



COUNCIL FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL
SCIENCE RESEARCH IN AFRICA

CODESRIA Policy Briefs

No. 2, May 2018

Finance Capital and the NATO Intervention in Libya

Opposition to the African Currency

Horace G. Campbell*

Summary

The ruling in the High Court of Britain in *Libyan Investment Authority (LIA) vs. Goldman Sachs*, the financial behemoth of Wall Street revealed how firms in the financialization of the energy industry mobilize resources of oil rich states with Sovereign Wealth Funds to sustain private equity, hedge funds and structured derivatives markets of the global capitalist economy. The imposed government of the UN Security Council with authority over the Libyan Central Bank has been unsuccessful following factions among the permanent members of the Security Council in this prolonged battle for the control of Libyan resources. The destruction of Libya highlights the need for a more robust African Union stand on external military interventions and common currency in Africa. The military management of the international system needs contention so that the intervention in Libya does not have the same repercussions for humanity as the Italian Invasion of Abyssinia in 1935.

* Nwame Nkrumah Chair, Institute of African Studies, University of Ghana.

Introduction

Many thanks to CODESRIA for including this public dialogue in the ongoing Democratic Governance Institute. This is another opportunity for Africans in general, and the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) community in particular to discuss some of the most burning questions for the peoples of Africa, for African diplomacy and the future of the world. One of these burning questions involves the role of finance capital in the destruction of Libya. The deliberate destruction was related to the international effort to subvert the process of creating a common currency for Africa.

Indeed, the question of the role of foreign capital in the destruction of Libya is of major concern to many peace-loving peoples in the world.¹ Mainstream western academics and think tanks continue to cover up the failure of The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) by referring to the 'transition' processes in Libya or referring to the country as one plagued by 'insecurities.' This discourse on insecurity was most prominent in the posture statement of the AFRICOM when it stated in 2017 that "the instability in Libya and North Africa may be the most significant, near-term threat to U.S. and allies' interests on the continent".²

The US State Department and other official bodies reinforce this outlook with the

position that Libya presents a 'permissive environment for terrorists' where criminals and human traffickers have free reign. In the past, African scholars and policy-makers have disagreed with the USA on its understanding of who 'terrorists' are and what organizations comprise 'Violent Extremists.'

Across Africa and beyond, CODESRIA is well known as a very important section of the Pan African intellectual community. In all the efforts of CODESRIA to repair the damage wreaked by the misinformation of western media, there is some agreement that the role of independent African institutions and organizations will have to be crucial to cut through the propaganda around terror and terrorism in Africa. Particularly, the misinformation and distortions about the real reasons for western intervention in Libya means that progressive intellectuals have special work to do in the Pan African world.

The discussion for this policy brief builds upon the thesis first developed in my book entitled *Global NATO and the Catastrophic Failure in Libya: Lessons for Africa in the forging of African Unity*.³ One of the unintended consequences of the NATO intervention in Libya was to advance the pace of the understanding of the necessity to unify the peoples of Africa and for clarity about the nature of the international financial system. Finance is warfare and this has been more manifest after the 2014 war for Tripoli.

The reader's attention is hereby drawn to the judgment in the High Court of London in October 2016 during the Libyan Investment Authority vs Goldman Sachs case.⁴ This was the outcome of a two-and-a-half-year legal battle between Goldman Sachs and Libya's \$67 billion sovereign fund over the use of the resources of Libya in the speculative activities of the financial oligarchy in the world. Understanding the time line of the external efforts at a transitional government and the outbreak of the war between the Dignity brigade and the Libya Dawn forces in 2014 may shed some light on the role of international financial organizations in Libya.

In the ruling of the British High Court on the Libyan Investment Authority (henceforth LIA) against Goldman Sachs, the learned judge, Judge Vivien Rose, found that Goldman Sachs did not have a case to answer for. This judgment exposed the subservience of the judiciary system of the United Kingdom in the same manner in which the factional fighting in Libya continues to relate to who will control the US\$200 billion plus in reserves which is still frozen. In the world of finance capital, countries such as Libya had been able to avoid the chokehold of institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and western banks because the financial sector of Libya was kept under strict control. More importantly, the leader of Libya made the case for using the vast reserves of the Libyan state to anchor the proposed African

currency. This placed the leadership in Libya on a path of direct confrontation with the train of financialization that had overtaken most societies worldwide.

Finance and Libya

For contemporary African leaders and policy-makers, the details of the Libya vs Goldman Sachs case exposed the hidden hand of the financial sector in wars in Africa. By the time the case was ruled in October 2016, Libya had been through two years of more war. There had also been disputations before the Court as to who ran the LIA. The inexperience of the officials of the LIA in their relationship with the international financial moguls in the management of the \$67 billion sovereign wealth fund demonstrated how financial houses such as Goldman Sachs could wield 'undue influence' over governmental authorities.⁵ As far back as 2011, one can read from the *Wall Street Journal*, the principal financial newspaper in the United States, how the LIA lost money and the acrimonious fallout of these losses prior to the NATO intervention.⁶ The evidence in this case exposed 'tales of prostitutes and lavish spending on hotels and meals' that became the business model of the aggressive financial house, Goldman Sachs. This well-known New York Investment firm charged the LIA \$1.1 billion for a series of complex derivative trades in the run-up to the financial crisis of 2008, which eventually proved worthless. The legal papers alleged that the bank is estimated to have reaped profits

on the transactions of approximately \$350million. In total, the New York bank lost more than US\$5billion of the Libyan resources. I had argued in the book *Global NATO* how, prior to the NATO intervention of March 2011, Goldman Sachs had been cornered by the LIA in demanding that the bank make good the US \$5billion that was lost.

“Goldman Sachs was trapped and had little room for manoeuvre but the Libyans were the ones with the resources. With the full knowledge that the financialization project was orchestrated through the financial sector in Dubai, the Libyan Investment Fund moved to consolidate its position in the ‘dark markets’ world of the emirates. Libya had entered into the opaque world of financing energy markets and because it was awash with funds could move internationally in ways beyond the control of Wall Street or London. After December 2010, the Central Bank of Libya took the controlling position in the Arab Banking Corporation based in Bahrain. The Arab Banking Corporation was owned by Kuwait Investment Authority, Central Bank of Libya, Abu Dhabi Investment Authority and other shareholders with minor shares. Any move for making independent decisions in the Arab Banking Corporation threatened the web of speculators in the derivatives industry that depended on the recycling of petrodollars from the oil rich nations of Kuwait, Libya and the Emirates. Libya had gone for the jugular by seeking to capture the base of the Intercontinental

Exchange. After February 17, 2011 when the Libyans started to move to divest their funds from their over-exposure with British and US financial institutions, there was the freezing of the assets of Libya prior to the façade of protecting Libyans by Britain, France and NATO.”⁷

In the uncertainties relating to the principals of the LIA it took three years after the NATO intervention (2011-2014) for the British High Court to hear the case about the losses by Goldman Sachs.⁸ The information before the court contended that a series of equity option trades worth more than \$1 billion did not live up to that billing. The trades were inadequately documented by the bank and when the sovereign fund asked for the records, it took weeks or months for the firm to provide them. The fragility of these actors of finance capital brought the world economy to the brink of disaster in 2008.⁹ Although Libya was a prosperous oil producing country, the financial sector had been kept under strict control up to 2011. The Libyan leader identified with those societies and peoples who wanted to rein in the banks that thrive on the exorbitant privilege of the US dollar.¹⁰ This experience of how Libya was courted by the wizards of finance and their consulting partners brought out vividly how finance capital operates in the global economy today.

