

NATO intervention in Libya is in its own (oil) interest

By Prof. Andreas Buro,

Speaker for Peace Policy of the Committee for Basic Rights and Democracy

and

Clemens Ronnefeldt,

Speaker for Peace Concerns of the German branch of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation



1. The Kosovo/Yugoslavia War as antecedent to the UN Libya Resolution of 1973

On April 15 1999 the following sentences appeared in a commentary in connection with the Kosovo/Yugoslavia war in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung:

„In German opinions on the Kosovo war the arbitrary naiveté of many who used to consider themselves ‚leftist‘ but have appropriated government rhetoric turning NATO into a kind of disinterested medium for morality or an organization for human rights by other means appears obvious. Both intellectuals and politicians concentrate, in their justification of military action, solely on its ‚humanitarian‘ aspects. Many recoil from wording that might sound even distantly connected to national or western ‚interests‘ – as if it were indecent for a military machine possibly also to be concerned with spheres of interest.“

The NATO Parliamentary Assembly – a body independent of NATO serving as a link between the alliance and the national parliaments – passed a „general report“ in December 2000 on „The consequences of the Kosovo conflict and their effect on conflict prevention and crisis management“. This states that:

„Thus the attacks of the UCK against Serbian security forces and civilians increased considerably from December 1998 on. The conflict escalated anew in order to produce a humanitarian crisis which would move NATO to an intervention.“ (1)

As a result of the NATO intervention in Kosovo/the Yugoslavia war of 1999, UN General Secretary Kofi Annan set up a commission whose deliberations were to prevent any future power political instrumentalisation of the concept of „humanitarian intervention“. The outcome of the deliberations of this commission led to the new central concept of „responsibility to protect“, which was passed by a majority of the UN General Assembly in a resolution of January 2005.

The UN Libya Resolution 1973 to uphold a no-fly zone and for the protection of the revolutionary center of Benghazi from the threat of Gaddafi’s troops must be regarded on the background of the several-year-long discussion of international responsibility

to protect civilian populations acutely threatened by genocide and crimes against humanity.

Professor Reinhard Merkel, who teaches criminal law and philosophy of law at the University of Hamburg, sharply criticized UN Resolution 1973 in an article in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung of March 22, 2011:

„UN Security Council Resolution 1973 of March 17, which opened the way to military intervention in Libya, as well as the extent and goal of this intervention, trespass beyond the limits of the law. Not only beyond the limits of positive norms – this is part of the impulse leading to its development – but of its very foundation: the principles on which every law between states is based. The decision by the German government not to assent to the resolution was correct. Indignant criticism thereof is as shortsighted and negligent as are the Security Council decision and the intervention itself: shortsighted in their disregard of essential factors of the situation in Libya, negligent in respect to the consequences of this war for worldwide norm-based order.

In reference to the Geneva Convention of 1977 and a decision of the International Court in 1986 Reinhard Merkel concluded: „These norms lay down the strict prohibition of military intervention in civil wars on foreign territory“.

If the point of departure in respect to international law appears so clear, how could the point of military intervention by NATO in Libya nevertheless be reached, and what are the reasons for this intervention?

2. A civil war is being fought in Libya, with perpetrators and victims on both sides

The fact that a civil war is in process in Libya, in which both sides, government and rebels, are using military force, is doubtlessly uncontested. It is salient that in the western media almost only the danger of a massacre of civilians in the revolutionary center of Benghazi is cited as justification for an international

war. Massacres on the part of the rebels were and are scarcely mentioned.

Gunnar Heinsohn, the author of the „Lexicon of Genocide“, writing in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung of March 22 2011, quotes the words of the journalist and filmmaker Farai Sevenzo, who already reported in February of 2011:

„Probably because mercenaries from Chad and Mali are fighting for him (Gaddafi, note by C.R.) a million African refugees and thousands of African migrant workers are in danger of being murdered. A Turkish construction worker said to the BBC: ‚Our firm had seventy to eighty persons from Chad. They were slaughtered with tree shears and axes and accused by the attackers of providing troops for Gaddafi. Sudanese were massacred as well. We saw it ourselves.‘“

Gunnar Heinsohn points to one of the aspects of the civil war previously scarcely noticed: „All the stops of international criminal law are being pulled against those defending their power in bloody fashion. Property that is to be confiscated is listed methodically. However, neither the text of the resolution nor speeches by US Secretary of State Clinton or French President Sarkozy call for warnings and threaten court action against the rebels. The ‚use of mercenaries by the Libyan leadership‘ is expressly mentioned. But the acts of genocide which were presumably perpetrated under the same excuse remain unmentioned. (F.A.Z., 22 March 2011)

According to UN estimates there are at present some 200 000 African refugees stranded on the Libyan-Egyptian and another 100 000 Refugees stranded on the Libyan-Tunisian coast. (2) Who feels responsible for their fate?

