

## Answer to Question

# The European American Struggle in North Africa

### Question:

My question is about North Africa and I apologise for its numerous aspects however in my opinion they are connected:

1 – Some matters regarding the topic of North Africa have become unclear to me and particularly concerning Libya. This is because Leon had specified 20/09/2015 as the final deadline to find a solution between the negotiating parties in Skhirat, Morocco, however just before that on 19/09/2015 Haftar undertook a military action in Benghazi which led to the United Nations envoy Leon to criticise this action as if it were intentionally undertaken to be provocative and to obstruct the reaching of a solution. And this is then what happened and a new deadline was set for 20/10/2015! It is known that Haftar is supported by America and that the Tobruk government is also supported by America. It is involved in negotiations whilst Haftar is obstructing the negotiations so what is the explanation for this?

2 – On 07/09/2015 the Spanish Senate gave the green light in an official manner to establish an American military base in the South of the country (AFRICOM) which America had been attempting to establish for a long period but had not (previously) found acceptance for... It was announced that the main task of this new force in accordance to the new revision in the Senate is: "Intervention by sea, land and air in different crises in the African continent..." Would that mean that America has decided to launch into a struggle with Europe and more specifically Britain and France who have the deepest colonial roots in North Africa? And what is the extent of its success in this?

3 – Extensive visits had preceded and were accompanied by Americans to North Africa and Tunisia in particular. Do these extensive visits to North Africa reinforce the second point I mentioned in regards to the struggle with Europe? Is it possible to explain this struggle in North Africa (Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Libya) even if it were in general terms since questions related to this are particularly relevant in the current circumstances? I am grateful to you and apologise for the lengthy question.

### Answer:

Your pardon is accepted and may Allah forgive us and you; and He is the Most Merciful of those who are merciful. I will answer you by the will of Allah observing the chain of events:

### Firstly: In respect to America's interest in North Africa and the establishment of the AFRICOM Base:

1 – America has been interested in North Africa since the fifties and not since today. This was when its ambassadors met in Istanbul in November 1950 and convened their first conference in Istanbul under the chairmanship of George McGhee, the American deputy Secretary of State for Middle Eastern and North African affairs. Since that date America has been struggling with Europe in order to remove them and takes their place within their colonies. This struggle becomes more severe at times and lessens at other times according to international and regional circumstances. The (aforementioned) conference lasted for five days and the most prominent political, strategic and economic situations within this region were presented and since that time the new American colonisation began in order to colonise the Europe of old.... America was successful to bring its influence in many of the Middle East's regions and the Nile Basin region at the expense of the European interests (Britain's

and France's) however its influence in North Africa did not settle and this was because America's priority was the Middle-East region and that of the Nile Basin...

2 – America realises that the political medium in North Africa belongs to Europe and for this reason it has utilised other means, other than the conventional political actions undertaken within the political medium, in order to penetrate the region. The most prominent of these means are the following two: The first of which is the subject of 'terrorism' and exploiting it for military agreements and to penetrate through the army, training and military aid and assistances which is followed by (the establishment of) military bases. The second means (to penetrate) is through economic aid and the subservient international institutions. America has been continuously mobilising these two matters with the exception of periods that fall under the heading of the fighters hiatus! From amongst the attempts to establish bases, was the decision of George Bush Junior to establish an American military leadership in Africa (AFRICOM): "On 06/02/2007 President Bush and the Secretary of Defence Robert Gates announced the establishment of the US leadership for Africa" as mentioned on the AFRICOM Facebook page.... This is whilst this leadership was originally manufactured to gain control over Africa, plunder its resources and colonise its people. However America in accordance to the custom of the colonialists attempted to portray this as being a form of protection for Africa. For this reason it invited a number of African heads of state to attend the celebration of this leadership (base)! (The African Leadership began its activity officially on the 1st of October 2008 by way of the celebration held in the Ministry of Defence with the consideration that the American leadership in Africa (US AFRICOM) is a unit composed of fighting forces which are unified to the American ministry of defence. It was attended by representatives from African States in Washington DC) as taken from Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.

3 – America attempted to exert effort in establishing this base in the North of Africa in order to gain control over the region and so that its influence can replace that of Europe but it was not able to achieve that because European agents were cautiously watchful of it out of their pure sincerity to the European influence and interests and as a result the AFRICOM project remained stagnant. Then when America despaired in respect to its implementation as it had planned for in North Africa it then directed itself to the north of North Africa and put down its camp in Spain which happened on 07/09/2015: "The Spanish Senate gave the green light in an official manner to establish an American military base for the Marines in the south of the country in the framework of what is known as the AFRICOM leadership" (Shorooq Gateway News, 07/09/2015). This base is not far from North Africa and indeed it is upon its surroundings and enables them to undertake their dirty plans within the region. The project 'AFRICOM' had been marketed under the pretext of the global war against 'terrorism' however this project contained many objectives all of which related to consolidating the American hegemony and controlling influence over the world. It is not therefore for the purpose of protecting Africa from the dangers of 'Terrorism' but rather it is within the strategic American framework to gain control over the sources of petrol and natural resources, to monitor all sea routes and passageways in the world from one angle and to remove the old colonial influence so that it can replace it with a new colonialism and also this all means from a second angle that the struggle is over sucking the blood (out of the region) and plundering its resources.

