

Chapter 9: The War in Libya

We must look back at the war in Libya led by France, among others. Indeed, I will try to show that we, the French, have gone astray in this action. We have even put ourselves in the ultimate case of misguidance: the inversion.

In this chapter I am addressing the French reader in particular. But it is a textbook case for everyone. Here are, first of all, the facts that everyone accepts. The representatives of France have judged a man to be evil and we have consequently given ourselves the right to shoot him and to set fire to his country and his people. Before our intervention, the Libyan people had achieved prosperity, despite an international blockade of several years. It was the most developed country in Africa with a per capita income similar to Argentina. It should also be noted that Libya had \$200 Billion in reserves consisting of assets and reserves in international banks. This seems huge, but it is what France gives in 4 years in interest on the debt, which Libya did not do as it had its monetary sovereignty.

And after our passage, there is a ravaged country, heavily armed terrorist militias, 3 competing governments, a permanent guerrilla war still active 8 years later. The country's oil production is at a third of what it was before the war because of sabotage.

How many dead? We don't really know. It would seem that the 26,000 NATO bombings and active support to the insurgents caused at least 50,000 deaths at the time of the end of the official regime represented by Muammar Gaddafi in October 2011.

Then come all the murders of the terrorist militias that have settled in and are still terrorizing the population, the NATO bombs with depleted uranium shells that trigger respiratory and cancerous diseases, children with malformations. Hundreds of thousands of refugees, massacres of black populations.

Libya's military arsenal has been scattered throughout the Sahel. Many desperate Africans, perhaps more than 100,000, embarking on light boats to flee and cross the Mediterranean sea.

Isn't there not already a big problem with these facts alone? You have to find the courage to know a little more. Yes, my dear compatriots, a country has been destroyed and its leader has been savagely murdered. And life goes on as if nothing had happened. Yes, I insist, because many people I have been able to interview are not at all as shocked as I am, in 2011 and again today in 2019. There is a certain indifference or even contempt for Gaddafi.

And in the media, it is also close to indifference, there is talk of a negative balance sheet of this operation. Sometimes a voice is raised, and evokes a problem or even a big problem, but no time is given to develop. It is without the slightest echo. On the other hand, there is much more talk of illegal campaign financing by Libya.

My feeling is that there was a consent of the majority of the population to what happened. Even if there is now an awareness that the balance sheet is negative, there is no question that there was a general consent for this action. Polls at the time claimed that two-thirds of the population approved. I think that if similar circumstances were to occur again, this general consent would unfortunately still be given. I am not saying that the French are bellicose, but they allow themselves to be led astray and allow abominations to take place.

Let us see how our leaders, who have positioned themselves as moral judges over one of their peers, have behaved. I draw attention to the fact that I do not want to pass judgment on a person, but an evaluation of the actions of persons in the context of very particular functions. Those of representatives of the people.

In the French constitution, article 3, it is said: "National sovereignty belongs to the people who exercise it through their representatives". Therefore, it is indeed the people who are responsible for what France does. It is therefore legitimate for the people to evaluate the actions of its representatives who act in its name. Especially in the context of a dramatic action: the destruction of a country and the murder of its representative.

It begins at the UN, with the passing of resolution 1970 on February 20, 2011, to impose sanctions on Libya. We need evidences. For this, we listened to a Libyan expatriate man who has just joined a newly created organization: the NTC (National Transitional Council). This man, unknown to all but perhaps the secret services, is making very serious accusations against a regime that has been in office for more than 41 years: genocide and crimes against humanity. Elementary verifications are necessary. But in the face of the horror of the reported elements, it is understandable that something must be done.

This may explain the Security Council resolutions 1970 and 1973, which go to the maximum, and even beyond, respect for international law. Indeed, international law prevents interference in the internal affairs of a country. There is still a ban on the sale of arms to Libya, a seizure of the bank accounts and assets of all the leaders and accounts that are in the name of a state body that they could use, an indictment of Gaddafi at the International Criminal Court (ICC) and a warrant authorizing force to protect airspace.

France was the initiator of these resolutions. All this without any verification. We are typically in a case of the first misleading principle: To affect strongly to induce a message. The message being: we must get rid of Gaddafi.

Thus, France has gone completely astray: it has acted under the influence of emotion. We believed the accusations of a group of opponents without any verification and demanded and obtained sanctions.

