

Libya Coming Full Circle. When A Deemed “Conspiracy Theory” Becomes Reality

Libya as a Functioning, Cohesive State has virtually Ceased to Exist

By [Sam Muhho](#)

Global Research, June 18, 2014

Region: [Middle East & North Africa](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [Terrorism](#), [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In the duration of the “revolutionary frenzy” that categorized western media coverage of the Libyan Civil War in 2011, public audiences were captivated with both tales of rebels aspiring for “democracy” and with complimenting stories of unabated brutality by Gaddafi forces.

Without any serious mainstream criticism, an imperialist mythology centered on the interventionist doctrine of the “Responsibility to Protect” was cemented in public consciousness with even usually non-mainstream and “anti-imperialist” figures such as Juan Cole [deliberately misrepresenting the situation](#) in Libya. In Cole’s perspective, no reference to armed militants from the start of the conflict or the [role of extremism](#) and [western premeditation](#) found its way into the narrative and he predicted a simplistic narrative where the overthrow of Gaddafi would lead the region into an era of unity, prosperity and freedom.

Libya Today

How is Libya today? If one denied the existence of hell, they need not look further than Libya to observe a case of hell on Earth. Libya as a functioning, cohesive state has virtually ceased to exist, having been replaced by a myriad of conflicting factions divided on tribal and religious lines. While mainstream media tends to obscure the identity of these factions and their connection to western imperialists, Eric Draitser in his analysis, “[Benghazi, the CIA, and the War in Libya](#)” shows the beyond the fractious infighting, both primary factions engaging in direct combat have been beneficiaries of the NATO imperialist powers in their systematic aggression against the Libyan state.

Battling over the strategic commercial area around Benghazi is the Islamist Ansar al-Sharia led by Ahmed Abu Khattala fighting against the former leader of the CIA-backed Libyan National Salvation Front and current renegade Libyan Army General Khalifa Hifter. The conflict is more complex than merely conflagration between these two main parties and is interspersed with competing militias and gangs. As noted by Draitser, the February 17th Martyrs Brigade, seen as one of the most capable militias in the region, has received training by western forces and is seen as a reliable security force, but is recognized by its own members as having anti-American sentiments.

The Islamist Ansar al-Sharia has been implicated in the September 11, 2012 attack on the American consulate in Benghazi with its leader Khattala admitting being present but denying leading the attack. With no end in sight for the war, it appears that the primary gainers in the conflict are the western [corporate-financier interests](#) who orchestrated the

overthrow of Gaddafi because he was seen an impediment to accomplishing their geopolitical aims.

Now they Admit the Truth.

On April 24th, 2014, Washington's Blog published a priceless and concise piece titled "[Confirmed: U.S. Armed Al Qaeda to Topple Libya's Gaddafi](#)" with a very astonishing admission by "*top military officers, CIA insiders and think-tankers*" confirming the obvious truth that "conspiracy theorists" have been saying since 2011. The US backed Al Qaeda in Libya and that the Benghazi attack was a byproduct of this. Washington's Blog notes that in 2012, it documented that:

The U.S. supported opposition which overthrew Libya's Gaddafi was [largely comprised of Al Qaeda terrorists](#).

According to a 2007 [report](#) by West Point's Combating Terrorism Center's center, the Libyan city of Benghazi was one of Al Qaeda's main headquarters - and bases for sending Al Qaeda fighters into Iraq - prior to the overthrow of Gaddafi:

The Hindustan Times [reported](#) last year:

"There is no question that al Qaeda's Libyan franchise, Libyan Islamic Fighting Group, is a part of the opposition," Bruce Riedel, former CIA officer and a leading expert on terrorism, told Hindustan Times.

It has always been Qaddafi's biggest enemy and its stronghold is Benghazi.

Al Qaeda is now largely in control of Libya. Indeed, Al Qaeda flags were [flown over the Benghazi courthouse](#) once Gaddafi was toppled.

What was once deemed conspiracy theory became confirmed reality when the [Daily Mail reported](#) as Washington's Blog subsequently pointed out:

A self-selected group of former top military officers, CIA insiders and think-tankers, declared Tuesday in Washington that a seven-month review of the deadly 2012 terrorist attack has determined that it could have been prevented - if the U.S. hadn't been helping to arm al-Qaeda militias throughout Libya a year earlier.

'The United States switched sides in the war on terror with what we did in Libya, knowingly facilitating the provision of weapons to known al-Qaeda militias and figures,' Clare Lopez, a member of the commission and a former CIA officer, told MailOnline.

She blamed the Obama administration for failing to stop half of a \$1 billion United Arab Emirates arms shipment from reaching al-Qaeda-linked militants.

'Remember, these weapons that came into Benghazi were permitted to enter by our armed forces who were blockading the approaches from air and sea,' Lopez claimed. 'They were permitted to come in. ... [They] knew these weapons were coming in, and that was allowed..