Before the NATO intervention in 2011, the LIA had over \$66 billion in assets, roughly half invested in a legacy of direct

equity stakes in some 550 companies worldwide, and the other half in a mixture of equities, alternatives, bonds and cash. This pattern of investment had been exposed to the courts and clarified how governments were trapped in the world of the dark markets.¹¹ In the world of finance the dark markets refer to shadow banking and the world of derivatives that comprises the illicit global economy. According to the World Economic Forum, in the years 2012-2014 the shadow economy was estimated to be worth \$650 billion. Since the publication of the Panama Papers in 2016 and the Paradise papers in 2017, the information of the trillions of dollars stashed in offshore tax havens has made headlines, but the incapacity of citizens and political leaders to hold banking institutions accountable brought more clarity on how International financial institutions through the shadow banking system remain at the core of this illicit global economy."¹² In this brief, the focus on the operations of the current international financial system is meant to cut through the stream of papers that continue to refer to the NATO intervention as the start of the Libyan Transition.¹³

Since the writings on Finance capital over a century ago by Rudolph Hilferding, Vladimir Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg, and Nikolai Bukharin, the role of finance in the international system has grown beyond the parameters outlined by those who linked finance capital to modern

imperialism.¹⁴ After the collapse of the dollar/gold system of 1944 the financial industry of the West has become the axis on which international capitalism spins.

The case in the London High Court brought out revealing evidence of how firms such as Goldman Sachs and others involved in the financialization of the energy markets sought to mobilize the resources of oil rich states with Sovereign Wealth Funds to keep alive the private equity, hedge funds and structured derivatives markets of the global capitalist economy.

Most societies and peoples in the world want these banks to be brought under control. But Goldman Sachs benefitted in the ruling because the war in Libya meant that there was no internationally recognized government and actual leadership of the LIA in that period. Thus the financial institutions are direct beneficiaries of the warfare that is going on in Libya, as in other parts of West Asia and North Africa.

The author wants to challenge colleagues in the African intellectual community to explain why we do not have enough discussion in Africa about the destabilization of Libya, the African currency, African Monetary Fund and the African Central Bank. The three entities are central pillars of the African effort to strengthen itself in the world of finance and international currency wars.

When the United Nations (henceforth, UN) passed Resolution 1970 and resolution 1973 in 2011, those who

had signed these resolutions did not understand, then, that the resolution was for regime in Libya.¹⁵ Seven years after the event in Libya, African intellectuals should demand that the Security Council of the UN have a thorough investigation of whether NATO exceeded its mandate in Libya. Reams of documents produced by US, British, French and EU intellectuals are meant to blunt the demand by those who want accountability from the UN with respect to Libya. But the UN cannot call for this investigation unless the African Union (henceforth, AU) calls for this investigation; and the AU cannot call for this investigation unless African scholars and African Institutions call for this investigation.

The importance of autonomous African intellectual spaces

This policy brief emanated from a public dialogue series of CODESRIA in Dakar, Senegal in September 2017. The discussions about the Libyan intervention automatically pivoted to the current instability in Libya and the on-going demands by some intellectuals in West Africa to leave the CFA (Communauté financière d'Afrique) franc zone. The general thrust of the public dialogue was to put a more proactive approach in advancing the African point of view in these international developments. Working as the Kwame Nkrumah Chair

of the Institute of African Studies at the University of Ghana, what has been striking was the ways in which imperial research platforms dominate the discussions about what happened in Libya. The differences between the German position on Libya in relation to that of French intellectuals or representatives of the think tanks in North America ensure that CODESRIA has a special role in capturing the African point of view of the destruction in Libya.

It is important here to review some of the dominant texts on the question of Libya and terrorism. The book by Phyllis Bennis (2015) *UNDERSTANDING ISIS and the NEW GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR* provides an overview of the origins and supporters of the ISIS group. This book is of particular significance in so far as it traces the various forms of counter terrorism that have taken place within the context of the military planners of North America and Western Europe. A bibliographical search from the Library of the Kofi Annan Center in Accra will expose the millions of dollars that was spent on counter terrorism in Africa from the era of the Trans-Sahara Counterterrorism Initiative, which was created in 2005 as a five-year, \$500 million endeavour with nine nations in Western Africa: Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, Senegal, Mauritania, Niger, Mali, Nigeria, and Chad. The current instability in Mali and the Sahel is not usually connected to this massive expenditure on counter terrorism and in the mainstream literature there is

scant connection between the current instability in Libya and the Sahel and the NATO intervention.

It is important to reiterate the position of the AU that there is no agreed definition of what constitutes terror.¹⁶ Africans who remember the era when Nelson Mandela and African freedom fighters were branded as terrorists now recoil from the banding about of the term terrorism in so far as the term is now “used almost exclusively to describe political violence committed by extremist Muslims.”¹⁷ This context is crucial towards understanding why the discussions on the war on terror fail to point out how western intelligence agencies used the town of Derna in Libya as a recruiting ground for violent extremists who were shipped to Syria after the overthrow of the Gaddafi regime. The press reports that Abdelhakim Belhadj became a leader of ISIS in Libya came as a surprise only to those who had not understood the crucial role played by the Libya Islamic Fighting Group in the destabilisation of the Libyan society.

Another important text by V.J. Prashad, *Arab Spring and Libyan Winter* exposed the differences between conflicting sections of the Gaddafi government.¹⁸ The other crucial book from the anti-imperialist perspective is Maximilian Forte’s *Slouching towards Sirte: NATO’s war in Libya and Africa*.¹⁹ The book is particularly interesting and important because it clarified why Sirte was the scene of such major

destruction as if NATO wanted to send a signal to Africa that this talk and idea about an African currency should not be engaged in Africa.

There are other relevant articles from *Foreign Affairs*, the *Congressional Research Service*, International Security Studies and other specialized publications. What these publications have in common is the studious avoidance of the issues relating to the battles between Goldman Sachs and the LIA, or the bribery case against the French banking giant Société Générale. Scholarship from German sources such as Sarah Brockmeier, “Re-examining the Lessons of the Libya Intervention”, seeks to debate the question of whether the mandate of the UN Security Council was for regime change in Libya. This scholarship is very different from the writings of the specialists of the Carnegie Endowment or the Atlantic Council.²⁰

In December 2015 when the UN set up a government of National Accord, the International Crisis Group initiated a study called “The Prize: Fighting for Libya’s Energy Wealth.” This document detailed the struggle for the oil fields, pipelines and tunnels and the financial infrastructures that supported the energy industry in Libya.²¹ This is also an important document because it brings to the fore the three most important institutions of the Libyan infrastructure for finance: (1) the National Oil Company of Libya, (2) the Central Bank of Libya and (3) the Libyan Investment Authority.

Although the authors of the International Crisis Group seemed to be focused on the question of the financial institutions, there was very little discussion on how the millions of dollars in cash held in the Central Bank of Libya remained a factor in the current war in Libya. While the US through the UN Security Council supports the Government of National Accord (GNA) led by Fayeza Mustafa al-Sarraj, the Central Bank in Tripoli is under the territory of one faction that does not recognize the GNA. Of the three contending forces seeking the legitimate authority over the use of force, there is also the struggle to control the Bank and the oil fields. One of these groups operated out of the eastern part of Libya under the nominal leadership of General Khalifa Hifter (sometimes spelt as Haftar). General Hifter returned from Virginia in the USA to claim leadership over the rebellion against Gaddafi and established the Dignity brigade in the east. Hifter is the head of the so called "Libyan National Army" which is aligned with foreign countries such as Egypt and the United Arab Emirates. Though there are clear linkages between the Hifter faction and the US intelligence agencies, when this eastern group attempted to print their own currency, they were rebuffed by the US Treasury.