In spite of all of that, the fact that America was unable to adopt an AFRICOM base in any place in North Africa means that it does not possess a firm foothold within this region. It attempted to establish it within Algeria and was strongly blocked... Similarly it was unable to achieve that within Morocco, Libya and Tunisia... It is currently focusing upon Libya taking advantage of the instability within it and it is likewise doing so in Tunisia exploiting the frailty of the rule within it due to the return of the former political class which the people had originally rose up against and which is disliked by the people... As such it is not easy to move

the AFRICOM base to North Africa because the barrier of fear has broken amongst the people and it is very unlikely that they would remain silent over the establishment of bases of evil within their lands... This does not mean however mean that the work of the AFRICOM base in Spain will not be too far to have an effect or influence within the political situation of North Africa but rather it means its effect will be lessened. America will therefore repeat its attempts, one time after another, until it finds an avenue to enter in from and specifically in Libya and Tunisia.

### **Secondly: In relation to the intensification of visits and the European American struggle in Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Libya:**

The increase in visits represents no more than a continuation of the American and European outlines in respect to competing over the resources of the region and its strategic location. As such the covetous ambitions and aspirations of America and Europe, as we have mentioned above, did not start today in North Africa but rather they existed before, during and after AFRICOM... We will present some of these actions and plans that America and Europe have been casting into the arena of the Muslim lands in North Africa (Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Libya).

- **Morocco:**

A – America supported the (liberation) movements from France inside Morocco for the purpose of taking its place. In this way it was able to insert its influence at the time of independence in Morocco in the era of Muhammad the Fifth. However this reality did not last long as the British influence became strongly present following the death of Muhammad the Fifth upon the arrival in 1961 of Al-Hassan the Second. The path to Morocco was then blocked before America until it found the opportunity within the Saharan Polisario Independence Movement after the departure of Spain on 26/02/1977 following 90 years of colonialism. Before that the United Nations under American influence formed a fact finding mission and sent it to the Western Sahara. The mission then submitted its report to the General Assembly in 09/06/1975 in which it advised the Sahara independence from Spain and that the Polisario Movement is in control of that region and held a considerable influence. In this way America brought the Polisario to the fore and supported it as representative of the Saharan people. The aim behind that was so the Sahara would not return to Morocco after Spain's departure from it and so that it could be a focal point for tension demanding independence for America to exploit for its interests in North Africa.

However Al-Hassan the Second opposed the American plans with British support during the period of his rule between 1961-1999 as he was known for his political cunning and intelligence since his youth and as such he was capable of leading Morocco strongly and realise stability which the neighbouring countries were unable to achieve even up until this day. He also gained a certain level of popularity after the Green March to liberate the Moroccan Sahara from the Spanish colonialism in the year 1975. <https://ar.wikipedia.org/wiki/1975>

B – Spain withdrew from the Sahara on 26/02/1976 and then on the following day the National Saharan Council announced the establishment of a Saharan Arab Republic... America began an actual interference immediately after that through its influence in respect to the issuing of UN resolutions related to the Sahara. However every time America attempted to provoke him with a resolution Al-Hassan due to his cunning and the British support behind him was able to divert it! In this way Al-Hassan absorbed all the American pressures without changing anything in relation to the reality of the Sahara. When Al-Hassan the Second passed away his son Muhammad Al-Hassan the Sixth followed him on 23/07/2015. He like his father was loyal to the British but he was not a man of politics, cunning and acumen like his father. Therefore America became active to win him over and

as a result Britain feared for him in respect to falling before the corridors of the American plans...

