Obama's Lies, Lies and More Lies About Libya

Who are "the people of Libya"? Libya has a population of 6.4 million people, of which in the "rebel-controlled" areas, in and around Benghazi, there may be a million, at best. While in the west of Libya, including the capital Tripoli, there are nearly 5 million. With bombs falling on them, the world doesn't hear what they want. It is only "the people of Libya" in Benghazi we hear about, not "the people of Libya" elsewhere in the country. So, the "majority" of the "the people of Libya" have been made non-people, while a minority has been turned into glorious rebels upon whose every word and foible we now hang. What kind of "democracy" is this? So, "the people of Libya" has been made to mean "the people" of Benghazi and its environs in the northeastern districts of Libya who want Muammar Gadhafii to pack his bags. Since when did "rebels" become so glorious that news reports are written from their point of view?

So, America, via NATO, is bombing the 5 million civilians in Tripoli in the west and its environs to "protect," supposedly, 1 million Libyan civilians, "rebels" in the northeast. Did you get that? And, the NATO (read USA) is doing this, as always for the good of "the Libyan people." Just this morning, May 14, 2011, the servile, sycophant U.S. media report the NATO (U.S.) bombing of "high level targets" in Tripoli killed 20 Muslim clerics of 50 gathered to pray for peace.

Of course, we have to distinguish between demonstrations, like those in Tunisia and Egypt, and insurrections – when "rebels" take up arms against a sovereign government. When such people attack police stations and army barracks with the aim of taking power, then, they are no longer demonstrators; they are insurrectionists and have to be treated as such (consider the tiny "threat" caused in Waco, Texas), and how the mighty U.S. military dealt with that, or the bombing of MOVE in Philadelphia, the "city of brotherly love." If there is a doubt about the legitimacy of a government and "the people" decide to launch an insurrection, that should be the decision of the internal forces. It should not be for external forces (U.S. British, French) to arrogate themselves that role. If foreign intervention is good, then, African countries should be the most prosperous countries in the world,

because they have had the greatest dosage of that: the slave trade, colonialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism, etc. All these foreign (white, western) interventions have, however, been disastrous.

These same western (white) powers participated in the killing of Lumumba, the only elected leader of Congo, Felix Moumie of Cameroon, Barthelemy Boganda of Central African Republic, the support of UNITA in Angola, and even Idi Amin at the beginning of his regime, etc. Clearly, the guns, artillery, and tank-wielding people we see in Benghazi are not just "ordinary folk" agitating for the right to protest. It is totally wrong to compare the revolutions in Tunisia and Egypt to Libya. None of the Tunisians or Egyptian protesters raised old flags. What we have seen in Libya, by contrast, is that those who genuinely hate Gadhafi (nothing wrong there…many of felt the same way about Bush) went beyond simple protest. If the protestors in Tunisia and Egypt had chosen the path of a face-off with the army, the outcome would definitely have been different.

Why is it that the U.S., Britain, and France can only offer violence, bombs and mayhem in place of diplomacy and peaceful resolution of conflict? There is something fundamentally wrong in societies where people cannot think beyond raining fire and brimstone on their "enemies." The same people who trot around the globe preaching the gospel of "love your neighbor," and "turn the other cheek."

Fritz Pointer
5/14/11