

Today it is Africa, tomorrow it is the world

By Christof Lehmann 14-11-2011

The withdrawal of the old colonial powers from Africa, in the context of a developing Cold War, a developing Pan-African nationalism, and the rising cost of maintaining a colonial administration system, during the 1960s left the African nations in a euphoric state of independence.

In most cases this euphoria was soon to be substituted by choking massacres and conflict, coup d'états unrest and destabilization.

The old colonial rulers had returned with a vengeance. Over 50 years later, most African nations are, in spite of the richness of their resources and productivity of their population, still catastrophically under developed, impoverished, indebted, plagued by conflict, unrest and instability due to the return of the colonial powers influence.

Those African nations who failed to comply with their returning rulers were and are mercilessly attacked.

Libya and the Ivory Coast are examples for the new colonizations subversive influence, and a warning for African leaders to face the lion in solidarity or be devoured one by one.

All conflicts in post-colonial African wars as well as internal unrest have the same common elements.

The involvement of foreign nations, the instrumentalization of local elements, and the goal to control resources, economy, and geo-politically as well as strategically significant locations.

Western media narratives of French, British, and American involvement in Africa is commonly manufacturing popular consent by eliciting a fabled advocacy for stability, human rights, and democracy for African countries; nothing could be farther from the truth.

Stability, human rights and democracy are but the pretext for aggressive neo-colonial subversion, invasion, long-term military presence and control.

This subversion and invasion has acquired an additional dimension after China began to invest massively on the African continent.

While the traditional colonial powers and the USA maintained the traditional role of the supremacist usurper, China is, though resource, trade and profit-oriented, taking an approach of joint ventures and contribution to the development of African nations infrastructure.

After all, the Sino-African model of free market enterprise and joint venture can not function if African nations don't develop to such degree that they can import consumer goods that are manufactured in China.

Thus, since China began investing in Africa, the traditional colonial powers and the USA's subversion and aggression began being directed against primarily China, and secondarily Russia, which is recently rediscovering it's strength as a global power after a period of restructuring and re-consolidation after the collapse of the USSR

The neo-colonial model of subversion is based on directing and co-opting local instruments, such as opposition parties, human rights organizations, an ongoing internal low intensity conflict, as well as expatriate communities, expatriates sponsored and with ties to (for example) the National Endowment for Democracy.

These systems interface with both civilian and military intelligence services and special operations forces, in a logical, systematic approach that invariably has the same outcome; the subversion of the country, and the installation of a controlled, friendly, or proxy government.

Precisely the same methodology is explained in an analysis of the subversion of Syria that began with the 'Arab Spring' in 2011.

A successful subversion without the co-conspiracy of local elements is neither viable nor desirable.

A US Training Manual for Unconventional Warfare is breaking such terms as feasibility for subversion down into operational details.

The co-opting of local opposition in African subversion has been an invariable part

of neo-colonial strategy since day one of neo-colonialism, when the Congolese government and Patrice Lumumba were overthrown by creating and aggravating internal tensions, and the financial, as well as covert military support of an armed insurgency with its basis in a local militia.

The function of any of this subversion is invariably the controlling of resources and wealth while keeping the African nations impoverished and indebted, and since the beginning of the rapid development of China's economy, the geopolitical as well as economical warfare on Russia and China.

Mercenaries and al-Qaeda

The use of local instruments in subversion has largely been based on either tribal or religious aspects.

A prime example of this strategy is Angola.

After the socialist MPLA, backed by Cuba and the USSR came to power in Angola, the Western bloc, read NATO countries, began building and supporting two alternative movements, the NFLA in the north, and UNI TA in the south of Angola.

Both the NFLA and UNI TA were based on the same charter, but were divided by tribal affiliation.

In the case of Afghanistan, the USA and NATO countries heavily supported what was then called 'Mujahedeen', and a CIA-run network of Arab mercenaries, which came to become known as al-Qaeda.

The same network of mainly Arab and Afghan mercenaries was used by NATO in the war on Serbia, and the conquering of Kosovo, and the same network has been used against Libya by Western intelligence services for decades, and (delivered) the core of the so-called 'rebels' in Libya.