The other claimants to the legitimate authority over force in Libya were those who were in control of Tripoli and the Central Bank with the gold and dollar reserves. This group was dominated by

the Misrata brigadistas and supported by the Qataris. In 2014 before news about ISIS, General Hifter had made strong representations to the US to give him all the support but the Tripoli based government with control over the money made an alternative claim to Jack Lew, the Treasury Secretary. Hence there was the anomalous situation in Libya by 2015 where the US military supported the Hifter faction, but the US Treasury Secretary refused to recognize the currency that was being printed by this faction.

For this discussion on finance capital it is pertinent to point out that as soon as the matter of the LIA was brought before the courts, a massive war broke out in Tripoli with the battles between the Dignity brigade of General Hifter and the Libyan Dawn. Here, it is worth quoting extensively from the Congressional Research Service on the war of 2014.

"Specifically, some armed groups from the city of Misrata and smaller Islamist militias formed a coalition known as Fajr Libya (Libya Dawn) and launched a multipronged offensive in July 2014 to take control of Tripoli's main international airport. Participants have included Libya's Central Shield Force, members of the Tripoli-based Libya Revolutionaries Operations Room (LROR), the Knights of Janzour Brigade, militias from Zawiya, and several Misrata-based militias, including the Marsa and Hatin Brigades. The international airport had long been held by a rival coalition of militias largely

from Zintan – the Sawa’iq and Qaaqaa Brigades, and the Martyr Mohammed Madani Brigade – who opposed the GNC-leading Islamist-independent coalition during its final months in office. Libya Dawn operations after the fall of the airport included clashes with militias in Tripoli’s Suq al Jumah neighborhood and militias affiliated with the Warshafanah tribe south and west of the city.”²²

What was missing from the US Congressional reports and the other write up from western sources is the link between this war and the ruling in the High Court. One of the key findings of Judge Rose was that the Court could not decide who represented the LIA and hence, Goldman Sachs did not have to answer for the loss of US \$5billion of Libyan resources. Currently, there is still uncertainty over who controls the Central Bank and the LIA. After the US gave its blessing for one faction to claim control over the Central Bank, that faction found that they had the authority but did not have the code to access the resources in the bank.²³

The International Crisis Group and the European Council on Foreign Affairs in Brussels are keeping a very close eye on Libya and documenting what the varying governments are doing in Libya. A library search about which African institutions are presenting the same information and keeping abreast of Libya does not indicate that level of interest. This is despite the fact that the shores of Libya are now the site of one of the most

organized trade in human bodies.

Put differently, an online search about what African institutions are doing about the present state of Libya will produce very little information. This being the case, it is hoped that this brief can accelerate the discussion on why African institutions must be more engaged in the question of Libya.

Theoretical Framework for grasping the insecurities in Africa

One of the laureates in the Institute has asked the author to say, yes, there is this empirical information on Libya but what is the theoretical starting point? Are we here to discuss Gaddafi and the Libyan state or we are here to discuss the African Union and the African State? Is the problem of Libya not linked to ‘tribal’ rivalries? What is our theoretical starting point for understanding the role of finance capital in Libya?

The theoretical starting point begins from the position of Pan African emancipatory politics which is grounded in the welfare and wellbeing of the African peoples that says Africans are human beings and have the right to live on the planet earth with dignity.

In the study of international relations there are theories such as realism, liberalism, feminism, constructivism, and Marxism; but there is a need for creativity at the intellectual and theoretical level

if Africa is to make a breakthrough on how African intellectuals and policy makers move forward. We also need to cut through the disinformation on Africa in relation to what is usually called 'failed states.' In March 2016, in the testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Army Gen. David Rodriguez, then, the head of the AFRICOM decreed that Libya was a failed state and that it would take over 10 years to achieve long-term stability in Libya. Rodriguez cited a "fractured society" and the lack of government institutions as major hurdles to overcome.²⁴ This designation of Libya as a 'failed state' is then repeated in papers by academics and think tanks without any acknowledgement of the role of the AFRICOM in the 2011 intervention and destruction of the government of Libya. This position also clarifies the indifferent position of the US authorities for the efforts of the UN Security Council to establish a government of National Accord. In the words of Rodriguez, "Yet even with strong international support, the new government will struggle for the "foreseeable future" to establish its authority and secure Libya's people and borders."²⁵ Supporting the position of the US military on Libya is the scholarship of those former cold war elements such as Robert Rotberg who justified western intervention in Libya.²⁶ The failed state thesis is also represented in the vast literature of the constructivists who spend an inordinate amount of words on the 'norms' of international relations and humanitarian groups when dealing with 'collapsed' states.

A state cannot fail. There may be a failed government. The historical materialist framework of society explains carefully that the state is an expression of the relationship between classes in society. The form of state power is expressed through the different apparatuses, e.g. coercive, ideological and productive organs of the state. The planners at Goldman Sachs knew that even without a functioning government in Libya, the legal status of the LIA had credibility in international law; hence one of the strategies of the foreign occupiers is to support contending leadership for the LIA.

African scholars have been alerted to the reality that there is a new industry of humanitarianism that is very much integrated with US military activities internationally. The work of Patricia Daley on *Gender and Genocide in the Great Lakes region* was particularly illuminating in exploring the business model of international NGOs that followed the lead of the French government in the Rwanda genocide and its aftermath.²⁷ There had been an effort after the NATO intervention for Humanitarian aid agencies to integrate themselves even more closely with military and intelligence operations. Given the high stakes of US \$200 billion involved, however, it was deemed more profitable to invest in 1700 different militias in Libya. It devolved to the constructivist to debate the responsibility to protect mantra within the 'discourses' on "doing good" for the tribal Libyans. Within this failed state

mantra, it is essential to see how the destruction in Libya has been premised on the idea of humanitarianism, what is called Responsibility to Protect, and how this humanitarianism had been used as the basis for supporting Western intervention in Syria.

Progressive African intellectuals will need to be even more engaged on events in Syria and West Asia because developments in Syria and West Asia are part of the outcomes of this war in North Africa. For the past six years, there have been attempts to mobilize African institutions for seminars and conferences on 'violent extremism.' There is also the expectation from this author that CODESRIA will join with the Kwame Nkrumah Chair and the Julius Nyerere Foundation of Tanzania to see how there can be an engaged political effort to have more discussions on the Libya question.

In April 2016, President Obama said what happened in Libya was the worst mistake in his presidency. Was it a mistake or that the US administration had been driven by the demands of finance capital and Wall Street? Obama, in saying that this was a mistake sent a signal about differences within the US military and financial establishment over what should be done in the administration giving the pressures on the Obama Administration for intervention in Syria.²⁸ In his interview with Jeffrey Goldberg of the *Atlantic Magazine*, Obama blamed the British for what is called the Libyan "Shit

Show". After Obama described what happened in Libya as a mistake, the British Parliamentary Committee admitted that what happened in Libya was based on lies. The British Government and the media said that the government claimed, without evidence, that Gaddafi was about to kill his citizens in Benghazi. Additionally, the British Parliamentary Committee said that NATO rushed into military intervention without pursuing other options.²⁹

In the United States of America and Britain, there is a re-evaluation of happenings in Libya consistent with the new mea culpa from Obama and House of Commons select committee. Such a re-evaluation is reinforced by the studies of German specialists who question the use of force for regime change in Libya. This notwithstanding, when academics and Western agencies inundate African institutions with grants to study terror, clearly, there is a studious avoidance of the implications of the intervention in Libya for the present instability in the Sahelian region of Africa. More specifically, the USA and western European countries finance and support organizations that they themselves deem as terrorist. One can critically assess the writings on reporters such as Jason Burke and examine the claims in his book, *Al-Qaeda: The True Story of Radical Islam (2004)* that there was not a real cohesive organization called al Qaeda. What remains striking is the difference in tone and content in the book twelve

years later on *The New Threat from Islamic Militancy (2016)*. The current war in Syria and the reversals for those groups allied with Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates has deepened the understanding of how violent extremists are funded by certain states of the Gulf Cooperation Council.