C - Britain feared for Muhammad the Sixth in the face of the American pressures and plans as the King is not as astute and experienced as his father had been in respect to dealing with the hazards and exploits of political life. For this reason Britain advised him (or ordered him) as is normal for them to do, to safeguard its small agents by not continuing upon the same strong and strict path that his father followed towards America. As a result there arose an understanding for what America calls freedom, democracy and human rights and dealing with America with increased flexibility. America then became the forth-trading client to Morocco and the number one trader outside of the EU (\$1.5 Billion size of trade exchange)... Then when America suggested during the convening of the NATO conference in Istanbul in June 2004 to grant Morocco with the status of a main ally outside of NATO as the first Arab state from North Africa to enter the NATO club, when America proposed that, Britain made him agree to that with precaution and wariness. This is because comprehended that the American proposal was in order to influence the Moroccan political situation... In this way his position towards American resolutions became less strict as his father, but rather he agreed and then procrastinated in implementation. For this reason he agreed to the Baker proposal about the compromise solution that was called the 'Third Solution' which has stages attached to it, beginning with an autonomous rule in the Sahara followed after five years by a referendum to decide its fate or future. This is the solution that the Security Council affirmed with its Resolution No. 1359 on 29/06/2001. He agreed to this but upon an English way i.e. after taking seven years until 2007 and similarly in respect to its naming as a Moroccan initiative! The American plans did not stop in respect to Morocco except for a number of years due to its preoccupation with other priorities like the economic crisis that reached its peak in 2008 and what followed afterwards in addition to its foreign political and military crises... That was until the spring of 2013 when America began to strongly excite the crisis once again in order to take the Saharan crisis as a pretext to interfere in North Africa and other African states that are attached to it... So it prepared a draft project to expand the UN mission 'MINURSO' in the Moroccan Sahara and made it include the monitoring of human rights within the Sahara so that it would then be a pretext to examine every small and large matter within the Sahara under the pretext of human rights! Even though the project was delayed for a further year in accordance to the Security Council Resolution No. 2099 issued on 25/04/2015... America nevertheless became active with the UN General Secretary and its envoy Ross during the year of extension to prepare the setting once again to look into the (issue of the) referendum and human rights... The American diplomat Christopher Ross in his capacity as the personal envoy to the General Secretary of the UN to the Western Sahara visited the region in October 2013 and then again on 28/01/2014. In his trips, Ross was concerned with the issues of the referendum and human rights...

D – With that the position of Morocco resembled the position of Jordan in respect to there not being a blatant confrontation. Morocco then later began to surpass America in respect to the war on terror by confronting it with what it called: "The Moderate Religious Speech" which is as a result of Morocco representing an Islamic religious reference point and particularly for the Maaliki Madh'hab and At-Tijaaniyah that is widespread within the coastal states, the Mali Desert, Senegal and Niger. And so they actually did send out preachers, orators and men of the Deen within Senegal, the Ivory Coast, Mali and Benin in addition to receiving 500 students for religious studies within Moroccan centres and universities. America was therefore compelled to praise the Moroccan role. The Deputy Assistant to the American Secretary of State entrusted with African affairs, Bisa Williams, said in a statement to the Moroccan Arab News agency on the sidelines of the international seminar hosted by Nouakchott (Mauritania) on the two days 19-20 of last month: "We highly appreciate the Moroccan experiment in Africa as a whole and particularly in the coastal region because

Morocco has not spared any effort for the sake of benefiting other countries from its own experience in the area of fighting extremism and violence” (Hasbris, 21/08/2015).

In this way America was not successful in terms of exploiting the Sahara issue or the subject of the referendum and human rights. It has not succeeded in all of that until now in respect to removing the influence of the English in Morocco and we say ‘until now’ because the struggle between America and Europe is continuing in Africa.

- **As for Algeria:**

It is a state of some significance that has strongly opposed the American plans more than its neighbour since the coup of Boumediene against Ben Bella who had been proceeding upon the American line alongside Abdel Nasser. Since that time the British influence has been entrenched in Algeria albeit with some French intrusions which intensified at some times and particularly in the time of some of the weak presidents. Boumediene continued in the position of ruling from 19/06/1965 until he died on 27/12/1978. After Boumediene’s period of rule in Algeria the rule was taken over by weak presidents thus the rule ending up in the hands of the army and the decision makers within were loyal to the French and trained by them and they undertook the coup of theirs in the year 1992. That was to prevent the Islamic Salvation Front from reaching the ruling position after their success in the elections... They executed massacres against the Salvation Front in particular and the many Muslims in general. They were not capable of running the country and indeed the people hated them. Their years of influence between 1992 and 1999 saw four Presidents who were all ineffective whilst it was the army that was the dominant force. However the Army personnel loyal to France were unable at that time to deal with the consequences of their coup and calm the situation of the country after having committed horrendous massacres against the Muslim people of Algeria...

Within these circumstances, Britain brought Bouteflika from Switzerland and returned him to Algeria. It created a political atmosphere portraying him as a saviour whilst exploiting the failure of the Army leaders in respect to the administration (of the land) and due to the people’s hatred towards them because of their massacres. As such in 1999 the men of the army agreed with Bouteflika for him to become the president upon the condition that they would not be held to account for the crimes and destruction of the country and so that he would work to heal the wounds by calling for building harmony, peace and reconciliation... i.e. they resorted to him in order to save themselves! Bouteflika became the President in 1999 and remains so until now and Bouteflika still has a firm relationship with Britain. This was crowned by a visit in 2006 representing the first visit of an Algerian President to Britain. Even though there exists a group allied to France within the French army who have a certain degree of influence they nevertheless comprehended Bouteflika’s relationship with Britain just as they understood that Bouteflika would not fall in line with the French policy. As such they rejected the Mediterranean Union project that France proposed in Sarkozy’s term... Therefore those who are loyal to France within the army have been unable to put an end to his presidency up until now! Even though Britain had not feared France in respect to its influence in Algeria at the same level as it feared America it nevertheless saw that it should end those French intrusions as that is stronger for its influence. However it proceeded in this matter gradually because it is not in a struggle with France but rather with America. For this reason the changing of these officers who were loyal to France happened without flaring the situation like it would have done had it been a struggle! So for example, ‘Al-Amaari, the Chief of Staff, resigned due to health reasons (or was made to resign) on 03/08/2004 and 48 hours after his resignation on 05/08/2004 Bouteflika discharged Lieutenant Ibrahim Ash-Sharif the Commander of the First Military Section... and in the beginning of 2014 General Hassan was relieved of his duty from the Anti-Terrorism group within the Intelligence services and then Bouteflika discharged others... These sackings were however undertaken without causing a

heated clash which would affect the infrastructure of the regime. A confirmation of this is found in when General Hassan was detained on 27/08/2015 and presented to the court Ahmad Awyahya the head of President of the Republic's department was asked whether this (arrest) means a struggle in power hierarchy in Algeria he denied this, stressing that what is rumored is parlour talk (Al-Jazeera, 12/09/2015)... "Even when Bouteflika excused a senior officer on 13/09/2015 from amongst those loyal to France who was the head of the General Intelligence Department, Muhammad Lameen (known as General Tawfiq) from his post, that was completed without any rouse of the situation or impact upon the regime infrastructure!' It is possible to say that Bouteflika has succeeded to an extent in regards to these sackings with British support even though there remains scope within the army for the French as the army culture and training in the most part is from France... However as we have said, Bouteflika's 'struggle' with the army has been gentle and taken place quietly resembling the breath of an athlete without having an effect upon the fundamental issues of the regime. This is different from the real struggle with America and its plans for the political acquisition of Algeria and to take the place of Britain. So for example:

A – After Spain left the Sahara in 1976 after 91 years of colonisation; America found an opportunity within the Polisario movement for the independence of the Sahara and took it as a justification to interfere in North Africa and particularly within Algeria... However rule in Algeria (loyal to Britain) was alert to the issue and so enclosed the Polisario within a strip along the border and surrounded it with its spies because it was aware that America had infiltrated it... Even today, despite the dominance of America over the UN missions and its envoys to the Sahara it has been unable to acquire influence in Algeria.

B – America attempted to establish a base in Algeria for its forces set up under the pretext of fighting terrorism and these are the forces called 'AFRICOM'. However Algeria refused because it and Britain from behind it comprehended that the purpose of this American base would be to interfere within Algeria's affairs. It is for that reason that the Foreign Ministry stated on 03/03/2007: "Algeria is not interested in hosting a base for the American special forces for Africa (AFRICOM)".

C – It attempted once again to stir the subject of fighting terrorism exploiting the events in Mali on 22/03/2012 and visits took place between it and Algeria for Algeria to participate in cooperation with America in confronting terrorism utilising the argument that it (terrorism) could reach Algeria and despite that Algeria (still) rejected with Britain behind her. It rejected the American plan and the most distinguished of these visits was that undertaken by US Secretary of State Hilary Clinton and her meeting with Abdul Aziz Bouteflika on 29/10/2012.

D – After Sibli (Tunisia) visited America on 21/05/2015 and made some agreements with America and they granted Tunisia a membership outside of NATO as they had previously done with Morocco, Jordan and Bahrain, Algeria raised escalated a powerful campaign against these agreements. The Tunisian president then attempted to improve the political climate between them and sent special envoy Khamis Juhainawi in order to deliver a letter to his Algerian counterpart on 24/06/2015...

The Algerian annoyance was not due to Sibli's visit to America because all that was accomplished fell within the English political plan followed by Algeria and Tunisia. Rather the only purpose behind this was two matters: To provide Tunisia with a pretext giving it strength to reject some of the American demands that are considered to pose a danger to the European (British) influence using the argument of not wanting to clash with neighbouring lands. The other matter is to send a strong message to America that Algeria does not accept an alternative of replacement for Britain and that it will never accept the American influence and exploits and particularly the establishing of bases... This was clear in respect to the annoyance not being a serious opposition to Sibli's visit and the evidence for that is that following the Sibli's envoy's being sent to meet Bouteflika. Algeria sent its foreign minister

Ramataan La'amamarah to Tunisia on 13/07/2015 on an official visit as announced in an Algerian Foreign Ministry statement and so the annoyance had come to an end!