'The intelligence community was part of that, the Department of State was part of that, and certainly that means that the top leadership of the United

States, our national security leadership, and potentially Congress – if they were briefed on this – also knew about this.’

‘The White House and senior Congressional members,’ the group wrote in an interim report released Tuesday, ‘deliberately and knowingly pursued a policy that provided material support to terrorist organizations in order to topple a ruler [Muammar Gaddafi] who had been working closely with the West actively to suppress al-Qaeda.’

‘Some look at it as treason,’ said Wayne Simmons, a former CIA officer who participated in the commission’s research.

While Wayne Simmons’ characterization of such actions by the globalist, imperialist establishment in the United States as “treason” is correct in the sense that it was a clear violation of not only the Constitution, but the public interest of America, there is a rather disingenuous factor involved when some people, especially on the Neo-Con right, attempt to play the “treason card.”

To perpetuate the false political theater of left-wing vs. right-wing designed to capitalize on myopic divisions, some Neo-Conservatives involved with the same [corporate agenda](#) as Obama have taken the time to [jettison responsibility of U.S. financing of terrorism in Syria and Libya on “Obama the crypto-Muslim.”](#) This charge is found among the likes of Frank Gaffney who would have you delve into partisan-driven Islamophobia blaming everything on the “liberals”, Obama’s “foreign policy”, and treasonous elements within the US government. This, of-course, is done without insight into how such figures are merely cogs within a bipartisan machine of globalist aggression.

Interestingly, while the Neo-Con right attempts to distance itself from the Libyan war, it was one of the most vocal factions, acting in concert with the Obama administration, in promoting greater US involvement in the war as [Tony Cartalucci points out in this article](#). He notes that, “In an [open letter to House Republicans](#), the Foreign Policy Initiative which consists of Gaffney’s fellow Neo-Conservatives, stated in regards to Libya (emphasis added)”:

We share the concerns of many in Congress about the way in which the Obama administration has conducted and justified this operation. The problem is not that the President has done too much, however, but that he has done too little to achieve the goal of removing Qaddafi from power. The United States should be leading in this effort, not trailing behind our allies. We should be doing more to help the Libyan opposition, which deserves our support. We should not be allowing ourselves to be held hostage to U.N. Security Council resolutions and irresolute allies.

Clearly the Neo-Con agenda has been [coming full circle](#) since the first Gulf War in the 1990s. The US “gun-walking” to jihadis in Syria from Libya, noted by the [Washington Times and New York Times \(albeit with partisan spin and distortion\)](#), was actually planned under Bush in 2007 as noted by Seymour Hersh in “[The Redirection](#).” It has continued under Obama, influenced by Council on Foreign Relations figures throughout both administrations from Dick Cheney to Hillary Clinton. Consider the following points from “The Redirection”:

To undermine Iran, which is predominantly Shiite, the Bush Administration has decided, in effect, to reconfigure its priorities in the Middle East. In Lebanon,

the Administration has coöperated with Saudi Arabia's government, which is Sunni, in clandestine operations that are intended to weaken Hezbollah, the Shiite organization that is backed by Iran. The U.S. has also taken part in clandestine operations aimed at Iran and its ally Syria. A by-product of these activities has been the bolstering of Sunni extremist groups that espouse a militant vision of Islam and are hostile to America and sympathetic to Al Qaeda.

To dispel critics' notions that this is passive, uncontrollable, and indirect support, consider:

[Saudi Arabia's] Bandar and other Saudis have assured the White House that "they will keep a very close eye on the religious fundamentalists. Their message to us was 'We've created this movement, and we can control it.' It's not that we don't want the Salafis to throw bombs; it's who they throw them at—Hezbollah, Moqtada al-Sadr, Iran, and at the Syrians, if they continue to work with Hezbollah and Iran.

Neo-Conservative writer Gary Gambill would ride on this wave of terrorist aggression and pen an article for the Neo-Con "Middle East Forum" titled "[Two Cheers for Syrian Islamists](#)." As noted in the analysis of the piece by Tony Cartalucci titled "[Globalist Rag Gives 'Two Cheers' for Terrorism](#)", one can see how terrorism is a useful piece of capital of globalist imperialism that is easy to hide in the sight of inattentive masses with easy ploys of political spin and plausible deniability.

The Syria Connection

[Libyan terrorists are invading Syria](#). They have been doing so since the influx of jihadis began, enabled by outside powers. These are not simply rogue networks operating independently but rather include state-sponsorship, especially of [NATO-member Turkey](#) and NATO's criminal proxy government in Tripoli, Libya. We are told by the media that the regime in Tripoli under the auspice of the National Transitional Council, and populated with puppets like Mustapha Abdul Jalil, is a moderate regime distinct from the "marginal Islamist forces." However, even in mainstream accounts, one can note that these "official, moderate" groups are involved with funding terrorism themselves as many geopolitical analysts have noted.