In Yemen, hundreds, if not thousands, of fighters from Al Qaeda of the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP), branded by the US government as the “most dangerous” affiliate of the loose international Al Qaeda network, have been recruited by Washington’s closest allies, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, to fight as foot soldiers in the near-genocidal US-backed war that these Persian Gulf oil monarchies have been waging against Yemen since 2015. There are now reports from the Associated Press that the Saudis “cut secret deals with al-Qaida fighters, paying some to leave key cities and towns and letting others retreat with weapons, equipment and wads of looted cash... Hundreds more were recruited to join the coalition itself.”³⁰

Penetrating humanitarianism

Alan Kuperman’s critique of the humanitarian fig leaf that was presented for the Libyan intervention presents very useful arguments about the motives of the western powers. Similar to most standard analysis, there is an omission of the role of finance

capital in that critique.³¹ The role of western nongovernmental organizations as ‘force multipliers’ for the US military was articulated very clearly by General Colin Powell. In 2001, Powell stated, “Just as surely as our diplomats and military, American NGOs are out there serving and sacrificing on the front lines of freedom... NGOs are such a force multiplier for us, such an important part of our combat team” in Afghanistan.³² The international ‘development’ NGOs that are integrated into the western military efforts must be distinguished from the thousands of local humanitarian organs that do not associate themselves with the intelligence/security apparatus of the US and Britain. Conscious policy-makers in Africa understand clearly that one of the biggest humanitarian projects of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was the humanitarian project of King Leopold that went to ‘save’ the Africans in the Congo. King Leopold and the Belgians killed 10 million Africans in that mission. It was surprising to this author that the majority of the laureates in the 2017 Governance Institute did not know this elementary fact which is documented in the book entitled *King Leopold’s Ghost*.³³ The ‘save Africa’ debate seek to dominate the spaces where learned scholars reflect on the ‘responsibility to protect’ in order to marginalise the ideas about Pan African responsibilities. Pan Africanism speaks about solidarity and the need to support our brothers and sisters in other parts of Africa that are suffering from exploitation and western involvement.

Nelson Mandela was one of those who called on the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the AU that Africans should be at the forefront of the fight against genocide. Accordingly, since the AU was formed in 2001 and 2002 it has held the position that the sovereignty of states does not give leaders the mandate to carry out genocide or other crimes against humanity. The Constitutive Act of the AU is explicit that this organization has the right to intervene whenever there are possibilities of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes. The discourses on human and people's rights in Africa informed the discussions in Africa after Rwanda and inspired African diplomats' support for the concept of responsibility to protect. However, after the manipulations of the Security Council Resolution 1973 in 2011 there was a crucial test for the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) of the African Union. The Libyan experience and the activities of NATO dictated that there will be vigilance in the future to be sure that international diplomatic instruments are indeed deployed to protect black lives and not to destroy them.

There has been a discussion on the inability of ECOWAS³⁴ to come to the assistance of brothers and sisters in Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin societies who are faced with this menace of Boko Haram. Boko Haram is an insurgent group that was created in North-eastern Nigeria and has grown beyond the borders of Nigeria. It now operates in Chad,

Niger and northern Cameroon. In April 2014, Boko Haram kidnapped 276 schoolgirls from Chibok and the leader Shekau announced the intention of selling them into slavery. Since the founding of this organization it has been internationalized and terrorizes citizens in the Lake Chad region.

Despite the lip service to the fight against terror, countries such as France that participated in the Libyan intervention manipulate the existence of groups such as Boko Haram and the militant elements from among the Tuareg peoples to promote the interests of French capital in Africa. Whenever France calls a meeting about terrorism, many of the African leaders come together. This has been most manifested in the energetic efforts of France to get the support of the Security Council of the UN for the financial backing for its G5 force in the Sahel.³⁵

New forms of warfare in Africa

The Libyan intervention represented a new mode of warfare; specifically information warfare a tactical and strategic use of information and data to gain advantage. This includes multiple types of information and the deployment of cyber resources (cyber warfare), electronic warfare and cyber-attacks. This warfare harnesses the satellite and communication resources of western states to facilitate electronic warfare, cyber warfare and

psychological operations (psy-ops). In the case of Libya, it was a supreme example of how the west rolled out its electronic warfare capabilities to control the Libyan electromagnetic spectrum. Additionally, there was coordinated electronic attack which consisted of jamming Libyan communications and radar. There was also the disruption of Libya's entire communications system.

Most modern wars involve psychological operations which in many ways is as important as the actual fighting. Psychological operations prepare the western population for them to politically support warfare, to finance warfare, to support military intervention and continued use of military means of engagement in other parts of the world. Information warfare started for example when the Psy-ops section of the western military infrastructure mounted a campaign to warn that the Libyan government was making plans to kill its own people. The now notorious military/cum PR firm Bell Pottinger was deployed for this propaganda barrage. We now have the authority of the investigation of the British parliament to note that this was a lie. Since the era of Donald Trump this information warfare has taken new dimensions with what is called fake news, specialized computerized production of data and lies spread mostly through the media. This information warfare on Libya had been set in motion so that we could have the resolutions of the UN. In Libya, this disinformation was directly

linked to the operations of the western intelligence operatives on the ground coordinating the massive air campaign.

Context for the Libyan Intervention

A year after the intervention in Libya, this author called a conference at the Syracuse University in Syracuse New York. It was during this conference that the Indian Ambassador and the South African Ambassador were asked why they signed on to resolution 1973 in 2011. They retorted that, we signed on to this resolution because we understood the resolution to mean that the UN was concerned about the citizens of Libya. We did not sign on to this resolution for NATO to carry on an incessant bombing campaign against Libya. The Indian Ambassador, then on the Security Council was further asked, then why do you not support the call by Africa to have an investigation of what went on when NATO exceeded its mandate? He said, we will call for such an investigation but the call must come from Africans. Many African countries are still too timid in their relationship with countries such as France, Britain and the USA.

Resolution 1973 of March 2011 said it "...demands immediate establishment of a ceasefire and a complete end to violence and attacks against, and abuses of civilians, and Impose a no flight zone over Libya, authorizes all necessary means to protect civilians

and civilian population areas and respect for foreign occupation zone, strengthens the enforcement of the arms embargo, and particular action against use of mercenaries, imposes a ban on all Libyan designated flights, imposes asset freeze on all assets owned by Libyan Investment Authority, and reaffirms that such assets should be used for the benefit of Libyan people, and extends travel ban.”

That was the summary content of the Resolution. Noticeably, there was nothing in this Resolution about bombing Libya or regime change. African intellectuals at that point set up a roadmap which called for an end to the hostilities in Libya. Today, even seven years later, that roadmap for Libya is still important. One outcome of the disinformation of the West is for the African publics to distrust interventions such as those of the African intellectuals who condemned the NATO destruction of Libya.

The disinformation machinery would have it that the trafficking of hundreds of thousands of young people in a clearly organised trade from Libyan soil, Africans are not supposed to condemn this new slave trade. The information warfare seeks to disarm Africans and give inordinate publicity to international humanitarian agencies. Given all these features of the destruction, there is need for clarity about the events in Libya. Younger generations must be educated to understand the happenings in Libya to promote clarity in Africa on why the intervention took place.