How can NATO, in a situation that is so unclear, in which the worst violations of human rights are perpetrated, take one side? Was there wishful thinking that the rebels are a democratic mass movement like that in Egypt?

How many uninvolved civilians have already become victims of NATO bombardment, in order to – the grounds given by NATO – protect other uninvolved civilians against violent attack by Gaddafi’s troops?

On 31 March 2011 Bishop Giovanni Martellini in Tripoli declared to the Vatican news agency „Fides“ that so-called humanitarian attacks had killed dozens of civilian victims in some quarters of Tripoli.

Western government leaders want to see Gaddafi deposed on account of major infringements of human

rights – reports by amnesty international speak a clear language. Their predecessors only watched, for example in 1996 when some 1200 prisoners were murdered in Abu Salim, and a few years later they even provided weapons to Gaddafi.

For many years they also disregarded the fact that Gaddafi, with European support, was building camps for African refugees, where some of them were brutally abused. Before that many of these refugees were picked up and deported to prevent their entering Europe by the European organization for border protection, Frontex.

3. Who belongs to the Libyan opposition?

Wolfram Lacher of the „Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik“ (SWP – Foundation for Science and Politics) in Berlin which advises the Federal Government, in his study on „Libya after Qaddafi. State dissolution or state building?“, writes:

„The decisive impulse for revolt, however, came from largely unorganized groups; most of them were unemployed or underemployed young men who set fire to police stations and government offices in northeastern cities and the Nafusa Hills, and thereby caused an escalation of the turmoil. (3)

What should Gaddafi’s „security forces“ have done in view of this situation?

How would other states have reacted?

Between the years of 2004 and 2010 western states provided more than a billion US dollars worth of weapons to the Gaddafi regime. Now US president Barack Obama is considering the provision of weapons exports to the Libyan opposition, in spite of the UN weapons embargo, in order to depose the Gaddafi regime.

Wolfram Lacher of the SWP writes on the Libyan opposition: „Among the oppositional groups, only the Moslem Brotherhood have a stable organization and an appreciable base, particularly in the cities of the northeast.“ (4)

In Egypt the western community of values continues to fear the Moslem Brotherhood after the fall of Mubarak. In Libya, where the Moslem Brotherhood represent „a moderate form of political Islam“ (Wolfram Lacher), NATO has turned itself into its air force.

Whole tribes, as well as former military and political personnel from the Gaddafi camp who have defected, may also be considered supporting powers of the opposition.

Wolfram Lacher draws the following balance:

„The majority of the political actors will be less concerned with the foundations of the Libyan state than with a redistribution of resources.“ (5)

Is this anything like a real movement for democracy, one which could justify the bombardment by NATO, with its large number of casualties and the destruction of infrastructure, for the sake of Gaddafi's fall?

4. The new opposition government, with pro-western puppets at the top?

While Gaddafi has not yet fallen, NATO has already determined two leading politicians for an opposition government: Mahmud Jibril and Ali Tarhuni. With what legitimacy do these two men now represent the eastern part of Libya with the most important oil operations over against the West? With what right will they probably soon agree on new oil delivery contracts?

Mahmud Jibril wrote to the Hamburger Abendblatt:

For French president Nicolas Sarkozy and US foreign minister Hillary Clinton he represents the new Libya: the economist Mahmud Jibril has been appointed as leader of a provisional opposition government in Bengasi. After studying and teaching in the US Jibril, born 1952, worked hard for years for economic reform of the Libya of government leader Muammar al-Gaddafi. Under the protection of Gaddafi's Sohn Saif al-Islam, who at that time had come forward with ambitions for change, Jibril led the National Committee for Economic Development (...)“

„The internet portal Wikileaks published US-embassy dispatches which describe Jibril as a ‚serious partner for talks‘ who encouraged the US to engage more strongly with Libya. He criticizes the world power for not taking advantage of its ‚soft power‘ after the end of the cold war – its triumphs of everyday culture from McDonald's to Hollywood – more purposefully.“ (6)

Will Mahmud Jibril be able to represent the interests of the Libyan people in the future with this basic attitude?

