynical to understand that they could defile the NATO bombing to gather to deliberate on Libya oil and how it must be harnessed to solving their own problems (economic recessions) and not that of the purported crying Libyans as portrayed by the western press that Gadhafi had deprived (Reed, 2011:5-6).

Just as the Arab League openly stated that they were mislead into Libya (Ruff, 2011), how are we sure that tomorrow, the United Nations will not say that they were pressured into killing of Gadhafi by the western allies. Even when against all odds, the west and the UN had used Neo-democracy totem as the benchmark to vilify their common enemy or those who disagreed with their nefarious policies of subjugation as was seen in Yugoslavia and Iraq.

Hence, with the hope that building a democratic state will be easier in Libya than elsewhere since Libya has a small relatively homogenous population. Thus, the easing out of Col Gadhafi was cogent and a necessary evil. With

this, the scheming idea of Obama and his allies who hatched the plan had only waited patiently for opportunities to eliminate Gadhafi. This showed the kind of over zealousness, desperate and poor attitude of the French president who was terribly looking for money by all means to finance his re-election as the initial financier is now late. Nicholas Sarkozy becomes the centre of the conspiracy and the pawn to inciting of the Libyans rebels against Gadhafi.

The question that the actors who orchestra the Libya unrest could not answer was why using Neo-democracy totem as the best bet to win the heart of the hallucinating world leaders in order to get rid of Gadhafi? Why did these actors rely on hocus-pocus paradigm to convince the Arab world that Gadhafi was killing his people? Why didn't they come out to state their categorical interest on the Libyan oil and natural resources instead of fanning violence to eliminate the man perceived as hindrance to their interests and course of these years? Why was interest on Libyan oil the pivotal diplomacy of the west in paying back to Gadhafi all his atrocities for years?

On the other hand, the view of Jones (2011:4) that throughout history, national and international conflicts can be traced to economic reasons is justifiable in the Libyan case as they can be disguised under different pretence and may take different forms as conflicts evolve, but these forms are the effects and not the cause. This, simply also made the acceptance of the fact that the western states' invasion of Libya was never normal but abnormal since it was centred on their economic interests hinged on democracy, war/violence and the sharing of boots. These was witnessed, according to Ruff (2011:1-4) that at the Libyan energy resources centre, David Cameron and Nicolas Sarkozy was seen with the NTC members while the war was still on. They were in the country to negotiate on how the oil export and sales will be absolutely free to their country. Their presence also explained the kind of western democracy façade that is fake with their strategies of the most horrible rogues promoting state terrorism and fascism and assisting even their eastern allies to keep creating problems for humanity (Abunimah, 2011:18).

Extracting reasons from the points above and questions raised above by scholars over the main causes of the western invasion and act of terrorism in Libya with the usual bracket propaganda that it is time for Gadhafi to go and give democracy in Libya a chance as repeatedly hinted by Hilary Clinton, the U.S secretary of states, it is obvious and reasonable to agree with the critics of the latter that the hunger for Libyan oil and other rich resources might have been the contending issues for the push to either see Col Muammar Gadhafi into exile or killed so that they can confidently display their democratic hocus-pocus while the thieffry of the oil and other resources goes on unabated in an unbearable magnitude. The war in Libya then, by this emphasis, be that as it may, has no any other reason to be established other than 'oil politics war' hinged on a façade that its instruments were conspiracy theory and frustration – aggression theory that was substantially employed to smoothen the whole project towards achieving the desired goal.

5. War and the Arming of Rebels in Libya

The international community's of the United States, Britain and France in particular, in expanding the tenets of their conspiracy to deal with Gadhafi once and for all, could be said to have manipulated the United Nations and others in taking a decisive actions against Gadhafi regime. This is sequel to the view of Risk (2011:26) that Nicholas Sarkozy and David Cameron muted the idea of no-fly zone so as to avoid Col Gadhafi airlifting of mercenaries and using his military aeroplanes and armoured helicopters against the civilian. It was this insinuation that informed their idea at the same time, that Gadhafi was killing innocent civilians. To facilitate this ulterior motives, the two countries of Britain and France drafted the 'Resolution' 1973 on No-fly zone and imposed it on the United Nations Security Council for ratification (Ruff, 2011).

However, alleging fear on its implication, the US Defence Secretary Robert Gates were quoted as warning with caution, to the US congress that on no fly zone as agreed with Britain and France, that if such is approved, it would begin with an attack on Libya's air defence, which might

affect both the civilian and the combat military without any distinction. But the white extremist who wanted if possible to skin Gadhafi alive ignored the warning, thereby giving way to deal with the external enemy at all cause (Risk, 2011:24). To exemplify the reason on the conclusion that Gadhafi had overstayed its usefulness, the AFP (2011:3) noted that France and Britain did draw up the resolution 1973 on no fly zone and was able to convince the Security Council and General Assembly of the United Nations on adopting it. The truth that it was never a UN draft was seen when the French and Britain argued that NATO will be made to enforce it. This argument also underscored the high level of the conspiracy against Gadhafi.

In a further revelation, leading to the war, even when the young and uncoordinated protesters decried of abandonment by the international community, who had inspired them to go ahead against their leaders, thus, agreeing with Gurr (1974) that in most rebellion, apart from the people being dissatisfied against government policies may be inspired from the outside against a hate regime. And as it is obviously known that Gadhafi regime fall within this angle of measurement before the international community and their press, nothing was left other than to quicken his exit. Accepting this observation, Risk (2011:14) revealed that the U.S in playing a covert position had asked the Saudi Arabian government to help it supply weapons to the rebels in Benghazi. Such weapons as anti-tanks rocket, mortar and surface to air missiles and medium range weapons were what Gadhafi opponents needed. He further reiterated that the United States however, warned agents (Saudi Arabia) of being careful since it is the same arms embargo as stated in resolution 1970 as applied to Libya – Gadhafi regime that is also applied to it (and the rebels). Meaning that it was the weapons shipped from Saudi Arabia that actually affords the rebels the gut to confront the Gadhafi regime. In addition to this, Global Security Consultancy (2011:5) noted that the British and France on their own side had talked 'strafer, an Egyptian special operations force Unit 777, the militia group led by Mukhtar Al-Akhdar, a member of Al-qanda group and the Tunisian volunteers to join force with the rebels to fighting Gadhafi.