Nicholas Sarkozy the then President of France emailed the then US Secretary of State, Hilary Clinton, and set out clearly why the intervention took place. The information came out in 2016 during the elections in the US. As content of the email revealed in March 2011, Sarkozy spelt out the following five reasons why there had to be intervention in Libya.

- 1) France wanted to gain a greater share of Libyan oil production.
- 2) The intervention was necessary to increase French influence in North Africa
- 3) To improve the internal political situation in France. That the internal political situation in France is dependent on the instability of Africa.
- 4) To provide the French military with the opportunity to reassert its position in the world; and
- 5) To address the concern of his advisers over Gaddafi’s long term plans to supplant France as the dominant power in Francophone Africa.

Every intellectual, student, soldier, and diplomat should study the email exchanges of Sarkozy to Hilary Clinton because it is here that the real reasons for the intervention in Libya are spelt out. Sarkozy said earlier that the war in Libya was to save the Euro.

Not well known about Libya and what Sarkozy and the French covet is the Nubian aquifer, the large ocean of fresh water under Libya. One of the more significant projects that had been undertaken by the Libyan government was the construction of a giant water transfer scheme called the great man made river to transport water from the Nubian aquifer to the urban areas of Libya. During the NATO intervention, the factory that made the pipes for the Great Man Made River was bombed. Libya had become a member of the Lake Chad Basin Commission (LCBC) in 2008. The Libyan leadership had pledged support for a massive water transfer scheme from the Democratic Republic of the Congo through the Central African Republic to replenish Lake Chad which has lost about 95% of its surface water. There had been discussions with the Commission for an integrated water transfer scheme in the entire basin of Lake Chad and French would not want efforts towards empowerment of Africans in the case of water resources that could be commodified for French water companies.

NATO, Global NATO and Finance Capital

This author designated NATO in global terms in so far as the post-cold war reach of NATO went far beyond the Atlantic areas of the planet. NATO is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which was formed after WWII to protect the interests of the West.

When WWII was at its height, President Roosevelt called General Eisenhower to ask where the US should enter this war. General Eisenhower suggested North Africa and to Libya claiming that if you control North Africa and the Mediterranean you will control Europe. Thus geopolitically, it was important to control North Africa. This is why there is such intense interest in North Africa.

This book is called Global NATO because while NATO was mandated to protect Western Europe from communism, they have expanded their mandate to integrate themselves with the organisation for military cooperation in the Middle East, with the Mediterranean Dialogue (MD) and the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC). Together with their allies, Australia, New Zealand, Mongolia, South Korea, and Japan, there is the partnership that renders NATO a global force. The characterization Global NATO is also significant because the military establishment of the West is to protect finance capital, the shadow banks, and the international financial system that sustains the exorbitant privilege of the dollar. It is in this context that we come to the crux of the problem that triggered the intervention in Libya.

Libya was a country where (whatever was thought of its leader), hundreds of billions of dollars had been accumulated in reserve and the money was tightly controlled by the LIA. With its vast wealth, Libya joined the Arab Banking Corporation. This Corporation was controlled by some countries in

the Gulf and Libya. In November/December 2010, Libya gained control of the Arab Banking Corporation in Bahrain. Thus, Libya with its billions of dollars in reserves signalled other oil producing states in the Gulf to desist from recycling their wealth to feed into the banks of the West but to use the wealth for the upliftment of their societies.

In the meantime, the Western institutions including universities like London School of Economics and Harvard University, and consortiums like the Boston Consulting Group, sent scores of consultants to Libya on why the country must invest in Western banking and finance institutions and open up the Libyan economy.

It is clear therefore that the Central Bank of Libya that was tightly controlled outside of the International Monetary Fund, the National Oil Company of Libya that was tightly controlled by the Libyan Government and the Libyan Investment Authority were the targets of the liberal intellectuals of the West and the Western banking structures.

In the past 15 to 20 years, finance capital has moved into an area of financialization called the financialization of energy products. The financialization of energy products means that those who produce oil are caught in a trap financially between the banks and the oil companies to ensure that the capital that is made from the production of oil and energy resources are flowing back to Western banks. This is the background

of events in Libya in 2011. The Central Bank in Libya and the Libyan National Oil Company were companies that were nationalistic in relation to its defending the Libyan people. But NATO destroyed Libya and after the destruction claimed that the intervention was the most successful campaign that they have ever performed. NATO said they transformed Libya.

The Mode of Warfare in Libya

As was stated earlier, the deployment of information warfare capabilities had defined the nature of the NATO engagement in Libya. Early in the campaign the US Defence Secretary Robert Gates had outlined why it would not be necessary to have boots on the ground in Libya. Though it was the planning of the NATO commanders that electronic warfare and bombing would bring the regime to its knees, after three months of bombing the regime was still in place. A new arena was opened in relation to information warfare when in April 2011, the bombing had failed to dislodge the Gaddafi government. There was the buzz of referring Gaddafi to the International Criminal Court (ICC) for killing his own people. Together with the sanctions mandated by Resolution 1973 international public opinion was mobilized to condemn the leadership of Libya. These manoeuvres meant that it was necessary to dismiss and diminish the efforts of the African Union to mediate between the Libyan government and

the opposition National Transitional Council (NTC). In fact the NTC refused to meet the team of the AU. Despite the overwhelming bombing campaign, the NATO form of warfare required ground troops. These were provided by Chad, Qatar, and Sudan.

NATO was using a new mode of warfare. The first aspect of this warfare is to bomb by air. In the 78 days the NATO forces (also called the coalition) flew more than 38,000 sorties. Despite the post intervention stories of the success of the bombing campaign the vaunted cooperation between the forces was hampered by the lack of interoperability between the computerized systems of the USA and the other 'allies.' There was no cooperation in relation to battlefield information collection and exploitation system (BICES). After the intervention there had been recriminations among analysts about the inability of NATO to advance information sharing. US forces utilized the SIPRNET (Secret Internet Protocol Router Network) and these capabilities were not shared.³⁶

Recently, Western children do not want to fight in war anymore hence they seek to bomb from the air with jets and drones. Electronic warfare accompanied the bombing so that the command and control capabilities of the Libyan leadership and Libya's telecommunication system was jammed. Secondly, NATO deployed Special Forces what the US call Special Operations forces. Thirdly, they use local militias; and fourthly, they employ

foreign forces that are aligned with them. This is how they went into Libya. Before this time, however, there had been enough information warfare on Africans and across the world to garner support for this warfare and its approach.

An understanding of the military weakness of NATO and the West would clarify the reason they needed third party countries such as Chad, Sudan and Qatar to fight in the month of August 2011. Notably, since this war in Libya the relationship between Saudi Arabia and Qatar has broken down to the point where the son of Gaddafi that was in jail in one part of the country has now escaped to another part of the country that is held by the United Arab Emirates, Egypt and General Hifter.

The role of African Intellectuals and Institutions

Given this situation, there are pressing questions about what Africans and particularly African scholars and institutions are doing or can do about Libya. What is the role of CODESRIA and African intellectuals?

Seemingly, when the USA established the AFRICOM (AFRICOM) and the French intervened in West Africa to say they were fighting against terror, African intellectuals should have been at the forefront of opposing AFRICOM and French military intervention in Africa.

This author noted that when General Rodriguez determined that Libya was a failed state, no one reminded the world of the cheerleading role of his predecessor, General Carter Ham, in the first days of the bombing of Libya

The activism of AFRICOM and US supported foundations is clear not only in directing the research priorities of social science but also in commenting on political directions in Africa. In September 2017, for example, the head of AFRICOM unambiguously told Kenyans that they should not vote out the present government because Kenya should remain in Somalia irrespective of the social and financial costs to its people. This is an obvious case of intervention by AFRICOM in the politics of Africa while African intellectuals were silent.