As for Ali Tarhuni, the F.A.Z. wrote on 30 March 2011:

„He was a professor of economics in the US. Now Ali Tarhuni is ‚superminister‘ for the rebel government and is setting the course for a market economy“.

Do these personnel decisions perhaps aim at a goal for NATO's intervention not officially named: the introduction of a neoliberal economic system?

The conflict among the western powers as to who should receive which pieces of the Libyan oil cake will probably become more intense in the next weeks and months. France has up to now been very modest in its exploitation of oil fields through its own enterprises. This could change after Sarkozy's commitment to this war, which is to the advantage of the rebels.

Libya has control of the largest oil reserves in Africa. 70 percent of its oil and gas exports go to the EU – around 40% to Italy, 13% to Germany, 8% to France and 7% to Spain.

On 16 February 2011 Libya, Italy (represented by the firm of ENI) and Russia (represented by Gazprom) founded a joint venture, to which one third of the oil production from the giant oil reserves of the so-called „Elephant Field“ around 800km south of Tripoli was granted by contract.

On 13 March Gaddafi met the ambassadors of China, India and Russia in Tripoli. At that time he suggested to these three countries that they replace the western oil companies, which had at that time already fled because of the unrest, with companies of their own. Four days after this meeting the UN ambassadors of Russia and China could not bring themselves to veto Resolution 1973, but allowed it to pass.

Jürgen Wagner, a member of the information office for militarization in Tübingen, in his study „Libya, Intervention in the name of the people?“ (7) mentioned an essential reason why western investors consider Gaddafi an „insecurity risk“ in view of their billion dollar investments in Libya.

When Gaddafi nationalized the Canadian oil firm operating in Libya, Verenex, (8), displeasure was great, as an industry report from the same year shows: „If Libya can threaten the nationalization of private property, if it can reopen already negotiated contracts in order to increase its income or extract ‚tribute‘ from companies that work and seek to invest here (...) then firms are being denied the security that they need for long-term investments. (...) Libya has failed to establish a stable platform.“ (9)

The armament managers of large western companies can consider themselves the winners of the present Libyan war. For the „Eurofighter“ it is its first battle deployment.

Under the title „Ein Bombengeschäft“ („Booming Trade“) the „Spiegel“ already published figures on the cost in the first days of the war:

„Those who see the Libya conflict as an advertising campaign cannot, however, let the costs run away with them. Zack Cooper, an analyst for the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments (CSBA) in Washington has already estimated the cost of the destruction of the Libyan air defense at 400 to 800 million US dollars. The maintenance of the no-fly zone costs the US alone a further 30 to 100 million dollars a week – under the assumption that the zone is not extended to cover all of Libya but is limited to the area north of the 29th parallel. (10)

In the future Libya will also be of importance for the provision of electricity to Europe. The planned Desertec Project for the production of solar energy in the Sahara at a cost of several hundred billion Euros necessitates a secure and stable Libya.

5. Western secret services have already been deployed in Libya

On 31 March 2011 the „Handelblatt“ published the following report:

„The CIA members involved are, according to the New York Times, an unknown number of US secret service operators that have either already been working in Tripoli or have been added.

According to British government officials ‚dozens‘ of agents of the secret service MI6, as well as members of special commands, are working in Libya. They provide information to the British Armed Services on targets for air strikes, deployment and movement of Gaddafi’s forces. (11)

US ground troops continue to be needed even in these hi-tech times to set laser marks for the air bombardment.“

Already on 8 May 2011 the „Hamburger Abendblatt“ had reported:

„The British ‚Special Air Service‘ (SAS) is considered ‚the mother of all special units‘ on whose pattern elite troops worldwide, from the German KSK to the American Delta Force operate. And the London foreign secret service MI6, home of the fictional James Bond, also has a reputation like a thunderclap. It is precisely these two services that are at present the target of bitter ridicule. Six black-masked SAS warriors landed in a Chinook helicopter with two MI6 agents early on Friday morning, not far from the rebel center of Bengasi. They are to make contact with the rebels.

But this they had already done on their own – they had already long since heard the helicopter landing on an open field and had arrested the British special-ists. According to the ‚Daily Telegraph‘ the Britons had first maintained that they were quite harmless, but then weapons, intelligence information and fake passports were found. The Libyans’ reaction was ‚not amused‘, but they released the shadow warriors on Sunday. They returned on board a British Marines ship, not exactly covered with glory.

The British press asked why the government had not openly sought contact with the Libyan opposition. Foreign Minister William Hague had given the operation his blessing. Now he was forced to admit that his team „ran into problems“. These had, however, been „solved satisfactorily“.

The former British ambassador in Tripoli, Oliver Miles, expressed it less diplomatically – the operation was a „farce“. The liberal ‚Guardian‘ even spoke of the „fools in the desert“. The only comfort for the SAS was that last week three Dutch elite soldiers on a secret operation had been arrested by Gaddafi’s troops.“ (12)

If the British SAS soldiers should really have felt like „liberators“ and „supporters“ of the insurgents – why had they first been taken prisoner by the rebels?

How is the deployment of Western special ground forces to be justified under international law, when these were expressly to have been prevented by Resolution 1973?

6. Power struggle in Europe – the enforcement of double standards against non-EU states

French president Sarkozy is considered the man who pushed hardest for the war. Under great pressure on account of catastrophic poll results in the election campaign, his diplomatic sleight-of-hand, to have got UN Resolution 1973 through without a veto and to pose as the defender of human rights, may have gained him some sympathy points among the youngest voters. Large sectors of the French population support(ed) France’s military action in Libya. Forgotten was the fact that Sarkozy had, only weeks before in the last days of Tunisian dictator Ben Ali, offered him armament assistance to fight the rebels there.

Within the fabric of Europe rents were appearing: a new French-British axis that would, among other things, like to operate a common aircraft carrier in the future, set itself against the felt dominance of the

German government and asserted itself successfully beside the US government on an important foreign policy matter.

To the question of why the Shiite majority in Bahrain does not receive any help against Sunni despots supported by the West in spite of the numbers killed during the demonstrations, Robert Cooper, one of Europe's leading senior politicians, already made some far-reaching statements years ago – without the concrete background of Bahrain.

Robert Cooper was one of the chief advisors of former „EU foreign minister“ Javier Solana, who was General Secretary of the Council of European Union and High Representative for its Common Foreign and Security Policy from 1999 to the end of November 2009. Cooper is considered the chief author of European security strategy. In a book on the post-modern state which appeared in 2002, he wrote what appears to have become reality today:

„The challenge of the post-modern world is to cope with the idea of double standards. Among ourselves we deal on the basis of laws and open security cooperation. But where traditional states outside the post-modern continent of Europe are concerned, we are forced to turn back to the tougher methods of a former era: violence, preventive attacks, deception – whatever is needed to deal with those who still live in the 19th century, in which every state was on its own. Among ourselves we hold to the law, but when we operate in the jungle we have to go by the law of the jungle.“(13)

In an essay for „Die Zeit“ Robert Cooper had already written in 2004:

„Neither dynamite nor the downfall of tyrants make people free, but ‚good laws and a good army‘, to quote Macchiavelli.“ (14)

7. Thoughts on the future of the German army and the securing of resources

The Center for the Transformation of the Bundeswehr issued a paper on the subject of peak oil in the summer of 2010, revised and officially published in February 2011: „Peak Oil – the Implications of Scarce Resources for Security Policy“ is the title of this first part of the complete report: „Armed Forces, Capability and Technology in the 21st Century“. (15)

The statements made therein speak for themselves:

„The share of oil traded on the global, freely accessible oil market will decrease in favor of oil traded under bi-national agreements. Economic strength,

military strength or the possession of nuclear weapons will become a paramount instrument for the projection of power and a decisive factor in new dependencies in international relations.“ (p.14)

„Depending on the type of connection between an importing state and supplying firms, the use of state – for example secret service – measures in order to gain licenses is to be expected. In extreme cases a continuation of this intensified competition will become plausible, even after licenses have been granted, which could culminate in an attempt to get firms to return their licenses. To this end the instrumentalisation of the native population is imaginable – particularly in areas with ethnic and religious minorities – to achieve the desired aggravation of working conditions in the oil companies concerned. „(p.33)

„The range of imaginable endeavours would finally also include the exercise, or the direct commissioning and supervision, of the – properly sovereign – function of the use of state force. This would however lead to a legal grey area and mean a further weakening of state sovereignty and institutions. „(p. 34)

„A prerequisite for a situation of this kind is, however, always the expectation of a certain profit margin, without which a private company would not be willing to continue working in a region of conflict, on account of its basic philosophy.

Thus short-term efforts of a ‚corporate COIN‘ campaign and expenses for the pacification of the area are conceivable, which would only be plausible in the long term if the expected profits, in consideration of previous investments, were high enough. „(p.34)

„The concept of ‚counterinsurgency‘ (COIN) always leads to misunderstandings and dissent in Germany, because it is based on varying translations and varying interpretations. Frequently translated as ‚combating rebellion‘, the concept is associated with military action against a rebel movement. On the basis of the generally accepted estimate that only 15-20% of the activity to end a revolt is military in nature, and that both the leadership and the majority of the necessary tasks are civilian in scope, the translation of ‚rebellion management‘ is to be preferred.“ (p.34)

The study assumes that the trust of the people in the policy of the government will continue to decrease. This assumption would seem to be correct.

In the new revised version of the report of February 2011 several passages have been softened over against the first version of summer 2010.

8. Alternatives to war existed: Sarkozy bombed the Turkish peace plan

In the beginning of March the Arab League reported that it had, with the participation of Venezuela, conducted negotiations for a Libyan peace plan. The hopes that it raised pushed the DAX up for a short period (cf. Die Welt online, 3 March 2011).

N-TV also reported on 3 March 2011:

„A turnabout of the civil war in Libya is possible. Its chief support is the role played by Venezuelan president Hugo Chávez. His plan calls for an international delegation to negotiate with both the ruler Gaddafi and with the Libyan opposition“.

Why was this logical approach, to set up a group of neutral international mediators not supported by the West which could first of all agree on a cease-fire, not supported by the Western powers? Was it because Hugo Chávez is seen as a „pariah“ with whom Western policy does not want to make common cause, however reasonable it may be?

Members and employees of the OSCE have considerable experience in civil conflict management.

Peace researcher Professor Johan Galtung has already succeeded in deescalating a number of international armed conflicts.

The Organisation „St. Egidio“, headquartered in Rome, brought to an end the extremely bloody civil war in Mozambique. A group of „elder statesmen“ is repeatedly at work to extinguish international conflagrations where they appear.

In peace movement circles early successful results have been achieved through a de-escalation measure in Sri Lanka through a ‚nonviolent peace force‘.

Why were none of these neutral mediation institutions called upon by Western governments during the early days of tension in Libya between Gaddafi and the rebels?

Shortly after passing UN Resolution 1973 – before the bombardment by France, Great Britain and the USA – the African Union (AU) met:

The news portal „dnews“ on 25 March 2011 reported on the meeting:

Representatives of the Libyan government – not however of the rebels – are participating in the meeting of the AU which has been trying since Friday morning to find a political solution to the conflict. Representatives of the UN, the EU, the Arab League and the Conference of Islamic States are participating as

well. The Libyan government has already announced a cease-fire that was not complied with. The consultation is based on a plan that a committee of five African rulers has worked out. (16)

The Libyan government was apparently prepared to put in effect a peace plan of the African Union (AU). At a meeting in the office of the AU in the Ethiopian capital Addis Abeba, representatives of Libya are said to have declared that their government would accept the AU plan to end the fighting in Libya. Why was this declaration not examined for its substantial content?

In sum, the African Union was not given the time nor the opportunity to develop its plans for peace, which were to be founded on a cease-fire.

On 24 March 2011 the Berlin „Tagesspiegel“ (17) reported in detail on the ‚bombardment‘ of a hopeful Turkish peace plan by Sarkozy.

While the Turkish foreign Minister Davutoglu engaged in talks with the Libyan opposition, premier Erdogan spoke repeatedly by phone with Gaddafi as well as with his sons and other high government officials.

The Turkish peace plan, which had been coordinated with US president Obama, provided for agreement on a concrete agenda for the setting up of democratic structures and to allow the regime to resign without losing face. This establishment of democratic structures was to include a new constitution and free elections and to be subject to temporary international supervision. The very large Gaddafi family was to be given the opportunity to found its own party.

„First successful steps on the way to a peaceful resolution are said to have been achieved – and then air attacks by the allies began,“ according to the „Tagesspiegel“. Gaddafi is said to have sent „positive signals“ on the suggestions made.

The French bombardment on 19 March collided with the Turkish shuttle diplomacy between Gaddafi and the rebels in a phase which gave occasion for cautious hope.

The Turkish newspaper Hürriyet headlined „France bombards a solution“.

According to the „Tageszeitung“ Turkish president Abdullah Gül criticized French president Sarkozy with the words: „Some have pressed ahead and preferred to set Libya afire.“

Turkish diplomacy has not been withdrawn in the meantime, but tried to save what may yet be saved.

Turkey has not sheered out of NATO but has participated, sending both warships to enforce the weapons embargo and fighter planes to supervise the no-fly zone over Libya, although not to take part in air attacks.

„Everything must be carried out under the roof of the UN,“ the „Tagesspiegel“ quoted a demand of foreign minister Davutoglu, which has as yet not been fulfilled.

Minister Davutoglu is also said to have counseled the Western states „to guard its rhetoric in respect to its actions in the North African Moslem country“:

„If a ‚crusade‘ is mentioned, then Turkey will in no case participate; in the whole Near and Middle East the concept of a ‚crusade‘ does not stand for freedom but for Western aggression,“ according to the „Tagesspiegel“.

Why was the operation not put under the roof of the UN, as Turkey suggested? Why was no attempt made to negotiate a cease-fire and – if possible and necessary – to keep the parties to the civil war apart by means of a mission of UN soldiers, as has been done in many other conflicts?

Are the western NATO states possibly less interested in a democratisation of the North African and Arab region as on regaining control of unexpected political processes? What would happen if, after the fall of Arab despots, forces came to power in each respective country that would not be as „easy-care“ as the dictators supported heretofore?

9. How will the situation in Libya go on?

The Viennese „Standard“ reported on 27 March 2011:

„Rome will now oppose the announced French-British Plan for Libya with an Italian-German initiative: Foreign Minister Franco Fratti declared on Sunday that the government is already carrying on respective talks with Berlin. The first step in such a peace plan is a cease-fire, to be supervised by the UN. The necessary establishment of a humanitarian corridor could be controlled by Turkey, with whom Italy is already negotiating. Contacts must be established to all the Libyan tribes, to integrate them in a peace initiative. The Arab League and the African Union will entrust the task of finding an appropriate exile for Muammar al-Gaddafi, whose remaining in Libya is unthinkable.“ (18)

These reflections sounded reasonable but were soon after rejected.

One day later N-TV announced the end of this plan:

„There will not be a German-Italian peace plan. A corresponding advance from Italy did not find a positive echo in Berlin. A speaker for the Foreign Office said Germany is in continued contact with its international partners – ,that is also, but not only, with Italy‘. Thus there are ‚various ideas‘ on ending the Libyan conflict. Beforehand, Italian Foreign Minister Franco Frattini backtracked. In a television interview he spoke against a proposal supported by only two states.“ (19)

In Libya much more is meanwhile at stake than the probably easily gained military victory of NATO and rebel ground troops against Gaddafi’s troops. In view of the tension and friction within the alliance, it is faced with a crucial test. Particularly the French-Turkish relationship will be fraught with difficulty for some time, as well as that of Germany and France.

On 31 March the chairman of the Munich Security Conference, Wolfgang Ischinger, warned „of a break-up of the alliance“ and demanded a political peace plan for Libya. „Ischinger also solicited support for opening the way to exile for Libyans ruler Muammar el Gaddafi. This is hampered by the threat to bring the dictator before the International Court of Justice: ‚The prospect that he will end up before a judge in Den Haag could prompt him to fight to the last drop of blood,‘ said Ischinger.(20)

Under international law it is to be considered whether Nicolas Sarkozy is a case for the International Criminal Court, for instigating a war.

On the subject of US policy several questions arise:

Was Barack Obama’s positive reaction to the Turkish peace plan only meant to deceive the public? Was a US plan of action already long-since prepared, that viewed the events in Libya and Bahrain as part of a comprehensive overview on the background of the new NATO strategy of 2010?

In his famous Cairo speech US president Barack Obama announced the beginning of a new historic chapter of mutual respect in the US-American relationship to the Arab-Moslem world. This speech is no long worth the paper he read it from. He has since so-to-speak revoked his Nobel Peace Prize himself after the „Libyan litmus test“ of the trustworthiness of his Cairo statements.

International law will not soon recover from the NATO bombardments in Libya.

Pressure by civil society through petitions to the respective NATO governments demanding an imme-

diate cease-fire could result in the peace plan of the African Union with Turkey being given a chance. Up to now peace demonstrations to exert immediate pressure for an end to NATO bombardment are not in evidence on the streets of European cities.

Although not yet over, this military intervention by NATO too proves that war is not a solution – alternatives are possible. (21)

It is a question of time before the facts which have either not been researched or have been suppressed by large circles of the international and national media landscape break through and bring about a widespread change of consciousness as far as the political evaluation of the Libya war is concerned.

Dated as of 4 April 2011.

Prof. Andreas Buro

Speaker on Peace Policy of the Committee for Basic Rights and Democracy, Grävenwiesbach

Contact: andreas.buro@gmx.de

Clemens Ronnefeldt

Speaker on Peace Issues for the German Branch of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, Freising

Contact: c.ronnefeldt@t-online.de

Translation: Dr. Angelika Schneider, Bremen

Notice:

The proliferation of this article by copying and distributing is expressly desired.

Sources:

- (1) Prof. Dieter S. Lutz in his preface to: Clemens Ronnefeldt, Die neue NATO, Irak und Jugoslawien, Minden, 2. Auflage 2002, S. 7.
- (2) <http://www.afrika.no/Detailed/20370.html>
- (3), (4), (5) http://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/aktuell/2011A12_lac_ks.pdf
- (6) <http://www.abendblatt.de/politik/article1830804/Mahmud-Dschibril-er-soll-Libyen-nach-Gaddafi-fuehren.html>
- (7) <http://www.imi-online.de/2011.php?id=2258>
- (8) Walkom, Thomas: Libyan oil, not democracy, fuelling the West, The Star, 3.3.2011.
- (9) Zweig, Stefan: Profile of an Oil Producer: Libya, Heatingoil.com, 29.9.2009.
- (10) <http://www.spiegel.de/wissenschaft/technik/0,1518,753095,00.html>
- (11) <http://www.handelsblatt.com/politik/international/obama-genehmigt-cia-geheimkrieg/4007182.html>
- (12) <http://www.abendblatt.de/politik/ausland/article1806343/Deppen-in-der-Wueste-peinliche-Pleite-bei-britischer-Geheimaktion.html>
- (13) Robert Cooper, The Post-Modern State, in: Mark Leonard (ed.), Re-Ordering the World, London 2002, 11-20, S. 16. Quoted in German translation from: Tobias Pflüger: Imperium Europa: Das militärische Fundament der Wirtschaftsmacht EU, http://www.petrakellystiftung.de/fileadmin/user_upload/newsartikel/PDF_Dokus/Text_Pflueger.pdf
- (14) www.zeit.de/2004/05/Essay_Cooper?page=4
- (15) <http://www.peak-oil.com/effizienzrevolution-nach-peak-oil/peak-oil-studie-bundeswehr/>
- (16) <http://www.dnews.de/nachrichten/politik/469860/libyen-friedensplan-afrikanischen-union-umsetzen.html>
- (17) <http://www.tagesspiegel.de/politik/tuerkenarbeiteten-an-friedensplan-fuer-libyen/3985262.html>
- (18) <http://derstandard.at/1297821568531/Initiative-Rom-schmiedet-mit-Berlin-Friedensplan>
- (19) <http://www.n-tv.de/politik/Staaten-planen-Libyens-Zukunft-article2962011.html>
- (20) <http://www.themenportal.de/nachrichten/ischingerfordert-friedensplan-fuer-libyen-55538>
- (21) See article of the same name, „Krieg ist keine Lösung – Alternativen sind möglich“ by Clemens Ronnefeldt under: http://www.versoehnungsbund.de/sites/default/files/cr_analyse.pdf

Spendenkonto für die Arbeit des Versöhnungsbund-Friedensreferates:

Sparkasse Minden-Lübbecke, Konto-Nr: 400 906 72, BLZ 490 501 01, Stichwort „Friedensreferat“

Kontakt: Clemens Ronnefeldt,

Friedensreferat des deutschen Zweiges des Internationalen Versöhnungsbundes, A.-v.-Humboldt-Weg 8a, 85354 Freising, Tel: 08161 547015, Fax: 08161 547016, C.Ronnefeldt@t-online.de, www.versoehnungsbund.de

Geschäftsstelle: Schwarzer Weg 8, 32423 Minden, Tel: 0571 850875, Fax: 0571 8292387, vb@versoehnungsbund.de



**Internationaler
Versöhnungsbund**

Seit 1914 gewaltfrei aktiv
gegen Unrecht und Krieg