Meanwhile, going by the word of Gates (2011) and Mullen (2011) that there was never any confirmation, either from pentagon or agents on the ground or whatsoever to ascertain that Gadhafi was firing at his people from the air, and that they were in utter ignorance as to what was happening in Libya. In reactions these revelations, one remained dumbfounded as to where did America, Britain and France got the news that warrant the issuing of the no fly zone resolution by the United Nations, the arming of rebels through Saudi Arabia and Qatar. And the employment of Mercenaries from Britain, France, Egypt and Tunisia to helping the rebels to win the war against Gadhafi, even when there was arms embargo resolution 1970 prohibiting such practices? Since, also the same US Defence Secretary Gates (2011:2) informed the international press that the UN Security Council resolution 1973 and 1970 did not in any way provides authorization for the use of armed force. There is no unanimity within NATO for the use of armed force. Meaning that even within the US cabinet and the presidency there are divided opinion on what kind of action should be taken against Gadhafi in the thick of the potential conspiracy theory of the actors against the former.

It is also this contrasting and contradicting scenario that prompts Kevin (2011:10-15) to argued that the western press, especially the BBC, CNN and French media, must be commended for helping to set Libya ablaze with the kind of falsehood and information misgivings that they fed their war marshals in their air conditioners offices who never see or know the true event or what was happening in Libya other than to instruct their war merchants to roll out tanks and missiles over one of the most stable economic buoyant nation in the Maghreb, because they wanted to partake, if not control, the gushing oil and gas of Libya. Logically, therefore, confirming from the views of Robert Gates and Marshal Mike Mullen amongst others that the west had become a tool to the destruction of Libya (Cooper, 2011:3).

Meanwhile, reacting to the double – edge – sword game of America, Booth (2011:1) argued that the US had breached the UN Security Council's arms embargo on Libya for sending arms through Saudi Arabia to the rebels. He however, wondered how the US could violate the resolutions that cover everybody in the conflict, which also means that

you cannot supply arms to the rebels. In another instance, Sands (2011:1) opined that they could not see how the US could legally justify sending arms into Libya under the current resolutions. To dissipate the degree of reaction against the abuse of the resolution, Clinton (2011) was quick to give the excuse that there may be amendment to resolution, so that there could be a legitimate transfer of arms to the rebels if the country should choose to do that. This singular assertion of Hilary Clinton also admit that the US was aware they had violated the UN resolution 1973 and 1970 on Libyan crisis either owing to permanent interest or a procedure meant to deal with an eternal enemy – Gadhafi.

In what seemed to be a battle of indecision and decision line, and a conspiracy of moulding up statements of the UN resolutions, the US had pinned their decision on both the resolution 1973 and 1970. But against this stands of the US, Grief (2011) noted that the resolution 1973 was meant to strengthen the earlier resolution 1970 in arms embargo, hence, it will be wrong to say that reading the two together can circumvent the arms embargo since the resolutions make clear it is for the Security Council to decide whether to strengthen, suspend or lift the arms embargo, and not for member state to act unilaterally. In support of this assertion the NATO secretary general, Anders Fogh Rasumussen stressed the importance of respecting the arms embargo, while affirming that the UN mandate authorizes the enforcement of an arms embargos...we are not in Libya to arm people but to protect people (see Guardian.co.uk, 2011). On how true and sincere the statement painted above was, becomes a confusing paradigm of hocus-pocus since NATO at that time was France and Britain, who had marginalized all other members, even the powerful, like the German. And it had not been ruled out that Humanitarian Agents in conflict zones do many at times act as conduct pipe to the arming of rebels (Okechukwu, 2011:10-11). Booth (2011) in furtherance to this allegation and findings from the information that US and its allies in Libya is implicated and, one would be interested to see what the US argument would be in detail. This is because taken together the two resolutions don't preclude the provision of arms to the rebels.

With damming reactions against the role of USA, NATO, Britain and France amongst others in Libya over the arming of the rebels, war and destructions in Libya some humane individuals like Hague (2011:2) had regrettably stated that our action in Libya, it would breach any common sense too-no one seems to have any knowledge of history. Remember what happened when we armed and trained the Mujahideen to fight the Russians....what we are doing in Libya has many possible consequences and a nice cosy pro-western democracy (Neo-Democracy) is incredibly unlikely. We shouldn't have got involved. The BBC doesn't help with its naïve and gullible reports, it seems to think that post – Gadhafi Libya would be like Islington or Hampstead, very wrong. The arming of the anti – Gadhafi rebels will only go on to devalue the west in the eyes of the rest of the world.

However, deducing from the acts to the violation of the UN resolutions 1973 and 1970 respectively, couple with the several reactions trailing the actions of the U.S, Britain, France and other states that joined forces in the war against Gadhafi under speculation of allegations, the concept of international law, especially the law of treaties may be brought into the fore. According to the Vienna convention on Law of Treaties 1969, which states inter alia, '*pacta sunt servanda*' meaning that international agreements to which a state enter into must be observed. That is to say, that once in force a treaty is binding upon the parties to them and must be performed in good faith. Good faith here, suggest that a state that expresses its consent either by signature, ratification or by accession is bound by the treaty (Green, 1987:163-167).