Tony Cartalucci notes that, "In November 2011, the Telegraph in their article, "[Leading Libyan Islamist met Free Syrian Army opposition group](#)," would report":

Abdulahakim Belhadj, head of the Tripoli Military Council and the former leader of the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group, "met with Free Syrian Army leaders in Istanbul and on the border with Turkey," said a military official working with Mr Belhadj. "Mustafa Abdul Jalil (the interim Libyan president) sent him there."

Another Telegraph article, "[Libya's new rulers offer weapons to Syrian rebels](#)," :

Syrian rebels held secret talks with Libya's new authorities on Friday, aiming to secure weapons and money for their insurgency against President Bashar al-Assad's regime, The Daily Telegraph has learned.

At the meeting, which was held in Istanbul and included Turkish officials, the

Syrians requested “assistance” from the Libyan representatives and were offered arms, and potentially volunteers.

“There is something being planned to send weapons and even Libyan fighters to Syria,” said a Libyan source, speaking on condition of anonymity. “There is a military intervention on the way. Within a few weeks you will see.”

Readers would be wise to note the heavy saturation of Al Qaeda terrorists in eastern Libya, [particularly in Darna](#), and whose historical role has been documented by the [US’s West Point Combating Terrorism Center](#). It is inconceivable that these forces would not have played a central role of the uprising. According to a October 2011 [Christian Science Monitor](#), Mustapha Abdul Jalil has given a “nod to Islamist fighters” who fought against Gaddafi by courting Islamist interests and in permitting polygamy, formerly banned under Gaddafi. He was seen as catering to Islamists by establishing Sharia law as the foundation of Libya’s future government; under Gaddafi, Shariah had also played a role with limited, moderate interpretation and in context to Gaddafi’s own political ideology. There are fears are that Islamists, repressed under Gaddafi, would make a forceful resurgence, as they have. The article states:

Gadhafi saw militants as a threat to his authoritarian rule...Islamists are a small minority among Libya’s population of 6 million, but they were by far the largest and most powerful faction among the fighters who battled pro-Gadhafi forces in eight months of civil war. Abdul-Jalil, analysts said, was likely to have given his address an Islamic slant as a nod to those fighters who were united with other factions by the common goal of ousting Gadhafi but now are jockeying to fill the political vacuum left by his ouster.

Furthermore:

“It may not be quite be the country that [NATO](#) thought it was fighting for (when Sharia is implemented in Libya),” said David Hartwell, a British-based Libya expert. “But the huge amounts of oil and gas in Libya will make everyone learn how to reconcile themselves with the new Libya.”

And just for the record, I don’t equate every single Libyan fighter on the ground as Islamist extremists and I believe there were individuals who felt disenfranchised and had legitimate grievances. As in any society, you have an opposition and in the case of Libya, a [Library of Congress page that concedes meddlesome US support for opposition groups](#), notes that the opposition is, “*Divided ideologically into such groups as [Baathists](#) (see Glossary), socialists, monarchists, liberals, and Islamic fundamentalists...*” Islamists, nonetheless, were one of the most critical driving forces of the conflict on the ground. Gaddafi also had popular support on the ground, especially in the west and among Black Libyans who Gaddafi had protected. One must not neglect the role of [racist elements among the opposition](#) fighters targeting blacks under false accusations of them being “mercenaries” as well as the accomplishment of the Gaddafi regime in bringing Libya from one of the poorest countries in the world to a nation that ranked as “high” in the UNDP’s Human Development Index

Full Circle of Destruction

The globalist agenda wanted Libya out of the equation for its role in opposing the global financial order envisioned by Wall Street, namely in challenging the petrodollar by proposing

a “gold dinar” currency for Africa with which to sell oil. This is explained in “[Are The Middle East Wars Really About Forcing the World Into Dollars and Private Central Banking?](#)” which notes the role of banking interests in orchestrating global aggression. Not to be missed is the “[Wolfowitz Doctrine](#)” proposed in the 1990s upon which Libya was a nation slated for regime change.

In seeking to reorient the Middle East according to its interests, the western powers have, in essence, attempted to alter the very forces of nature and reaped undue consequences. Libya is now a failed-state and a terrorist safe-haven. Regardless of one’s opinion of Gaddafi and his short-comings, no one can seriously argue that Libya is better off today. Innocent people continue to die in order to fulfill the hegemonic ambitions of the western elite. This will continue unless we collectively rise up, boycott, and replace these interests. [That is real revolution.](#)

Sam Muhho is a student of history at Florida State College (FSCJ) and an advocate of anti-imperialism and anti-globalism. He can be reached at smuhho1@gmail.com.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Sam Muhho](#), Global Research, 2014

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Sam Muhho](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca