## -252/2725

## Muammar Gaddafi is no worse a "dictator" than Saddam Hussein, to name another leader whose only qualifications to be painted thus by the fawning western corporate media has always been his loyalty (or lack of it) to Western powers. By contrast to the other "dictators", Gaddafi had been a huge influence in aiding the struggles against Western and racist powers in Africa and elsewhere over his long reign.

Gaddafi has been a prime supporter of the Palestinian cause; he developed Libya from being the poorest in Africa to becoming the best in terms of lifeexpectancy, fairly distributed mean family income, free education and health, at the highest HDI (Human Development Index being the UN's standard measure of overall welfare of citizens) for Africa: he dared to contemplate nationalizing Libyan oil companies in foreign hands; he undertook the world's largest man-made river project to share huge water deposits under the desert sands with

neighbouring countries; he was a stalwart of the ANC's and Nelson Mandela's antiapartheid struggle; he was a champion of many other struggles against colonialism and racism, colonialism being a component outcome of racism.

The Western powers masquerading as "humanitarians" (How can we continue to look on when Gaddafi kills his own people) consist of the US, UK and EU, under the rubric of "NATO" have already managed to murder about 60,000 Libyans in six months, only a minute fraction of which dictators usually "eliminate" for political reasons. The media continues to conflate the issue with the "Arab Spring" (a largely non-violent uprising against

exploitation of national wealth, cronyism and nepotism) attempting to mislead the ill-informed public.

One of the biggest points

## Lasantha Pethiyagoda

of contention and fear in the West was Gaddafi's plan to trade its oil wealth in a new "gold-backed" Dinar, which might at least have reflected a fair value in comparison to the artificially propped-up US dollar as the world's reserve currency. One can hark back to Saddam Hussein's threat to sell Iraqi oil for Euros a few years prior to UN sanctions and invasions on false pretexts.

After the fall of Mubarak, a true dictator by any standard and staunch ally of the West acting as a bulwark shielding Israel I legemony in the Arab world, the US did not have a base for its central command in Africa (Africom) and eye Libya with greed. Note that the "rebellion" did not start in the capital but in the oil-rich region, with British secret agents "volunteering" unannounced.

No African country has earlier agreed to US designs to base its command centre in their country. Gaddafi also defied the West in turning to Russia, China, "anti-US" states, Turkey, India and South America for help and trade. His somewhat grandiose plan to form a united states of Africa would have further weakened Western colonialist agendas to decimate the African population while exploiting its

## MUAMMAR GADDAFI DOES NOT QUALIFY AS A GENUINE DICTATOR!



rich agricultural land to face future food and land shortages and maintain their decadent lifestyle that has largely destroyed the planet to-date

One might wonder why France and Britain have been so hard at work to "save" Libyans from being massacred by Gaddafi (suddenly, after 40 years!) The Western media have been deceptive enough to shamelessly parade the publicly mouthed lies of Sarkozy and Cameron when addressing the victorious "masses" in Tripoli recently.

In the early part of the last century, colonial Britain exploited Egypt, while Algeria and Tunisia were worked on by the French, and Italy laid claim to Libyan ports. France also coveted Morocco and agreed to co-operate in the pillage. Pretexts were even then used to intervene "humanitarianly" (saving the natives). With the rise of fascism the alliances changed, and Italy joined German interests while the French supported

Notwithstanding Gaddafi's eccentricities, ever since he deposed the former king, he had worked in the national interest and in the interests of oppressed peoples elsewhere. He dared to act as a countervailing force against colonial subjugations of African nations and sometimes in other continents, which the West promptly termed "terrorism" (now a catch-all phrase to mean any anti-western, anti- colonial venture for the freedom from oppression). His assertion that the West is the biggest terror is correct if a simple analysis of statistics is made. For example the US-UK terror machine eliminated a few million innocent civilians in Iraq and Afghanistan in a matter of a few vears, while the West's favourite bogevman OBL and his cohorts may have managed to kill not more than about three thousand in several decades.

The UN has so far faithfully applied sanctions on behalf of the interests of the Western powers, eliminating many millions of children (for example) especially in the "Mid-East". Gaddafi's dislike of the monarchies of the region that are nothing but parasites of their peoples' wealth has helped the dissemination of anti-Gaddafi rhetoric from media mouthpieces based in such monarchies

Recently, the western media commemorated ad nauseam the tenth anniversary of the 9-11 attacks. So far, no media outlet has dared to question the scientific illogicality of

the implosions that took down a third tower not impacted by the Saudi Arabian hijacked and piloted American domestic airliners. While OBL had not taken credit or responsibility, the US itself still remains outside the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court.

It is now beyond question that Al-Qaeda are seen as enemies of the West.

However, interestingly, the constituents of the "rebel" forces now triumphantly hosting Sarkozy and Cameron in Tripoli (for example) have as their ideology, "Islamism" and Sharia law, where the principal source of legislation is Islamic jurisprudence. Similar trends have been evident after the ousting of secular Saddam Hussein in Iraq. By far an overwhelming percentage of Afghans and now Pakistanis seem to desire such a framework, where no vestiges of the Britishimposed Westminster system are evident on either side of the "Durand-Line".

The Dalai Lama is reported to have claimed he was a Marxist, alleging that capitalism did not have moral ethics and only taught the virtues of profit. The notion of the nonexistence of a viable alternative to capitalism and the "dangers" of communism continues to dominate Western thinking. However, west-

ern societies have quietly adopted many tenets of socialism while "freedoms" continue to be pared down under various preteyts

When the pillage and plunder of the weak becomes an accepted way to maintain decadent life-styles, they make for themselves a legal system that condones atrocities in the pursuit of colonial agendas and provides a moral code that justifies and glorifies it. Is this truly the better of two necessary evils or are we being hood-winked well into eternity?