As the Kwame Nkrumah Chair, the call of Kwame Nkrumah for the establishment of an African High Command is needful and reaffirmed. Progressive scholars should break the silences imposed by funding agencies that seek to harness the research capabilities of African institutions to focus on the priorities of what is defined as security by the US. It is in this regard that the work of Michael Hudson (2015) on Finance as Warfare becomes important in so far as the security interests of the USA in Africa relates to the security of the dollar as the dominant international currency. It is incumbent on patriotic scholars to use every platform to say that AFRICOM has no legitimacy in Africa and that we are not afraid to stand up in platforms

in any part of the world to call for the expulsion of all western military forces from Africa.

Kwame Nkrumah is one of those leaders that some Pan Africanists call continentalist because those who want to divide Africa say Africans everywhere should not be united. It is along this divisive line that the West classifies part of Africa where Libya is situated with the Middle East.³⁷ It is therefore necessary to understand events in Libya and their meaning for Africa.

We have to ask ourselves, in August they captured Tripoli and controlled Libya. Gaddafi escaped to Sirte and they tracked down Gaddafi and captured him alive. Why did they have to sodomize and kill Gaddafi? The sodomization and dehumanization of Gaddafi was an attempt to humiliate Africa and to say any African leader that stands up for African independence would be destroyed.

This author was never a supporter of Gaddafi and remembers the days when Gaddafi supported the Idi Amin dictatorship in Uganda, especially in the Ugandan Tanzanian war.³⁸ Nevertheless, the intervention in Libya, the killing of Gaddafi, the humiliation of Gaddafi and the theft of Libyan resources by Goldman Sachs and Wall Street is more important than Gaddafi as a person. A central part of the disinformation campaign is for African intellectuals and diplomats to disengage themselves from the events in Libya. It is therefore far too easy to centre on Gaddafi as a person

in order to camouflage the reasons and consequences of the intervention.

Having destroyed and plunged Libya into the current situation of three governments, there is an attempt at rationalization by the West amidst the many disruptive consequences of the self-serving intervention.

Part of the responsibility for African intellectuals and institutions is that our students and youths in our mosques, churches, schools and communities must be educated to have African reference points. They must know who Patrice Lumumba was and why Patrice Lumumba stood for the independence of the Congo. It was amazing twenty years ago, while walking on the Campus of the University of Dar es Salaam to learn that primary school children did not know many of our African leaders. Only five years after Samora Machel died, a question about who he is had the answer: "Samora who?" Inferably, our intellectuals are following the disinformation process because many of the current people do not know about Samora Machel. Similarly, most Africans do not know that it was the defeat of the South African army at Cuito Cuanavale in 1988 that brought about the final defeat of the apartheid army and ushered in the independence of Namibia. The African academy therefore has the urgent duty to educate this generation to understand African events from African points of view.

There is no discounting, however, what our African brothers and sisters do in

their engagement with Africa. In fact, there is continuing engagement with the radical African feminists who are raising questions of how to create a Pan African Women's Liberation Organisation because these feminists agree with our brothers and sisters in North America who are saying "Black Lives Matter". This agreement with the Africans in the Americas is important in stimulating discussions about the safety of Black Lives everywhere. What is surprising nonetheless is that in Africa when some people die in France from a bombing African leaders fly to France and march on the streets with President Hollande about the people dying in France but when people die in the United States not one African leader say anything about Africans who die. That sensibility is therefore needed first within the African academy and then policy cycles that anything that happens to an African in Haiti, Cuba, Brazil, United States, Libya or Somalia is an injury for all Africa.

Institutions such as CODESRIA, the Nyerere Foundation, the Mbeki Foundation, and other such institutions in Africa have a role to play in closing the gap between the academy and policy-making. The younger graduates of CODESRIA Institutes do not just have to look to the African leaders for guidance on human trafficking in North Africa and the destabilization of the Sahel. Along this call, a CODESRIA bulletin on the Libya intervention as one of the most important things that have happened in Africa is overdue.

Importantly, foreign funding should not always determine discussions relating to the security and wellbeing of Africans.

UN Security Council Resolutions 2259, 2278, and 2362 call on Member States to recognize and support the Government of National Accord and to comply with Security Council efforts to enforce asset freezes, travel bans, and arms embargo measures. However, the USA selectively uses the mandate of the Security Council to intervene in Libya (to fight ISIS) as in 2014 when it seized a ship with millions of dollars of oil but the same US government is very quiet in relation to the activities of General Hifter and the so called Libyan National Army.

It is however not too late to engage the question about the role of states such as Egypt, the Sudan and Chad in the present destruction of Libya.

There is no statute of limitation regarding the engagement of the Libyan question. It is not too late because the same justifications for the Libya intervention are being used for going into Somalia. Through this medium and other forums we want the African population to make the connection between Libya and the rest of the continent because many Africans are told that Libya is not an African country. In fact, there have been real human rights violation against Africans most notably the 30,000 African 'slaves' in Libya. It is therefore critical that our intellectuals and institutions do not

close the chapter on Libya until that part of Africa and Africans restore peace to this country and the continent.

Lessons, responsibility and recommendations from Libya

The first instructive lesson we need to learn is that Africans must get hold of the information on happenings in Africa and make their own decisions on it. African intellectuals at the time of the NATO intervention in Libya brought out a document that was signed by two hundred (200) African academics to say that Libya is an African country and NATO should not be involved. That initiative that was taken by African scholars in South Africa should be expanded given its continuing importance. We should not accept Western designation of terrorism, the idea that France is fighting terrorism in the Maghreb, or that France will bring peace to Africa.

The second responsibility that comes from this brief is that the AU must pressure the UN for a re-evaluation of the Libya intervention and ensure accountability by the West. African intellectuals must relentlessly pressure the continental union to call for this re-evaluation. One important historical lesson may suffice to drive home the need for constant call for accountability on the Libyan question. In 1935 Benito Mussolini invaded Ethiopia, Abyssinia. This invasion was

to destroy an independent African country but the defeat of the Italians in Abyssinia was a reawakening among Africans on the need to mobilize for political independence. Expectedly, the Ethiopians never forgot what Mussolini did in Ethiopia. Seventy years afterwards the Ethiopians called for the Italians to return the obelisk that they had stolen from Ethiopia.³⁹ Similarly, it is hereby underlined that as African intellectuals even fifty years afterwards we must call for the re-evaluation and accountability for what went down in Libya. More importantly, progressive scholars ought to learn how the Italian invasion accelerated the demand for African independence. The current fragility of international capitalism along with the fires of warfare presents another potent moment for speeding the unification of Africa.

The third clarion call is the demilitarization of Africa and ultimately withdrawal of French and foreign forces from Africa and the expulsion of AFRICOM. For extremists in Africa, those who kill people, we should mobilize the police activities that can ferret out those who finance these people to carry out all the inhumane actions in Africa. Here the groups that come to mind are Al Shabbab, Boko Haram and Séléka rebels.⁴⁰ In efforts to overcome extremism in Africa, cooperation within Africa by Africans would be more helpful. African driven cooperation within the continent is very important because we cannot have the United States saying they are

fighting Al Shabbab in Somalia and the Somalia Wahhabis are financed by the Wahhabis from Saudi Arabia while these financiers are the allies of the United States of America.⁴¹

The fourth point is the need to engage the discussion on the African currency. We have the figures for capital flight from Africa from the high-level panel of the AU. The figures are clear that Africa is losing over US \$50 billion dollars every year via illicit financial outflow. The debate on foreign aid and 'development partners' has in the past diverted attention from this very important aspect of the loss of resources from Africa. More than a trillion dollars have been lost from Africa because Africans are being mobilized to keep their reserves in the Euro and the US dollar. In the struggle between the Euro and the US dollar, the CFA created by France is linked to the Euro so that the Europeans can now compete with Americans in the present currency wars. There is urgent need therefore to implement the AU time table for an African currency and unite the resources of Africa so that the peoples of Africa can use their resources to invest in Africa.