In line to this contention, and in agreement to the UN arms embargo, Epps (2010:1) argued that the essence of creating a global regulatory framework for the effective control of conventional arms transfer is to strengthen arms embargo implementation. This is because arms embargo could become mutually supportive instrument of the international community for maintaining international peace and security. The arms embargo is legally binding convention on states, parties to established global standards to improving the national regulation of international arms transfers. Arms embargoes are reactive tools intended to prevent the transfer of all conventional weapons to particular

targets. Another question consequent this could be to call to the mind, how mandatory was member states expected to obey the arms embargoes? The United Nations arms embargoes are imposed by the UN Security Council under the authority of chapter VII in the UN charter which presupposes that all member state ought to obey it. But, if most of the Security Council arms embargoes are intended to prevent transfer of conventional weapons to the target of the embargo, why should the US engaged in the arming of the rebels in Libya? What is her interest? What do she intend to achieve in the international system, mindful of the fact that many look up to it? What moral burden is it trying to convey to its forty (40) loyalist states that allied with it to kill Gadhafi?

Against this posture, it seems that the events of the cold-war era had not considerably been forgotten or forgone, but the basic information expressed by the actions of the big actors in the Libya quagmire is a time – bomb, that its consequence may sooner or later play itself out either in Libya or amongst the perceived allies as the sharing of every criminal boots or loots had been the major exposure of all criminals to a particular crime, because the arming of rebels in Libya is criminal. A complete violations of the UN arms embargo treaty; a violation of the rights and sovereignty of state (Libya), as stated in the Westphalia treaty of 1648 and 1962 on state ratification; and a clear indication on aiding to commit violation of the Geneva convention of 1949 on targets against sect, tribe, group, innocence, and targeted group with the intention to exterminate or annihilate them under the genocide conventions. This is because if Gadhafi was the target, what then happened to the over 20,000 civilians' deaths caused by the NATO air strike. The UN human rights body is silent the issues because they were involved in the unfortunate incident that they directly or indirectly teleguided against humanity in Libya. Although, this may be controversial but the agency need moral burden to strengthen the record that they were not party to the blackout in Libya with aid of western press.

6. Libyan Crisis and Africa's Helplessness: The African Union's Silence

Strolling from cyclical poverty, insecurity, corruption, bad leadership and high level of incapacitation, Africans , particularly, North of the Maghreb, especially the vulnerable might not hesitate to question their maker if given the opportunity, 'why they were created in that part of the world', where nothing is pleasant; where nothing is enjoying; where nothing is interesting; where killing is applauded; where nothing is appealing and where every inch of the time, minute, second, and day is crises. This might be the general deduction due to the Arab world uprising and unrest occasioned by what Jones (2011) sees as bad socioeconomic and political absence.

The odds facing the African continent on the Libyan crisis, just like what transpired in the Rwandan conflict of 1994 were best settled as most of the African states leaders were confused as none of the member state of African union deemed it fit or attempted to intervene. Even the continental body were meshed in self contradictions of who to follow. What was noticed and heard amongst the member states was the normal cold feted and hand that did not discriminate to join them colonial allies and the western press to express hatred on Gadhafi. None was willing except South Africa, who was able to disagree with the western invaders on their intention to intervene for the purpose of oil business. Jacob Zuma, who in his early life and his country had passed through a more terrible and destructive audacity of the colonial Britain and others never hesitated in asking the western fortune seekers to allow Africa to handle it in Africa way, the persistence could not yield any effort as Gadhafi fate had been sealed.

The African Union, which had gradually slipped into the old order, was never heard condemning the negative western reports against Libya. The body's failure to counter any of the allegations on the air was due to what was on the ground, coupled with what has always being their problem of incapacitation and poor logistics. The Libyan crisis, if for nothing need Africans to show interest and mediate into the situation, bearing in mind that history will never forget Gadhafi in his role toward African Union re-birth. Col Gadhafi was able to persuade the African leaders in July

2002 at Harare to return back to the view and vision of the African founding fathers on the issue of United African states; the issues of being indifference in African states crisis; the issue of one high command; the issue of collective security and collective sovereignty amongst others as enunciated by Nkrumah (1965). Through his efforts the OAU was rejuvenated and re-established as AU. A more proactive African Union meant to tackle African problem. Against the turn of event however, all turned into dog eat dog on him when the western leaders whose economic woes was looking for a free oil and gas money to resuscitate their economic recession came knocking by inciting the people against their leader.

Meanwhile, a pertinent question that needs to be asked is why were the African states always keeping quite at every unfortunate event in the continent? Why are they always helpless when it comes to neighbours' problems? Where are those who professed self-acclaimed African giant? Why are they playing supportive role to invaders like US, France and Britain? Is Africa no longer the centre peace of the Nigerian foreign policy? The despicable thing about the whole scenario was that South African and Uganda been the only voice calling for caution wouldn't have face the problem alone if a country like Nigeria did not align itself with the western invaders due to her weakling leader.

According to Global Research (2011:9) Nigerian, that ought to show and sue for caution was among those that voted for the UN resolution 1973 to establish a Libyan no-fly zone in its capacity as non-permanent member of the Security Council on March 17, 2011. Nigeria also recognized the NTC, thereby creating hollow division in AU against its initial refusal to accept the international community stands on Libya. This hasty decision did not only shock many even the citizenry but it showed a cowardice attitude towards what it stand for vis-a-vis African problem for African solution as adopted at Harare in 2002. The Nigerian decimal decision also weakened the AU call for peace deal amongst the Muammar Gadhafi government and the NTC.