How NATO is using this 'network' or al-Qaeda, depending on what function it is supposed to fulfill in a given operation, as respectively purported enemy or ally is elicited by a West Point Study, that shows that the same al-Qaeda terrorist network in Benghazi and Derna, Libya, the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group, delivered the greatest per capita contribution of foreign fighters against the USA in Iraq, while the same LI FG is now providing the core around which among other, CIA

imported Afghan fighters are installed in the theatre of operations in the occupation of Libya.

At the onset of what is generally termed the 'Arab Spring' in Libya, US President Barack Obama signed an order, designating CIA operatives to the eastern Libyan cities Derna and Benghazi, in preparation of the final stages of the covert, and the beginning stages of the overt subversion of the Libyan government.

Publicly, Obama sent the CIA operatives to 'analyze' the rebel forces.

This analysis however, had been done in the West Point Study long before, and knowing about how intelligence operations are performed, was part of the step-by-step strategy for subversion, explained in the TC18-01 Unconventional Warfare manual.

Meanwhile, the corporate Western media villanized and positioned Muammar Ghaddafi and the Libyan government as dictators that indiscriminately bombed 'peaceful protesters' while it's al-Qaeda and associated army of mercenaries, and the political proxies Mahmud Jibril, Jalil, and a cohort of 'anonymous 'politicians' of the Transitional National Counsel were made into the heroes of the Libyan revolution.

The manufacturing of consent by media is one invariable element of warfare.

The manufacturing of a quasi-legitimate new government is an invariable element of neo-colonial strategy, as it can be observed on the example of the manufacturing of the National Counsel of Syria, which is in NATO's sights too.

The main obstacle for the advance of neo-colonialism on the African Continent has never been al-Qaeda, but Muammar Gaddafi, the Libyan government, as well as Laurent Gbagbo of Ivory Coast, and Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe.

Africa and the Supreme Court

In Ivory Coast, the situation was not unlike the one in Libya.

Ivory Coast held a Presidential election, with an apparently very close outcome.

In Western corporate media all we hear is that the Electoral Commission of Ivory Coast had declared Outtara the winner of the elections.

What Western media failed to report was, that there had been widespread election fraud, that the President of Ivory Coast and his party took the election results to the Supreme Court, and that the Supreme Court declared Laurent Gbagbo the winner of the election and thus Laurent Gbagbo to be the lawful President-elect of Ivory Coast.

What was reported, and emphatically reported, was that 'security forces' clamp down on 'peaceful protesters', and then, that 'Outtara's Army' is cornering Gbagbo 'in his bunker'.

This news coverage and manufacturing of consent is only possible in populations that are inherently racist and traditional or neo-colonial powers.

The important question is, where did Outtara, who just claimed to have won the election, got an 'army' from... To illustrate the point.

When George Bush and Al Gore had the closest ever election held in the United States of America, who certified the election?

The Supreme Court.

Even though many Americans felt utterly disenfranchised, the population respected the Supreme Court.

Can you for one moment imagine that 'Al Gore cornered Bush in his bunker, with Al Gore's army, neglecting the Supreme Court, because an Electoral Commission had pronounced him the winner?'

Where would Al Gore have gotten an army from anyways?

What happened in Ivory Coast was that France and the United States backed Outtara in neglecting the Supreme Court and the Constitutional Counsel of Ivory Coast because the Supreme Court decided in favor of Laurent Gbagbo and not the proxy president of neo-colonialism in Africa.

Outtara's 'army' consisted of a collection of 'rebel forces' or French-backed insurgents from the northern part of Ivory Coast, who had been convinced by the French DGSE and old colonial power structures, inherent in French Freemasonry in Africa, to side with Outtara, against Laurent Gbagbo.

Besides that, 2 500 French soldiers, plus UN soldiers were present, taking actively part in the ousting of Laurent Gbagbo and the legitimate government of Ivory Coast.

That is where Outtara got 'his army' from.

Insurgents, French and UN troops were Outtara's army.

An army that murdered thousands of Ivory Coast's citizens in the neo-colonial post-modern coup d'etat.

Justice on Laurent Gbagbo is then served at the ICC making the UN, France and the USA the judge, the jury, and the executioner.

Why did France hate Gbagbo?

The question that needs to be answered, before it is possible to discern why the events in Ivory Coast and Libya as they do is 'why' did the USA and France want Laurent Gbagbo and Gaddafi removed from political office.

The unrest, the engineering of dissent, the alliances with armed militia, politicians and oligarchs are nothing but 'functions' and 'instruments'.

It is comparable with a script for a play in the world political theatre; the script is written, the acts planned, long before the cast of actors is chosen.

The discourse of political reporting, and the manufacturing of opinion discuss the cast, seldom the playwright, almost never the playwright's motivation, and that is one of the most critical functions of media with respect to social engineering.

It is absolutely necessary to have an understanding of this background to understand the subversion in Ivory Coast and Libya.

After World War II the European economies were scrambling to reconstitute.

The traditional form of colonial control by military might and absolute political control had, in spite of the richness of African resources, become too costly, too cumbersome, and in the light of the depletion of military force due to two major conflicts, become impossible.

What is also noteworthy is, that the post-war period also is the period where the development of media and public relations significantly began substituting police and military force as instruments for social control.

Laurent Gbagbo had discussions with other visionary African leaders who not only knew that the new-colonization of Africa was keeping African nations impoverished and virtually enslaved its citizens being the backbone of new colonial powers economy, but who had vision, courage, and integrity in resisting the usurpers of Europe, the USA, and globalized Corporate Influences.

Most prominently, Robert Mugabe, President of Zimbabwe, and Muammar Gaddafi, honorary leader of the Libyan Revolution.

One of the main reasons why Laurent Gbagbo had to be replaced by France, and replaced fast, was that Gbagbo was not only seriously working towards creating Ivory Coasts own currency, that would be independent of France, but that he, like Robert Mugabe and Muammar Gaddafi, actively lobbied and encouraged other African nations in the CFA region to follow suit.

The main reason why France 'never would allow this to happen' in one of its old colonies is, that the CFA is one of the main sources of income for the French economy. Not only does France control the value of the CFA, and thus how much it earns on trade with CFA nations, not only does France cooperate with the IMF on regular devaluations of the CFA, France is printing the money for and exerts absolute control over the eight African countries' economies.

Moreover, the monetary policy of France in governing the eight nations economy is in fact operated by the French Treasury, without any reference to the central fiscal authorities of any of these eight nations.

Under the terms of the CFA Agreement, it is France that is unilaterally setting up these African nations' central banks, and each of the eight countries is obliged to

keep at least 65 percent of foreign exchange reserves in an 'operations account' held at the French Treasury, as well as another 20 percent to cover financial liabilities. In other words, 85 percent of all foreign exchange reserves of Ivory Coast, Benin, Burkina Faso, Guinea Bisau, Mali, Niger, Senegal and Togo are 100 percent under control of the French Treasury, with France in a position to devalue and manipulate these countries' economy to it's own advantage.

The CFA was created to keep African nations impoverished, to maintain the plunder of their resources and wealth, while feeding the French and European economy.

The social unrest that follows in the wake of new devaluations is then oppressed by those 'African Viceroy's' that are nepotist enough to co-operate with France as agents of their own nations and peoples enslavement.

Laurent Gbagbo opposed the colonial master because Laurent Gbagbo was working for the benefit of his people and Ivory Coast.

That is why Laurent Gbagbo had to be removed.

The Sun Kings and Gaddafi

Colonialism in Africa has changed significantly since the USA entered African politics after World War II, and very significantly with the consolidation of the European Union.

While France has particular national interests in the CFA region, most of Southern Europe's states are working towards an expansion of the European market to the Mediterranean Basin, and a new colonization by means of economic control and military presence in North Africa.

Seldom mentioned in the corporate media, the royal family of Morocco is a stern supporter of this policy.

Co-operation on multiple areas, such as the control of the Mediterranean Basin states' social economy have been implemented for years.

French President Nicolas Sarkozy made it his personal ambition to achieve what

even Napoleon did not - a colonization of the entire North and West Africa.

In 2008 France and the European Union had been so far in their preparations, that the only remaining obstacle for it's North African colonial ambitions was Libya.

And Libya outright rejected to play into the hands of the want-to-be colonialists.

When asked for his opinion about the Mediterranean Basin alliance, Muammar Gaddafi said: 'If Europe wants co-operation, it should go through Cairo and Adis Abeba'.

In 2008, President Sarkozy wanted to make the Mediterranean Alliance his contribution to the European Union.