There are some pundits who call for a methodical approach to the African currency. In the attempt to create the African currency, a key consideration however is that we cannot have a methodic abolition of the western European currency. The abolition must be sharp, sudden, and by surprise.

Anything methodic is warning and giving them notice. Instead of methodic abolition constant information and education is required so that when the inevitable moment comes given the financial crises we will be ready.

The prevailing capitalist crisis means that stepwise processes for integration and regional integration are unhelpful. This crisis means that there are different currency blocks. There is the US Dollar, the Euro, the Japanese Yen, the Chinese RMB and the Latin Americans want their own currency. Why does Africa have to wait to have our own integration and currency?

Germany offers an instructive example in the discussion about African currency. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, there was clarity among German political leadership to unite the currency of West and East Germany. Consequently, in the universities in Germany they always taught German students about what it means to unite the currency. Thus at the time of the fall of the Berlin Wall, Chancellor Helmut Kohl did not do a methodic abolition of the two currencies. He did it overnight and then informed the French, the British, the Russians, and the Americans to avoid opposition that could ensue from a methodic approach. Accordingly, Africa should avoid being methodic in the creating of the African currency. Unsurprisingly, the French might want a methodic approach for Africa to gather information on that process and currency in order to stage the fiercest

opposition possible. Most importantly, however, France must be out of Africa. One of the central tasks to realize this objective is to educate Africans on the role of the CFA; that the CFA is not a stabilizing force in Africa but a basis for draining currency out of Africa. Moreover, if they practice quantitative easing, that is print more currency in currency wars, what kind of stability are they bringing to Africa with this kind of war?

Lastly, there must be an end to warfare in Africa. This call to end warfare in Africa is not just to bring peace but to secure peace in order to engage in the reconstruction of Africa. The reconstruction of Africa requires that the resources of Africa and African peoples are used to invest in building up the productive capabilities of Africa so that Africa can end this tale of exploitation, domination and manipulation. In this present financial crisis intellectuals, activists, and those who are concerned with the future of the world need to engage with questions of peace so that Africa can make decisions about Africa for Africans at home and abroad.

Conclusion

In conclusion the intervention in Libya has to be understood as being primarily driven by Finance capital and the desire of the West to control the wealth and energy resources of Libya to prop up, especially French interests in Africa. This understanding must be connected with the prevailing currency wars to provide

the broader picture of competing parties which collaborated to destroy Libya to share its wealth and supplant attempt to create an African currency.

It is clear however that this intervention and the prevailing fragility of the global capitalist economy is rather working to

facilitate the timeline for the emergence of the African currency.

In all these developments, African engagements are necessary to accelerate the pace of the African currency within a peaceful environment devoid of militarism.

Notes

1. The head of Training Grants and Fellowships at CODESRIA, Dr Ibrahim Oanda, is hereby acknowledged for his initiative in setting in motion this discussion on the role of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in the continued destabilization of Africa.
2. United States Africa Command 2017 Posture Statement, as delivered to the Senate Armed Service Committee on March 9, 2017, <http://www.africom.mil/Tags/annual-posture-statement>.
3. Horace Campbell (2013) *Global NATO and the Catastrophic Failure in Libya: Lessons for Africa in the forging of African Unity*. Monthly Review Press.
4. Case Number HC-2014-000197. <https://www.judiciary.gov.uk/judgments/libyan-investment-authority-v-goldman-sachs/>. The details of the case which have been published online can be accessed from <https://www.judiciary.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/lia-v-goldman.pdf>. Some of the issues bordering the case are raised in the article "Goldman Sachs vindicated but bruised in court battle with Libyan fund" posted by Reuters on October 16, 2016. See <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-libya-swf-litigation/goldman-sachs-vindicated-but-bruised-in-court-battle-with-libyan-fund-idUSKBN12G0QE>. Two days earlier, viz, October 14, 2016 there was an article posted by Reuters titled "Goldman Sachs wins \$1.2billion with Libyan Sovereign Fund" This article is also available online at <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-libya-swf-litigation/goldman-sachs-wins-1-2-billion-dispute-with-libyan-sovereign-fund-idUSKBN12E1GL>. It can be understood from these articles by Claire Milhench that the \$1.2billion dollars was part of LIA's \$67billion sovereign wealth fund. It has revealed another \$2.1billion battle between the LIA and the French Bank Societe General.
5. Mrs Justice Rose. *Libya vs Goldman Sachs Judgment*. Case No: HC-2014-000197. In the High Court of Justice Chancery Division. Royal Courts of Justice Strand, London, WC2A 2LL. October 14, 2016. <http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/10/14/business/dealbook/document-Libya-vs-Goldman-Sachs-Judgement.html>
6. Margaret Coker and Liz Rappaport, "Libya's Goldman Dalliance Ends in Losses, Acrimony," *Wall Street Journal*, May 31, 2011, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304066504576347190532098376.html>
7. Horace Campbell (2013) *Global NATO and the Catastrophic Failure in Libya: Lessons for Africa in the forging of African Unity* (Monthly Review Press).

8. The dispersal of many of the principals of the Libyan Investment authority and state-owned National Oil Corporation (NOC) hindered the development of the position of Libya. In April 2012, the former prime minister and oil minister Shokri Ghanem who had also been the chairman of the NOC was found dead in the Danube River in Vienna. Ghanem was supposed to have drowned. He was privy to potentially damaging information including on oil deals with Western governments. See Michael Shield, "Gaddafi-era Libyan oil chief drowned: Vienna police," Reuters, April 30, 2012 <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-libya-ghanem/gaddafi-era-libyan-oil-chief-drowned-vienna-police-idUSBRE83T0SJ20120430>
9. Jack Rasmus, *Systemic Fragility in the Global Economy*. Clarity Press; New York, 2016, See also James Kwak and Simon Johnson, *13 Bankers: Wall Street Takeover and the Next Financial Meltdown*, Pantheon Books, New York 2010.
10. Barry Eichengreen, *Exorbitant Privilege: The Rise and Fall of the Dollar and the Future of the International Monetary System*, Oxford University Press 2012.
11. The activities of the financial houses in the opaque world of derivatives and dark pools are well documented in the book by Charles Ferguson, *Predator Nation: Corporate Criminals, Political Corruption, and the Hijacking of America*, Crown Business, 2013.
12. According to the World Economic Forum the Illicit global economy is formed "from the proceeds of illicit trade which is, in turn, largely rooted in organized crime. Whether it is human trafficking, arms trafficking, the illegal wildlife trade, counterfeiting or money laundering, these activities are incredibly lucrative and fuel the magnitude of the illicit economy." World Economic Forum, *State of the Illicit Economy: Briefing Papers 2015*, http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_State_of_the_Illicit_Economy_2015_2.pdf. See also Peter Andreas, *International Politics and the Illicit Global Economy, Perspectives on Politics*, September 2015|Vol. 13/No. 3.
13. This classification is frequent in the various Congressional Research report. See for instance Christopher Blanchard, *Libya: Transition and US Policy*, Congressional Research Service, October 2017.
14. John Bellamy Foster, *The New Imperialism of Globalized Monopoly-Finance Capital*, *Monthly Review*, Volume 67, Issue 03 (July-August) 2015.
15. Resolution 1970 was passed in February 26, 2011. This was however replaced with the more controversial Resolution 1973. This latter Resolution was not ready to make the mode of intervention and its analysis clear. It was the 5 abstentions that brought out the lack of clarity in the hurriedly passed resolution which aimed at killing and destroying the Libyan society to facilitate the interests of France. The full resolution which has been included in Appendix 3 page 281 of the book "Global NATO and the Catastrophic Failure in Libya: Lessons for Africa in the forging of African Unity" could also be read on <https://www.un.org/press/en/2011/sc10200.doc.htm#Resolution>
16. The African Union Strategy for the Sahel Region, Peace and Security Council, 449th Meeting 11 August 2014.
17. Phyllis Bennis, *Understanding ISIS and the New Global War on Terror: A Primer* Northampton, MA: Olive Branch Press, 2015.