However, two-third of the African states, especially those who are weak, poverty driven and never good at taking decision on their own were against Gadhafi based on the

western press reports and the persuasions of the western actors' lobbyist. Most of them who had benefitted from Gadhafi largess that helped them to pay their workers' salaries suddenly remembered that they had an ally whom they could depend on to punish Gadhafi in order to be a good follower. These states also failed to call on the AU Security Council to investigate and brief the Assembly on the true situation in Libya. The usual western brainwashing was used to sandpaper all the nations including Malawi, Nigeria, Niger, Mozambique, Mali, Senegal, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Seychelles, Swaziland, Gabon, and Cote d'Ivoire among others. On the other side were South Africa, Zimbabwe, Uganda, Zambia, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, Ghana and Lesotho amongst others who strongly opposed the international community decision to humiliate Gadhafi by all means. To show how detestable some African leaders felt over the ambush of Gadhafi in both the African and international fronts, Jammeh (2011) critically allege a grave fear over African future. He further blamed the African Union for its unacceptable silence in a situation like the on goings in Libya. He tongue lashed many African leaders who welcome the French foreign minister Alain Juppe, who was sent by the west to lobby the African leaders in supporting the intervention and condemning the Gadhafi regime with the alleged accusations of killing her own people. It was against these hate sentiments of the regime that many African states were said to have based their sentiments and condemnation of Gadhafi while deeply relying on the western information misgivings. This kind of information misgivings paraded by the west against Gadhafi without any authentication, couple with the perpetual silence of the African Union and the unholy acceptance of the condemnation of Gadhafi as a murder by the western leaders to which this feeble minded and weakling leaders in same African states accepted with hook and sinker, explained the reason for the double ambushes against Gadhafi and his regime. Most of these gullible African states leaders who once see Gadhafi as a benevolent dictator only turned to betray the African Union collective sovereignty and collective security charter principles.

The event in Libya was never worst compared to Egypt and Tunisia, Salama (2011). The only major problem was

that the Africans in the UN had joined force in outright condemnation of Gadhafi, while unaware of the western interests and intention in Libya. Agreeing with this observation, Ruff (2011:1) argued that the west misled the Arab and the African so that they can convincibly nail Gadhafi. Based on this notion, does it mean that the Africans had not learnt from the past history, especially on what happened in Rwanda, Angola and Sudan? Can one say that the role of Alain Juppe was to destabilize African while trying to re-insert the French dwindling foreign policies on Africa.

Premised on the revelations above and the cynist scheming of the western world, which the African states and members of AU were short-lived of the pre-history of crisis on the African soil, especially where there is mineral resources like oil, gold, diamond, timber or gas to scramble for by the parties to conflict in Africa. The long silence and intermittent statements of AU, the body that supposedly ought to mediate and resolve the conflict was unfortunate. The role of states that before now were being looked up to as a driving force for African peace motivator, but surprisingly had proved otherwise explained the level of decadence, poverty, inept and incapacitations. It also shows how far a state can go to deny its neighbour in conflict even under the new AU interference principles (see AU charter principles, 2002).

Already, it is on record that under the UN responsibility to protect, that are always quoted by the invaders, and as further buttressed by Vacler (2000) that we live in a new world in which all of us must begin to bear responsibility for everything that occurs, that there ought to be an African intervention in the Libyan crisis by the African Union or any member state, and not the situation that the French envoy Alain Juppe will be sent to African to talk states to agreeing that the west arming of rebels and intervention is the best for Africa. This is because whatever action or intention of the west to convince the African states are basically on what they intend gaining. A posted question that needed a rethink is where were the west in the Rwanda crisis of 1994? Why should the west hurriedly left Somalia in 1992 to date? Why was Darfur crisis a prolonged battle

before the western intervention if the responsibility to protect in the UN charter was actually working? Against all these, do they consider Africa in any sense of reasoning, even when their actions are detrimental to the African sense of brotherhood and security? Silence in African parlance means acceptance of fate and what it bestowed. The African union silence and watching of another arms shipment into African continent repeating itself like the period of Cold War, to which not long before then, many African states in that decade was set ablaze, while the suppliers in turn oiled their remnant to armoury either watch, abandon the victims or comes back to advise on sharing of power under the western model of democracy, thereby agreeing with Okechukwu (2011:5) that arising from these unpleasant and undemocratic transformation, Africa was quick to be turned into a battleground; in the name of power struggle, power sharing and possible resource control with some parties benefiting, while some loses. A fact that Turner (2005) also observed as a criminal tendency and processes meant to manipulate towards attaining power at the end of the resolution of the crisis while still retaining the western interest in the system, as the opposition or rebels in Libya may be allowed to share power and seats of governance irrespective of their integrity and stake in the state.

Thus, going by these points of arguments, it is obvious that the perpetual silence of AU to the crisis, the high level lobby that had wooed over two-third of the African leaders to supporting the western invasion and NATO terrorism on the Libyan soil; the double ambushing of Gadhafi by the western world and the African sycophants and the helpless citizenry who might be weary and confused on who to support could have contributed immensely in expanding the hate expressions that had combined with the premeditated acts of the west, propaganda of the western press and cheap blackmails to form part of the contour that escalated the conflict in Libya.

7. General Implications

In the general evaluation of this piece, it is evidence that several implications abounds, both in the face of the international political system of the international community

that makes law and violates it at the same time (Melvern, 2000); the African frontier, being a continent that had persistently meshed itself in the incapacitation paradigm; the Libyan neighbours and the spring up of different armed groups looking for who to sub-due at any instance; the Libyan society that had been polarized with discontent and ethnic bigotry, rooted in vengeance and pay back syndrome; and or, probably the vulnerable masses who are always at the receiving end of every political upheaval, social disequilibrium and the porous insecurity nature of the region, that might await all parties to the Libyan project as the last had not been heard of the aftermath of the country's revolution.