- **As for Tunisia:**

It had been under French colonialism and afterwards fell under British influence in the period of the rule of Habib Bourguiba from 1956-1987. In 1987 Bourguiba was 84 years old and incapable of implementing what was required of him. At that time Zine El Abidine Ben Ali came to authority who had been from amongst the close confidants of Bourguiba. Therefore he followed in his steps remaining loyal to Britain. America attempted on a number of occasions to enter its influence in place of the British influence but it was unable to do so due to the pro-British political class standing in its way... However when the events of the Arab Spring flared up in 2001 and Ben Ali was overthrown America considered that as a new opportunity to interfere in North Africa. This is although both Britain and France had arranged the departure of Zine El Abidine Ben Ali and the fact that Europe dominates the political medium and has been capable of guaranteeing the survival of the fundamental regime in the land without change and even after the appearance of the Nahdah party in the country! The political medium in Tunisia still remains strongly under the British control through European Union agreements that bind Tunisia to Europe. Europe has been able to restore the ruling class within a period of four years which existed alongside the regime of Bourguiba and Ben Ali. They did not change the faces like their associates but rather out did them in the lack of any shame. And so they returned their main people who were the same faces of corruption and fomenters of corruption! And so Sibi their most prominent of the English agents became the President of Tunisia! This return was a clear provocation against the people who had risen up against the tyranny of the former regime, its corruption and subservient agency. The people had thought that they had rid themselves from their evil and now here they are over them once again. The people therefore revolted against them and so the tyrants responded with suppression and states of emergency just as their likes who preceded them. However the fear barrier has been broken and it is no longer within the capability of the tyrants to silence the mouths as it has been previously. As such the regime resorted to the pretext and argument of 'terrorism' in order to scare the people with an explosion here and there planted by the regime's minions and officers of NATO and the spies of the embassies which are struggling and competing over the land of Tunisia, a land of great heroics and Jihaad through the depths of history. The government would then attribute these acts to unknown terrorists! America has been active in this climate and is not far from its doing or participating in it and its embassy has become a retreat to buy Tunisian politicians who support Europe just as it has been active in respect to penetrating or infiltrating the army. Britain therefore feared that the regime would fall before America and so in accordance to its own manner of protecting its small and weak agents it instructed them to bend and be flexible before America however without negatively impacting the main British interests! It has confidence in Sibi's loyalty as he is from amongst the foremost British agents...and this is what happened:

A – Sibi visited America and met President Obama on 21/05/2015. Obama discussed the situations of Libya and the region with Sibi saying: "The United States will provide assistance soon to enable Tunisia to complete its economic reforms" (Russia Today, 21/05/2015). And because America considers NATO to be a powerful tool to bind its agents as not to slip away, just as it did with Egypt as it gave it the status of a main ally outside of NATO. Similarly America also considers NATO to be bait and a lure to attract new agents from Britain. For that reason the US State Department announced on 10/07/2015 the completion of granting Tunisia the status and rank of a main ally outside of NATO to become as a result the 16<sup>th</sup> ally of America, following Morocco, Jordan, Bahrain and Kuwait from amongst the British agents...! In this way the colonialist disbelievers struggle and compete with one another within our lands in order to attract and win over traitor agents from amongst the rulers... One of them attempts to fortify and consolidate their agents whilst the other

hunts and fishes for them (to catch them in their net)! Had it not been for the treachery that nests and spreads in the hearts of those rulers they would not have responded and the disbelieving colonialists would not have found a place to set down their foot within our lands... May Allah curse them how they are deluded...

B – Britain even provided Tunisia with a line of return and pretext to prevent Tunisia from submitting to the American pressures as it agreed with Bouteflika to escalate the disturbance that resulted from Sibli's visit to America and the agreements that were made. This was two accomplish to objectives: To provide Tunisia with an excuse that would enable it to reject some of the American requests that are considered to pose a danger to the European interests (i.e. British). In line with this Algeria escalated its protest and inflated the issue to the level of a storm... The other matter was to send a message to America that Algeria will not accept an alternative or replacement for Britain and that it will never accept the American influence and particularly the setting up of bases... It was clear that this disturbance and annoyance did not represent a serious opposition to Sibli's visit. The evidence for this was that after Sibli's envoys to meet Bouteflika Algeria sent its foreign minister Ramatou La'amamarah to Tunisia on 13/07/2015 on an official visit as announced in an Algerian Foreign ministry statement and so heat of the storm gradually diminished!

C – Thereafter the American contacts and communications with officials in Tunisia continued:

- The Tunisian Interior Minister, Najem Gharsalli, in statements to the press on the Friday following his meeting with the deputy assistant to the American Secretary of State [Daas Arfeizi] expressed his gratitude and appreciation for the American Democratic support in Tunisia. And the Tunisian Interior Minister added, "The cooperation between his country and the United States shall continue because the shared enemy is one and the same and it is the war against terrorism". (Misr ul-Arabiyyah, 28/08/2015).

- The assistant Secretary of State for American Foreign Affairs charged with the Middle East Ann Patterson after her meeting Tuesday morning in Qisbah with Prime Minister Habib Said, reported that he had gone in the direction of: "A firm bilateral cooperation established in relation to the exchange of information and continuous information coordination between the two countries around the issue of terrorism from the purpose of guaranteeing an effective confrontation to this pestilence (i.e. terrorism).

- US Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy and Human Rights Tom Malinowski visited Tunisia on 02/09/2015 accompanied by Patterson the assistant secretary of state for the Middle East and he stated: "The United States is still committed to helping Tunisia to strengthen its security capabilities in the field of intelligence, equipment and training. Tunisia is also in need of assistance in the economic field and to accomplish development particularly in the southern and internal regions" (Saudi News Agency, 02/09/2015).

- America made "the appointment of an extraordinary ambassador last July, Daniel Rubinstein. He has worked in a number of political posts including as the Director of the Office of Israeli and Palestinian Affairs within the American State Department. He is fluent in Arabic and Hebrew and he will also take over the responsibility of the actions of the Embassy in Libya. This means that America has given Tunisia a particular significance in order to conduct political work within it and to launch into the North African region..." (Wikipedia – The Free Encyclopedia).

- Christine Lagarde began an official visit to Tunisia yesterday on Tuesday to evaluate the reforms package that Tunisia adopted some days ago in respect to the sixth revision of the standby credit agreement that amounts to approximately \$1.7 billion... Lagarde during her meeting with a number of civil society representatives, political parties and economic institutions called for the strengthening of the banking sector immunity, the establishment of

tax reforms and the reduction of bureaucracy that hampers investment (Website Al-Ayyaam Issue 9649, Thursday 9 September 2015 corresponding to the 25 Dhul Qi'dah 1436 AH).

- However this American back and forth movement, the extensive visits and the status of Tunisia being an ally to NATO has not made Tunisia implement fundamental matters for America out of sincerity from its rulers 'The new old faces' who are loyal to Britain. The United States has applied pressure upon Tunisia to enable it to establish a military base in the country under the cover of the 'war on terror' however the Tunisian leaders refused that continuously in compliance to the command of the British. As such the former rule and the current have refused to host a base for the American African leadership (AFRICOM) within Tunisia. Until now America has not succeeded in establishing a base within Tunisia due to the loyalty of these long time followers of Britain! And we say: 'Until now', because America continues in its carrot and stick policy with Tunisia exploiting the fragility of the regime, its corruption and the provocation it brings to the people through the restoration of prominent pro English politicians from the regime which the people rose up against... Until America is able to find a gap that it can enter in so as to spread its influence in Tunisia replacing the British influence or to divide it at which time it will do so...!

- **Libya:**

A – America has attempted for many decades to win over and acquire the influence in Libya but has not been successful. That was because Gaddafi was sincere to Britain and was guarding over the continuation of its influence in Libya. Britain became aware of him whilst he was a student in Sandhurst and then they fostered him and protected him for a number of decades whilst he continued to safeguard their interests... So up until the uprising in Libya in 2011 the United States did not have any influence within Libya... As such America, well known for its pragmatism and seeing politics as the art of possibilities, viewed the developments that the North African region was witnessing or what became known as the 'Arab Spring' which launched itself from Tunisia to Egypt and then to Libya, they viewed them as an opportunity for American interference and to generate its influence to revival that of the Europeans. From there it attempted to exploit the instabilities which occurred throughout the Arab Spring revolutions and strove alongside its agents to divert them from their path utilising a variety of dirty means. As such the United States joined the military intervention for the sake of gaining influence within Libya....

B – America comprehends well that the political medium in Libya is a British production and as such it has expended its effort to destabilise the political situation in Libya until it is capable of bringing about a political class that can compete for authority with the pro-European political class in order to cast it out if possible or actively share the rule with it... So it was that it thought about shuffling the cards militarily whilst the first step was to commission a military man to move in a manner resembling a coup against the standing situation which was controlled by the 'National Conference' in the case where the majority within it were pro Europeans... And so in this manner Haftar made his move and his biography indicates that his loyalty is to America. Haftar spent nearly 20 years in the American state of Virginia where he was trained by the CIA. He did not return to Libya until after the revolution of the 17<sup>th</sup> of February 2011 which he played a role in and particularly in the city of Benghazi where he grew up... Then on 16/05/2014 Haftar moved and launched an attack against armed groups that he described as terrorist in Benghazi within a military operation that he gave the name 'The dignity of Libya' and he then continued his military provocations in accordance to the American policy... Then Haftar proceeded to obstruct any stable political situation within Libya unless the greatest share belonged to him (i.e. to America). In the same way the other side strove for the greatest portion to belong to it (i.e. to Britain)... So there came to be two governments within the land and two parliaments! The Libyan Parliament in Tobruk and the General Conference in Tripoli with each possessing a military force! Haftar was able to

impose upon the Tobruk parliament to recognise him as the General (overall) commander of the Libyan army with the rank of Lieutenant General which was followed by his official oath swearing on 09/03/2015 and in this way the Tobruk government is controlled by America... As for the General Conference and the government of Tripoli then those with influence and impact within it proceed alongside Europe and the British in particular with some influence from France. Amongst them within the Conference there are Muslim men who are far away from the English however they are lacking in the sufficient level of political awareness which makes it easy for the European men to take them in the direction that they want!