During the six months of the French EU Presidency French Foreign Minister Bernard Kouchner did not only convey Sarkozy's 'disappointment', but clearly indicated that Libya and Gaddafi had become 'the' obstacle for further colonial expansion in Northern Africa, when he stated that: 'Colonel Gaddafi is not in agreement with this vision.

'Neither was he in agreement with the Barcelona process which we intend to support and pursue.'

The reason why Libya opposed the Mediterranean Alliance was, that it would have split, rather than united African nations.

Rather than establishing one more 'zone' like the CFA region in Northern Africa, Gaddafi and Libya were lobbying the African Union to abandon the CFA treaties with France, and to establish a Pan-African, gold-backed currency, which would end the usury, the robbery of African nations resources, and the enslavement of an entire continent's population.

The Libyan arguments were persuasive.

Libya had the highest per capita GDP, the highest standard of living, social services, wages, job security, education program, literacy rate, and countless other 'firsts' among African nations.

After Gaddafi's and Libya's outright rejection of the Mediterranean Alliance and success at lobbying for a Pan-African currency, with among others Laurent Gbagbo from Ivory Coast, meant that the USA and Europe had only one option left, to topple the Libyan government by any means necessary.

The Myth of an African Union.

To understand the full range of the problem Libya created, it is necessary what the African Union (AU) is. The African Union was established in 2002 by member states of the former Organization of African Unity (OAU).

The OAU was established in 1963 with the function to facilitate African nations' transition to independence, to counter all forms of colonialism, and protect the independence and national integrity of African Nations.

The transition from the OAU to the African Union in 2002 was ... modeled on the European Union.

The African Union is but the new colonial administration of a now united Europe.

With approximately one-third of the entire budget of the African Union paid for by the European Union, as alms to Africa, taken from the money that is usurped from Africa, the African Union is but the European Union's Colonial administration.

An African Court of Justice modeled on the ICC, an African Investment Bank, an African Development Bank, and an African Central Bank, managed by Europe, for Europe and the USA, and global finance capital.

The African Union did not 'cower in the light of pressure from the EU' as some interpreted it's support of UNSC Resolution 1973.

The African Union, strictly speaking, functioned exactly as it was designed to do; as an instrument for the new colonization of Africa.

Just like Laurent Gbagbo, who had to be removed because he wanted Ivory Coast to have it's own currency or a Pan-African Currency under African control rather than that of the French National Bank, Muammar Gaddafi had to be removed, because he was the one obstacle that prevented the establishment of the

Mediterranean Alliance, and because his ideas about a Pan-African Gold Dinar was seriously considered by many African leaders.

That is why Gaddafi had to be removed.

Spiraling towards global conflict

Ivory Coast and the removal of Laurent Gbagbo from office; the criminal war against Libya and the ousting of the legitimate Libyan government, the aggressive expansion of the US African Command, the ongoing subversion of Syria, the manufacturing of war in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, Yugoslavia, Somalia, Sudan, Ossetia; the manufacturing of insurgencies in Chechnya, Yemen, among other, and countless 'Color Revolutions' and 'Arab Spring' coups d'état have only been possible for two reasons.

The fact that Russia was severely destabilized after the collapse of the USSR, and under the Presidency of Boris Yeltsin, who strip-sold Russian assets to global oligarchs, and which had to find its footing as a global power.

The fact that the transformation of the Chinese economy was prioritized higher by China than the defence of the nations in Africa, that provide much of the resources that drive the Chinese economy.

Already at the International Security Conference in Munich, 2007, then President of The Russian Federation Vladimir Putin used the strongest possible diplomatic words to warn the United States of America, saying that its aggressive expansionism has brought the world closer to a third world war than it has ever been before.

After the absolutely criminal and shameless abuse of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1973 and the attempt by NATO countries to abuse the UN for a similar resolution on Syria, both China and Russia responded with a veto.

The global danger however, is not the fact of the veto, but the fact that the world today, with a United Nations that has utterly been co-opted by NATO countries, has no forum for a peaceful resolution of what increasingly seems to develop into a global war.

This is indeed an unprecedented crisis that demands unprecedented leadership, courage, and integrity. - nsabc

• Dr Christof Lehmann is the editor of nsabc. He is a practicing clinical psychologist, a life time peace activist, political advisor, and advisor in behavior, finance, economics, conflict resolution and peace-building.