To start with, according to Hague (2011) the consequences that trail the invasion and the arming of the rebels in Libya are yet to manifest. The United states and its allies has not survived the arming of rebels in Iraq and Afghanistan, just as the arming and training of the Mujahideen against Russia and the enormous problems created had remained a great challenge and huge loses to the international community.

No one seems to have any knowledge of history, of how the dangerousness of late Saddam Hussein, the late Osama Bin Laden, Abdullah Ojullan of the PKK amongst others who were the handmade of the US when they were crazy about achieving a high popularity and power towards an end. These same crops of agents late confronted the Americans – their mentor in war power supremacy when it was obvious that the devils trained in the dark had grown extra and dangerous horn before the mid-day. It is on record that the same persons later rose up to be a torn on their master's flesh – the United States. Another inference that points to same scenario was the use of men like Victor Bout, Leonid Minin and Armstrong amongst other merchants of death to distribute deadly weapons in conflict zones as was seen in the US operations in the 1990 Gulf war, to which they helped in transporting weapon to Bagdad. With the US and others like Britain and France violating arms embargo of the international system, their agents like the characters mentioned above might not be bordered in doing the same against even the international system. A scheme this study

found to be devious and callous, especially in arming rebels to overthrow a legitimate government in whatever platform or reasons. The invasion of Libya and the arming of the rebels against Gadhafi were not only political but economically driven.

This also led to one of the basic fact postulated by Booth (2011) that the US and its allies breached the UN arms embargoes on Libya portend a terrible danger. This action also confirmed the earlier willingness to breach the resolution 1970 and 1973, as reiterated by Susan Rice statements when she noted, that they have not made that decision but that they have not certainly ruled out such to arms rebels. This statement of naivety and unrepentant processes and procedures marked the deficiency in American positive thinking about others interests in the global system. This is because it had just probably displayed to the world that the UN is a mere tissue paper in the hand of the powerful nations, and of which at the same time confirmed the reason why the so called Resolution 1973 was drafted outside the UN body and imposed on it for ratification in order to satisfy their individual political and economic desires on Libya.

On their economic interests, which actually exposed the thinking and actions of the west into Libya was the crazy for oil and gas. The implication of this over zealousness however exemplified the notion that Obama – battling with economic recessing, high unemployment and, the fall of the wall street may face a grave hell in his re-election bid in 2012 with no money in the pocket, while Sarkozy whose major benefactor, Oman Bongo of Equatorial Guinea, the chief financier of his last election is dead and nowhere to fall back to, had not only put himself between the devil and the blue sea, of men with drug money bags in France and conservative bureaucrats with stringent spending. Meaning that, he needs money from elsewhere to finance his 2012 re-election or go the way of others.

Thus, the steady relationship established between him and the Judas in Libya needed to yield a good fruit before the French election in 2012. The meeting of the French leader and the role of men like Mustapha Abdul Jalil and Mahmoud Jibril amongst others of the National Transitional Council (NTC) leadership was never hidden toward the

conspiracy theory. According to Ruff (2011:3) there is nothing like permanent peace in the world now controlled by western terrocracies. No one had expected that USA and Europe would attack an emerging friendly Libya. In fact there have been no rivalries or conflict between Libya and the western powers, rather they are cooperating with each other, for oil, getting Libyan energy resources was paramount. Hence, they wants to make the oil import now absolutely free, which is tantamount to act tainted towards economic sabotage (Ashton, 2011:2). This study, however, did not differ with Ashton (2011:1-2) and Ruff (2011:3) that the main reasons why Cameron and Sarkozy visited Libya while the war was still ongoing at Bani Wali was purely economics. After all, they never wore any military regalia as their separate countries Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces or as the Field Marshal of the battle. And neither do they have any bullet proof on as Marshal Mike Mullen or even Robert Gates as they claimed to be on assessment mission. Cameron and Sarkozy had just temporary exposed themselves to a dangerous stray bullets flying all over the places. This move was not only a mark of impatient, over zealousness to greed and as chief instigator who will not want to miss out from the sharing of the war booties. It also underlines fact that it was on the quest for the Libyan oil that the war was fanned and staged. The oil politics and war as has been seen and witnessed in Libya mean that there is nothing like respect for state sovereignty if what one state sought cannot be attained at its peaceful demand. A twist implication also suggesting that the world is gradually going back to the empireonic era where obtaining, mafianism, and the brutish idea of Hobbs state plays itself out in the act of conquer and occupy basis.

Then in placing the dice before their European colleagues was never welcomed. According to Franchon (2011:6-8) suspicious among the EU members also points to the reason that the intervention in Libya was mere of economic idea than any other. The international commentators on the other hand had also faulted the sudden proactive burst of the French. This some will not fail to point out that Sarkozy is currently more preoccupied with his re-election in 2012 bid and the breakthrough of Marie le

pen, than the actual protection of the Libyan people (Anderson, 2011:4-5). Thus, states like the German and other European Union members who felt marginalized or schemed out from the Libyan crisis was never happy as they never supported the intervention at early stage. This also point out that amongst the EU members that there are also element of conspiracy theories suspicions against their own interests.

Furthermore, the west has no business interfering in Arab affairs, if Libya did not have any oil well. The west would not have demonstrated the same willingness to intervene, after all democracy is not exportable with missiles or destructions of those intended to govern. It would have been wiser to provide the Libyan with the means to defend themselves instead of intervening illegally (Badran, 2011). It would have been better for Libyan people with the help of their Arab brothers to make its revolution than the western involvement thereby stalling and shielding them from taken all the necessary risks since in the Arab proverb who wants honey is exposed to bee stings. To contradict the United States effort while probably showing some discontent against the cabinet member of the Obama administration, the US state dept even listed the Libya rebels as terrorist group, to which the NATO leaders are guilty under the US code for providing material support to terrorist group (Cartalucci, 2011:7).