18. This book by Vijay Prashad published by AK Press in 2012 catalogues the assault on Libya in the light of the waves of revolutions that swept across parts of North Africa and the Middle East in the spring of 2011.
19. Forte's book "Slouching towards Sirte: NATO's war in Libya and Africa" was published in November 28, 2012. In this book Forte examines the myths and puts the involvement of the USA into perspective.
20. See inter alia Frederic Wehrey and Peter Cole, "Building Libya's Security Sector," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, August 6, 2013, <http://carnegieendowment.org/2013/08/06/building-libya-s-security-sector> and Alan Kuperman. "A Model Humanitarian Intervention? Reassessing NATO's Libya Campaign". *International Security* 38 (2013): 105–36
21. In this 32-page report by the International Crisis Group, the destructive effects of the intervention were identified and, what need not surprise the reader, the "frenzied competition for control over the oil resources of Libya by the coalition parties that led NATO to the war on Libya. See ICG Middle East and North Africa Report No 165 published on December 3, 2015.
22. Congressional Research Service Report prepared by Christopher M. Blanchard on "Libya: Tradition and US Policy", August 3, 2015. RL33142. This report was also published online on March 29, 2017, an could be read at https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/20170329_RL33142_6202307c0d047d809ff29d9011afc99d7a847ffa.html
23. Statement on Central Bank of Libya, May 25, 2016; and Hassan Morajea and Tamer El-Ghobashy, "Libya's Central Bank Needs Money Stashed in a Safe; Problem Is, Officials Don't Have the Code," *Wall Street Journal*, May 13, 2016.
24. "US commander in Africa says Libya is a failed state," *Associated Press*, March 8, 2016, <http://www.apnewsarchive.com/2016/The-top-American-general-in-Africa-says-Libya-is-a-failed-state/id-dbb1d572b9b54a5cb5cbde1081b26f9d>
25. *Libyan Express*. US Commander in Africa: Libya is a failed state. March 9, 2016. <https://www.libyanexpress.com/us-commander-in-africa-libya-is-a-failed-state/>
26. See the chapter of Robert Rotberg, *Odious and Failed States, Humanitarian Responses* in the book, *Failed States and Fragile Societies: a new world disorder*, edited by Ingo Trauschweizer and Steven M. Miner, Ohio University Press, 2014.
27. Michael Barnett, had written on the duplicity of the West in the Rwandan genocide and also *Empire of Humanity, A History of Humanitarianism, Cornell University Press, 2011*.
28. Jeffrey Goldberg, "The Obama Doctrine," *Atlantic Magazine*, April 2016. <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2016/04/the-obama-doctrine/471525/> One of the persons who was fired by Obama and who wanted more intervention in West Asia was General Mattis who had given President Obama a draft plan of how to invade Iran. That General Mattis is now the Secretary of Defence of the United States of America.
29. This observation had been made earlier by the abstentions during the vote in the security council of UN to intervene in Libya

30. <https://abcnews.go.com/International/wireStory/yemen-us-allies-defeat-al-qaida-pay-57051248>
31. Alan Kuperman. "A Model Humanitarian Intervention? Reassessing NATO's Libya Campaign". *International Security* 38 (2013): 105–36
32. Quoted in *Humanitarianism Contested, Where Angels Fear to Tread*, by Michael Barnett and Thomas G. Weiss, Routledge, New York 2011
33. In this book Adam Hochschild uses information from archives, journals of soldiers, and available public documents to detail the genocide that occurred in the Congo in the civilization and humanitarian project of the Belgians and King Leopold. The full title of the book is "King Leopold's Ghost: A story of greed, terror and heroism in colonial Africa" published in 1998.
34. ECOWAS is the Economic Community of West African States.
35. The G5 Sahel Cross-Border Joint Force was officially launched on 2 July 2017, in Bamako, by the presidents of five States of the Sahel. This joint military force has since been endorsed by the African Union and recognized by the UN Security Council by resolution 2359 (21 June 2017), sponsored by France. Its mandate is to combat terrorism, transnational organized crime and human trafficking in the G5 Sahel area. The G5 members are Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, Mauritania and Niger. See .Security Council authorizes UN support for G5 Sahel troops: <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2017/12/security-council-authorizes-un-support-g5-sahel-troops/#ampshare=https://www.vanguardngr.com/2017/12/security-council-authorizes-un-support-g5-sahel-troops/>
36. Maj Jason R. Greenleaf, USAF, *The Air War in Libya*, Defense Technical information Center, 2013, <http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a576042.pdf>. See also *Precision and purpose: airpower in the Libyan Civil War*, edited by Karl P. Mueller [and thirteen others], Rand Corporation 2015 .
37. In classifying parts of Africa with the Middle East and the other part as sub-Saharan Africa, these divisive efforts fail to recognize that there could be a "sub" without the main from which the so-called sub was derived. That recognition would have meant that there would be a Saharan Africa. More importantly, Africans must just be seen as Africans and the continent as Africa.
38. During this war fought in 1978/1979 the troops that fought for Idi Amin included several forces from Libya. It was also by the end of this war that the dictatorial regime of Amin finally collapsed
39. In April 19, 2005, after 68 years when Benito Mussolini invaded Abyssinia the first piece of the estimated 1,700 year old granite obelisk was returned to Ethiopia. Throughout the period Ethiopians did not stop calling for the return of its cultural heritage even after Italy refused to abide by the 1947 UN agreement to return the stolen asset to the people of Abyssinia. The news about the return could be read at <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2005/apr/20/italy.ethiopia>. Last year a committee was honoured for their efforts in ensuring the heritage was returned, see <http://www.ena.gov.et/en/index.php/social/item/1440-ethiopia-honors-nat-l-committee-for-return-of-axum-obelisk>

40. Al Shabbab is known to widely operate in Somalia. Boko Haram has been operating in Northern Nigeria. The Séléka rebels operates in the Central African Republic. These situations must be policed out of Africa for the peace and reconstruction of the Africa and the specific African lands. The existence of these groups does not however indicate a prevalence of terrorism across Africa as the West would have Africans believe.
41. The Wahhabis are known close allies with the Al Saud, the ruling family of Saudi Arabia and are therefore linked with the state apparatus in that country. The contradictions in international relations of the West has meant that though the European Parliament has identified Wahhabism as the main source of the so-called global terrorism, the United States and the West are the close allies of the Saudi state. On the European identification of Wahhabism with terrorism and its general history see for example <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/03/29/what-is-wahhabism-the-reactionary-branch-of-islam-said-to-be-the/>



Acknowledgements

CODESRIA would like to express its gratitude to the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), the Carnegie Corporation of New York (CCNY), the Open Society Foundations (OSFs), Andrew Mellon Foundation, Oumou Dilly Foundation and the Government of Senegal for supporting its research, training and publication programmes.

CODESRIA, Avenue Cheikh Anta Diop X Canal IV, BP : 3304, Dakar, 18524, Senegal
Tel: +221 33 825 98 22/23 - 33 864 01 36 • Fax: +221 33 824 12 89 • Web: www.codesria.org