C – America and Europe have been throwing solutions back and forth in Libya in accordance to their interests... As for America then they are lacking in the political medium in Libya as we have mentioned as the majority of them are from amongst the British agents and from those who revolve around them or proceed under their umbrella from amongst some of the Islamic movements who are not aware of the political games and their adverse results.... So America commissioned Haftar over the military actions and then supported him from Egypt. Indeed Obama even requested from Congress to delegate him to undertake military actions in (certain) conditions (or circumstances) whilst it is likely for Libya to have been intended within this. Reuters news agency mentioned on 23/02/2015 that Obama had sent a message to Congress saying, “The situation in Libya still represents an abnormal and exceptional threat to the security and foreign policy of the United States”. It is understood from Obama’s message that the America’s situation in Libya is critical or in danger and as such American intervention serves the interests of America and saves its agents... Europe had anticipated that by standing strongly against military intervention being used in the crisis. British Foreign Minister Phillip Hammond said in a Press Conference in Algeria, “We do not believe that military action can lead to solving the problem in Libya” (Russia Today, 19/02/2015). Britain was at the head of those opposing military intervention or arming the Tobruk government and Haftar’s army within the Security Council. Ibrahim Ad-Dabashi the Libyan representative within the UN said to the *Sharq Al-Awsat* (Middle-East) Newspaper: “That some of the members of the international Security Council under the British influence requested from a team of experts to send a message to justify their opposition to agreeing upon a deal to lift the arms embargo from the Libyan army which represents a clear attempt to remove the awkwardness from them” and he said: “Britain does not want the Libyan army to settle the matter with the terrorists and militias who control the capital Tripoli... this is a game that has been exposed” (*Ash-Sharq Al-Awsat*, 07/03/2015).

D – After taking the attention away from military intervention through the decision of the Security Council, America and Europe agreed upon the decision to work upon a solution based on negotiations to produce a political solution to the crisis, each in accordance to its own method! As for Europe then it wants the negotiations to produce a political solution in the quickest possible time because the majority of the political medium is with her and any solution directed by the political medium will be in its favour. As for America, then it agreed to the negotiations because it was unable to find an opening for military intervention and because it is lacking in respect to the political medium within Libya. For this reason it will work to innovate style of obstruction so when the negotiations come close to arriving to a solution it will then ruin it via military actions through air strikes or by using economic strangulation like what happened when the Tobruk government requested the National Oil Company from transferring its oil revenues to the Central Bank (Misr ul-Arabiyah from *The New York Times*, 06/04/2015). All of these matters have a negative impact in respect to the continuation of the negotiations in a productive manner. It also provides Haftar with time to establish an influential support base for him that would enable him to form an effective political medium... And so the negotiations are moving from Skhirat (Morocco) to Geneva and without any resolution and this is because the dialogue is not between the people of Libya but rather they are in reality between the old colonialism and the new colonialism in

accordance to their interests without any concern being given to the interests of the people of the land!

### **Thirdly: The issue of Haftar and his military campaign in Benghazi 19/09/2015:**

What Haftar undertook in terms of a military campaign in Benghazi under the name 'Operation of death' then this falls within the policy drawn out by America. This is to apply pressure and to obstruct until a significant support base can be realised upon the ground and from there to establish a new political medium... This means that it wasn't a contradiction or by chance that Haftar would choose Saturday 19/09/2015 the day before the deadline of 20/09/2015 that had been announced previously (to undertake this). "The UN envoy to Libya Bernardino León announced the 20<sup>th</sup> of September as a firm date to arrive to a final agreement between the two disputing Libyan parties in respect to forming a single national government in order to escape from the crisis. And he added to journalists in Skhirat when the talks were happening that this date was fixed and was not open to being delayed" (Sky News Arabic, 10/09/2015). Haftar will continue with similar actions until America orders him to stop when it has seen that it has accomplished its interests... Britain and Europe alongside it have comprehended this matter and so they extended their utmost efforts to appoint Leon and his choice as the envoy of the UN in respect to Libya. They were successful in that and it represents one of the very few occasions in which the UN envoy is not of the American persuasion! Leon is closer to being a European envoy than being a UN envoy and as such Leon expended his utmost effort to not allow Haftar and America from behind him, to enable the derailing and obstruction. So every time they provoked and stirred the issue he tries to cause it to fail or shows resilience against it. Indeed he attempted to draw in the tribes into the negotiations to generate a force for it against obstruction and this was in accordance to a British opinion. However he failed in that, "Hussein Al-Habouni one of the influential leaders of the Eastern region mentioned that the UN envoy invited in the tribal chiefs and elders when he became certain that the dialogue of the parties had failed and that it is going around in circles and so Leon resorted to holding a meeting with the influential people of the tribes... Leaks from Cairo revealed that the former British ambassador for Libya Michael Aron is the one who requested the international envoy to meet with the tribal chiefs indicating that they represent a fundamental component and that it is not possible for the UN mission to ignore that component" (Tunisian Independent Daily News, 11/09/2015).