To expand this degree of disagreement among the US citizens, Ron (2011) reiterated that the current situation in Libya may be short term victory for the empire, but it is a loss on America Republic. And I fear it may be devastating for the Libya people. There is no doubt that Gadhafi is a bad guy, and that he has brought misery and harm to his country. However, our involvement in another country civil war is costly and unconstitutional. We have spent \$1billion dollars on a war that the administration has fought not with the consent of the congress but under a NATO flag and authorization of the UN. It is a serious thing for a president to engage us on a war. He is bind by our constitution to seek authority from the people, through congress but he did not prior to engaging in military action.

However, on general security situations before and after the invasion, it is critically erroneous and destructive to give

the west a clean slate performance. This is one of the reasons why this study earlier on adjudged the whole situations as a time - bomb, because of the way the actors to the gushing Libyan oil hurriedly rushed into Libya. If the war against Gadhafi had been fought alone by the indigenes who felt dissatisfied with the regime, then, probably a little help from the outside as argued above would have been acceptable. It would have been a clear struggle against the dictator, of which who becomes the winner, might be immaterial. But the people of Libya – both hate and liked – know that they wouldn't have been able to face Gadhafi, just as the west know that it wouldn't have been easy to end the war so quick, instead it would have been another desert war for them alone to be able to confront Gadhafi just after few years that he bought massive weapons from America. Imperatively too, the overwhelming criticism against the west for invading Libya might be correct going by the rules, processes and procedures for either intervention, responsibilities to protect and or on who should be responsible.

The following instances therefore fall as a damning fact against the western manner of intervention and actions in Libya. Analysts like Anderson, Hague, Ashton, Ruff and Di-Vitto amongst others had unanimously argued that the US and its allies violated the UN arms embargoes by arming the rebels who were not even defined. Two, the major actors of Britain, France and the US had erroneously endangered their own national security. A scenario that looked like a dog turning back to its vomits, owing to a long drawn enmity and war between the west and Al-Qaeda terrorist groups in the Middle East and its environs. For apart from the above earlier mentioned groups that was recruited to fight along with NATO, the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIFG) having a link with Al-Qaeda under the leadership of Abdel Hakim Al-Hasidi who was once caught, tortured and released by the America C.I.A. was recruited and declared a pro-democracy Group by the west. Another is the Mujahedin-e Khalq (MEK) that was seen fighting the US and the others at Iraq and Afghanistan, and based in Iran was among the new intakes to fight Gadhafi.

The simple fact that the actions of Obama, Cameron and Sarkozy portends danger to their citizens, countries and the world in particular goes a long way to show the degree of absurdity. This is because for their government to armed the same groups that they abhorred, who had fought them standstill at Kabul and Baghdad and now recognised, recruited and armed as pro-democracy fighters to do away with Gadhafi owing to their drive for economic interests to sustain their dwindling and weak regimes is sheer inconsistency with reality. It also means that the bloods of the average American, British and French killed by these destructive groups means nothing to their leaders but a mere self indulgent with no course by the individuals.

Third, according to Ashton (2011:9-10), the violation of the US code section 2339A and 2339B had implicated their leader for betraying their people by providing material supports in the most egregious, overt case since the code was written. This also means that the leaders of the US, France, Britain and NATO are clearly guilty of providing a listed terrorist organisation with materials, training and arming to fight Muammar Gadhafi, the eternal enemy. All these are done criminally under the guise of International Law rubber stamped by the contrived UN and bolstered with support from the equally contrived International Criminal Court, showing how partially and why more people are unable to understand the scope of criminality involved in NATO's intervention in Libya.

Finally, if the west had for long denounced the Al-Qaeda, MEK, LIFG, Tunisian Volunteers, the Unit 777, the Zanitans group and Abdel Hakim AL-Hasidi who led one of the rebel squad had remained a strong man of AL-Qaeda, then the saying that... NATO will return Defeated... because most of the western recruited allies are former/still enemies of the west sounds probably realistic. This is because the idea of calling them pro-democracy or social group in the eyes of the world is not only risky and insincere, but an act of trying to sell a deceptive dummy to the world in trying to fight the common enemy, which one of the antic of conspiracy theories. In the words of Di-Vitto (2011:16), the action of the west, aided by the disgraceful manipulation of news by the main stream media: BBC, CNN, UNHCR amongst others caused the level of aggression on Libya, the

Arab nations and Arab world, on who control Africa and the Great Middle East amongst others which in all are illegal military actions. The killing of Gadhafi by the NATO terror and NATO war crime was all about oil war and oil politics, which had helped in welcoming AL-Qaeda back fully into the region.

8. Conclusion

Evidence had shown that the Libyan crisis was far different from any other major political crisis that had ever taken place in the African soil and it is also ever different from international and humanitarian timely response or intervention to any states crises in Africa, which at the same makes the moves, manoeuvres and actions very suspicious. Although, this might be located on the fact that the crisis was taken place at a time when the world was facing a deep seated economic recession with bail outs upon bail outs that had ever threatening the global economic system. It was also a time when long enemies of states are been settled by way of pay back. Hence, the death of Saddam Hussien, the timely demise of Osama Bin Laden in the hand of America invaders. Unlike the Rwandan crisis, where in 1994 the international community folded its arm and abandoned the people because of poverty of mineral and natural resources. An event that was also overtaken by the end of gulf war, the Balkan crisis and others, which had encouraged buoyancy in oil price boom less states felt uninterested in Tutsis annihilation. So also was the Angolan crisis, Sierra Leone crisis, the Liberian crisis and the Sudanese-Darfur crisis amongst others, that was the struggle for leadership and the appropriation of oil, diamond, gold and timber monies amongst others which was fanned by cold war and post – cold war manoeuvres of actors who had for long settled their differences.

In the case of Libyan crisis, which was inspired and spurred by the Arab world uprising, that was hinged on freedom and neo-democracy, that the concept of hocus-pocus paradigm did locate it on conspiracy theory of the quest by the economically broken nations of the west who were looking for timely – opportunities to annex and probably re-colonised states that its open door-policy does

not tally with their economic investment overture. Coupled with the releases of the 2012 elections time table in America and France, that is a huge challenge, both to finance and garner supports on issue based by the incumbents going by their streams of abysmal records of performance vis-à-vis promises made not kept in France over civil unrest; the over forty million Americans job seekers suffering from unemployment, and the London looting, student fees hike and social unrest, among others located in failing economy. Col. Muammar Gadhafi, being a long enemy of the west who though had embraced them and was even called a political realist for his change of political pendulum by Tony Blair, and who owe no debt in the world but swims in billions of dollars that had not tangentially circulated round was targeted. For sure Neo-democracy and freedom cannot be preached with missiles, air-to-land surface missiles, tanks, mortars and medium range weapons or rocket launchers amongst others as the west paraded in Libya. Therefore, implying that there are more to the Libyan invasion, destructions and the killing of Muammar Gadhafi than what we saw and heard in the crisis. The fact that Gadhafi had violated their citizens in the time past means that men like Mahmoud Jibril and Mustapha Abdel Jalili who were once the best brain that Gadhafi assembled in Tripoli was the Judas and the sheep in wools clothing to the dismembering of Libya.

Nicholas Sarkozy and his country had not in any way benefited from the Libyan oil and this is the opportunity. The same Sarkozy and Cameron drafted the UN no - fly zone and imposed it on UN with the America veto. America and its allies, the Saudi Arabia and Qatar armed the rebels while the British and France provided mercenaries and war strategist that designed the war against Gadhafi. Thus, with the naivety of the western press like BBc, CNN, Al-Jerzera, and Monde amongst others the hate expressions, premeditated actions, propaganda and cheap blackmail was mounted up against Gadhafi on one side and on the other meant to brainwash the Libyan citizen and instigated them against their leader. Venom of frustration-deprivation bitterness was rejuvenated to push for aggressive tendency that conspiracy theories helped to smoothened. A strong force and factor which formed a huge contour in process towards the

escalation of the conflict. This, thus call for questioning and, the re-examination of the role of the international communities and the United Nations in the arming of rebels cum insurgence and the awful idea of sponsoring of violence in a sovereign state by the other while violating the Westphalia treaty of 1648 and the reaffirmed treaty on states 1962 in whatever platform. Of course, the war in Libya against Muammar Gadhafi and his people had clearly shown that it is the western interests of America, France, Britain and others in gaining from the gushing Libyan oil and gas that sparked – off the destruction, and killings of the innocent and the accused by the NATO led force who had professed to protect the vulnerable, but turned out to be the chief murder, if there is anything as such in the lexicon. The grave implications of these actions are yet to manifest as it remained a time bomb as peace cannot be driven by violence, freedom cannot be attained by way of destruction and neither can democracy or neo-democracy be established with missile, and traumatising of the beneficiaries since it is oil politics that is on in Libya.

References

- Abaza, K., (2011). "The Implications for the Arab Uprising: Libya Situations Differently Compared" Retrieved from www.Guardian.co.uk
- Abunimah, A., (2011). *Military to military Relations: America and Libya Agrees under Col. Gadhafi*. Project New York: Africom
- Anderson, L., (2011) "Demystifying the Arab Spring: Passing the Difference between Tunisia, Egypt and Libyan Crises" Free Weekly Update. Retrieved from www.ForeignAffairs.com
- Angrist, M.P., (2011). *Should we sell fear: Antics of conspiracy theory*. London: First Press.
- Badran, T., (2011). "Intervention in Libya: Policymakers Should Rely on History" Independent Monitors Paper, New York.
- Barkun, M., (2003). *A culture of conspiracy: Apocalyptic in contemporary America*. California: University Press.
- Booth, R., (2011). "Arming Libyan Rebels Not Allowed by the United Nations Resolution". Retrieved from www.Guardian.co.uk
- Brain, M., (2001). *Introduction to conspiracy theories*. United States of America: Oliver stone press.
- Bruce, R., (1992). "Libya Terrorism: the case against Col. Gadhafi" *Contemporary Review*.
- Byman, D., (2011). Rebels with a cause: the History of Governance, from the U.S. civil war to Libya. May/June News line.

*Oil Politics and War in Libya: Arming of Rebels and the New Phase of Neo-Democracy
Evaluated*

- Cantril, H., (1967). *Human Nature and Political system*. New Branswick: Rutger University Press.
- Cartalucci, T. (2011). “Libya Rebels listed as a Terrorist Group by the U.S. state Sept. 18th.”
- Chomsky, N., (2011) *Documenting mainstream conspiracy: Linquist and Scholar, contrasts conspiracy theory*. U.S.A: Honaca Press.
- Clausder, S.P., (2011). “The United Nations and its Allies Enforces No Fly Zone in Libya” Daily Telegraph Newspaper. March 27th.
- Cooper, K.T., (2011). “Illegality has become legal for Americans”, News Post International Botton, United Kingdom.
- Coser, L., (1956). *Conflict theory and current politics in continuities in social Conflict study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Di-Vitto, Y., (2011). “Anti war, Middle East, World war” www.mathaba.net. 25th August.
- Epps, K., (2010). “UN Arms Embargoes and Arms Trade Treaty.” Working paper, Projects ploughshares, Ontario, Canada.
- Edward, M.G. (2011) “Mercenavies in Libya, Britain and France fingered” Independent magazine, London, June 18th.
- Franchon, A. (2011) “Strategic Review Strategy” Le Monde Sept. 11th.
- Fisk, R. (2011) “Arming of Rebels in Bnghazi” Independent Newspaper 7th March New York.
- Eljahmi, M. (2006) Libya and the U.S: Gadhafi unrepentant Middle East Quarterly.
- Eljahmi, M. (2011) “Libya and the west once enemy – once friend – once enemy” Global Research Sept. 18th.

- Green, M.A.N. (1987) *International Law*. 3rd Eds London: Pitman Pub.
- Grief, N. (2011) *Strict Implementation of Arms Embargo Necessary*,
Conference: Direct of Legal Studies. University of Kent.
United Kingdom.
- Gurr, T.R. (1974) *Why men rebel*. New Jersey: Princeton University
Press.
- Harry, G.W. et al (2003) *Transparency and conspiracy: Ethnographies of
Suspicion in the New World order*.
U.S.A: Duke University Press.
- Hague, W. (2011) "The UN Resolution" in *Guardian*. Co. UK March 30th.
- Icke, D. (2004) *And the truth shall set you free: the 21st century*, London:
Bridge of Love Press.
- Jammeh, Y. (2011) "Criticism: AU Silence on Libyan crisis" in *Global
Research* August 17th.
- Jean, P.C. (2011) "France and Britain: A New special relationship
March 26th.
- Jones, M. (2011) "An Interview on Middle East Analysis" *Global risk
and mitigation strategies on the changing political
landscape*. CEO Magazine Service.
- Keith, A. (1946) *Evolution and ethnics* a New York: Puitnam Press.
- Khader, B. (2011) *Libya: History of a failed revolution 1969 – 2011*.
CERMAC, University Catholique de London.
- Kravetz, M. (1984) *Conspiracy theory and open – secrecy: Culture of
events in America*: Minneapolis: Classque Press.
- Kevin, M. (2011) "Split on Libya averted as NATO Given Military
Control, *Guardian* Co. UK.
- Laxner, L. (2010) 'Libya eight wonder of the world' *BNet* (via) Find
Articles: UK.

- Laxner, L. (2011) Libya chemical weapons destruction costly, arms control association. www.armscontrol.org
- Melvorn, L. (2004) Conspiracy to Murder: the Rwandan Genocide. London: Verso publication.
- Melvorn, L. (2000) A People Betrayed: the Role of the West in Rwandan Genocide. London: Zed Books publication.
- Merriden, F.C. (2008) A New Lease on Life for Humanitarian: How Operation Odeyssey Dawn will Revive the Responsibility to Protect. London: forterites prints.
- Milton, W.C. (1991) Behold a Pale Horse: London: Light technology pub.
- Mintz, F.P. (1985) The Liberty lobby and the American Rights: Race, conspiracy and culture. London: Free Press Inc.
- Okafor, F.C.N. (2004) Neo-Democracy and Poverty management in Africa: the ideals, illusion and realities. Awka: Mercury bright press.
- Okechukwu, G-P. (2011) "The politics and failure of Ethics of Humanitarian Intervention in African crisis" Journal of Alternative Perspectives in social sciences. Vol. 3, No. 3, Florida: JAPSS Press.
- Okechukwu, G-P. (2009) Military in politics and the third colonization of Africa: Beyond destruction and despairs. Lagos: Lawpat Prints.
- Paul, R. (2011) Lake Jackson, Texas Republican Presidential Candidate, "Issued statement on the situation in Libya." Washington.
- Pipe, D. (1998) The hidden hand: Middle East fear of conspiracy. New York: St. Martins Press.
- Pipe, D. (1992) Dealing with Middle East conspiracy theories. Orbis: Orbis Central Press.

- Ramsay, R. (2006) Conspiracy theories. Pocket essential London: Loobis Press.
- Reed, R. (2011) “Libyan Essay” London Review books Vol. 33, No. 9, 28 April.
- Reed, R. (2011) “Friends of Libya” London Review book April Vol. 33, No. 10.
- Rory, S. (2011) Have we go again on the Libya intervention. Independent Newspaper. London.
- Rudy, N. (2011) “The Arab World Journey unsettled” Mirror Graph Newspaper. 26th March. Cairo.
- Ruff, A. (2011) Lesson from NATO Terrorism over sovereign Libya: NATO – UNSC must end illegal war against Libyan Arabs. <http://abdu/ruff.wordpress.com/>
- Sands, P. (2011) “The Law cover everybody” conference on international law. University College London.
- Salama, V. (2011) Arab back Allied offensive on Libya as Leader Gadhafi remain defiant, Bloomberg. www.bloomberg.com/news/2011/3/2/quarterly.
- Sanders, T. (2003) Main stream conspiracy theories: Transparency and conspiracy discussed. U.S.A: Wilcox Press.
- Stanik, J.T. (2003) “Reagan’s undeclared war with Gadhafi”. Daily Telegraph March 20th.
- Thierry, M.(2011) “World politics: Aggression on Libya, Grand Oil theft” Mainstream Media. Qatar.
- Thudicey, F.Z. (2008) The face of real enemies: conspiracy theory updates. New York: ABC Press.
- Turner, T. (2005) “AU and the New dimension to conflict resolution in Africa”, Interview Butare: University of Rwanda. March 18th.
- Vaclar, H. (2000) “Interventions and the vulnerable” in the ploughshares

*Oil Politics and War in Libya: Arming of Rebels and the New Phase of Neo-Democracy
Evaluated*

Monitor, June Vol. 22, No. 2.

Vacler, H. (2010) "History of Libya under Muammar Gadhafi". In
Wikipedia Encyclopedia. December.

Wolff, S. (2011) "Libya: A solution worse than the problem: International
Security. Tuesday 22nd March.

Young, K.K. et al. (2008) Sanctifying Misandry: Goddess ideology and
the fall of man McGill: McGill – Queen University
Press.