In spite of the judiciousness and shrewdness of Leon to give the appearance that he is neutral and in respect to hiding that he is of a European persuasion he has however at times been exposed and the Tobruk parliament has accused him of bias. "The latest steps of Leon agitated the anger of the Libyan parliamentarians in the case that they accused him stating that his only concern was to respond to all of the demands of the National Conference the term of which has ended. The drop that made the cup spill over was his meeting with a group from Fajr Libya and the Islamist extremists in Turkey and then the participation of Abdur Rahman As-Suwayhili one of those who had been accused with war crimes by a section of the Security Council..." (Libya 24, 11/09/2015). Leon was not concerned by this accusations and rather strongly criticised Haftar's military campaign in Benghazi. It was mentioned in the statement of the UN mission to Libya that it: "Strongly condemns the military escalation in Benghazi on 19/09/2015 in the case where the air strikes clearly aim to undermine the continuing efforts to end the struggle and obstruct it at a time when the negotiations had reached a final and critical stage..." (*Al-Masriyoon* Newspaper, 21/09/2015)... And of course Britain comprehends the issue of sabotage from Haftar whilst being pushed by America and that America is holding his leash and that the solution passes through it... As such the negotiators from the Conference (also) realise that and some news has been reported about there being a movement from parties of the Conference towards meeting some of the American officials in an attempt to reach an understanding with them. The rescue government in Tripoli that emanating from the conference of the meeting in Skhirat made

a forward step and their head Khalifah Al-Ghuwail met with an American official in respect to developments in regards to the issue. Sources of the Tripoli government informed (Al-Hayaat News) that Al-Ghuwail signed a series of agreements Sunday and Monday night with William Palmer, the deputy head of the institution for the management of American logistics services, which covered memorandums of understanding to 'Open new horizons for cooperation in the areas of defence, health and investment'. Sources in the Tripoli government described these agreements as representing 'an important step' in respect to relations with America" (Al-Hayaat, Tuesday 22/09/2015).

In light of that, it appears the two sides are like racehorses where neither of them is able to defeat the other. Rather they are both in need of dirty manoeuvres competing to suck the blood out of the people of Libya and their revolution whilst being assisted in that by their local agents who do not fear Allah, His Messenger and the believers... As such the two sides were in need of a battle time-out or recess! This was extended until 20/10/2015 as Leon stated or it will be further extended like is expected to happen, "The personal representative of the General Secretary of the United Nations Bernardino León in Libya during a press conference to present new developments in respect to the political Libyan dialogue in Skhirat that was organised yesterday evening on Monday said: 'We have a final text and our mission has ended. The matter now returns back to the participants to respond to this text and the response will never happen through more negotiations or making adjustments. Rather it will be by saying either 'Yes' or 'No' to the agreement'... and the UN envoy reiterated the necessity to begin the implementation of the agreement before the date of the 20<sup>th</sup> of the coming month of October..." (Morocco Today, Tuesday 22/09/2015).

In conclusion Leon wants to bring about a political solution as quickly as possible because Europe wants that on condition that the real gains attained from this solution would be in her favour and this is because Europe has regarded itself as being Libya's rightful owner for decades. America considers Europe as having been (in the past) and subsequently died leaving it as the only inheritor and if it can't be alone then it and Europe will be partner recipients of the inheritance. As for Europe returning alone in respect to influence over Libya then this represents a red line! These two demands are difficult to meet in the short term and as such it is difficult if not impossible for Leon to bring about a real and stable solution and it is only possible to bring about a solution on paper; an agreement which is signed today and breached the following day which is what is currently happening... This will continue until one of the two parties gains mastery over the other which enabling it to impose the solution that it desires. Another option is for the people of the land themselves to take over the reins of the issue by their own hands and fear Allah, their Lord so that they make His Shar'a the judge and then trample upon the old colonialism (Europe) and the new colonialism (America) in addition to their agents, followers and adherents. It is worth noting that the Wilayaat (provinces) of Tunisia, West Tripoli and Algeria when they were under the Khilafah used to impose taxes and conditions upon America for their ships to pass through their waters. So where were these lands under the shade of the Khilafah... and where have they descended to now in the absence of the Khilafah...

﴿إِنَّ فِي ذَلِكَ لَعِبْرَةً لِّأُولِي الْأَبْصَارِ﴾

**"Verily in that is a lesson for those who possess vision." [24:44]**

9<sup>th</sup> of Dhul Hijjah 1436 AH

23/09/2015 CE