A few days go by. Either we are honest and we study what the accusers say, we learn about their intentions and their paths ... and we recognize our mistake. Either we hide our crime by giving credibility to the accusers about whom we knew nothing. We must also consider the option of our representatives knowing who these accusers are. They still have intelligence services at their disposal. But then they know they are not Democrats at all for

the most part, and probably we even know that they lied about the massacres reported to the UN.

Thus on March 10, France chose to give credibility to the accusers by officially recognizing the legitimacy of the NTC to represent the Libyan people. It is a shame for France to cover up its mistake of having slandered Gaddafi, by validating things that are false or unverified, but in addition we are handing over the Libyan people to an autocratic regime, at best. That is to say, this group of Libyans represents only the people who make it up ... in the most favorable case. The most likely case is that they are acting for shameful interests. In such circumstances, one should not hope for anything other than a group subjected to colonizers.

Thus France is the first country to recognize the NTC as the only legitimate government of Libya. There can be no excuses for this act, even the stupidity coupled with naivety that might have been evoked before, about our behavior at the UN. We will then witness the total misleading, by principle number 6: the finger in the gear. Indeed, our errors or forfeits, you will choose the most appropriate term according to your appreciation, could have had limited consequences thanks to the respect of international law. But instead of respecting it, France broke it.

The UN's mandate is to ensure that there is no air activity. 'No Fly zone'. Gaddafi decreed a ceasefire and the closure of Libyan airspace on March 18 to comply with the UN resolution 1973 passed the day before. Gaddafi has been warned that he risks having planes shot down if he uses them against his people. So in the worst-case scenario, we shoot down military planes... in flight.

Yet on March 19, the French president gathered his partners in Paris to announce the decision to bomb Libya. On prime-time French public service television, the foreign minister explains how much everyone agrees with France that Gaddafi is terrible for his people. But one sentence escapes him: "It is not written in the resolution of the Security Council that he must go, but it is quite obvious that the goal of all this is to allow the Libyan people to choose their regime. I don't have the feeling that today his choice would fall on Colonel Gaddafi ". Do you understand, as I do, that everything that has been done to mobilize the international community has only one goal: to get Gaddafi to leave, regardless of the law and the international community? His feeling takes precedence over reason and truth.

What is ironic, even tragic, is that in this newscast, images are shown of a fighter plane flying over Benghazi, Libya, and being shot down. The journalist specifies that it is not a Gaddafi plane but that it is part of the rebel forces. A new contradiction in the version that Gaddafi is attacking pacifist populations asking for democracy. Dear French friends who demonstrate your despair in yellow jackets, can you imagine, whatever your determination or intentions, finding yourself on board a fighter plane flying over a metropolis?

So we attack Libya. Were there Libyan planes in the air? A bombardment can only hit planes on the ground. You cannot drop bombs on planes in the air. This is a violation of the UN mandate. No international consensus has authorized us to do this. So we attacked a foreign country without a declaration of war! Not declaring war with the specified causes prevents any possibility of dialogue and mediation. We put ourselves in a situation where we want war and nothing should stop us. This is a violation of the written and accepted laws of war since ancient times.

France has committed a serious transgression. Are you aware that we could be legitimately attacked for this reason? So, with the first bombings, our representatives have fallen lower than the person they want to judge: non-respect of international law with non-declaration of war and non-respect of a UN mandate. Everything that these

representatives say and do is therefore suspect. Dear French people, your moral duty is to make an effort to know what happened and to look for other versions than the one that the media and the politicians have presented to us.

Very quickly, Gaddafi's air force was annihilated. But we continued to bomb, for an indefinite period. What the secret services could not make official in order not to disavow their leaders, NGOs (non-governmental organizations) and groups of experts did by inquiring on the site. There was no massacre of civilians, but armed groups attacked with heavy weapons the symbols of the Libyan power. You can, for example, consult the report of international experts of the CF2R (French Center for Intelligence Research) which sent a mission on the spot in April 2011 and published in May 2011 its report "Syria: an uncertain future". But the French media remains on the same line of a Gaddafi massacring his people. However, abroad this raises questions. One can no longer hide behind feelings. The French Minister of Foreign Affairs said on June 16, 2011 in Algeria in Algiers: "It is true that the UN resolutions do not require the departure of Muammar Gaddafi, but we, we demand it". Who is the dictator? Who flouts international law? Who has been bombing innocent people for several months? Who allows terrorist militias to abuse the entire population? Our representatives and all the media have lied and are lying to the French population. They are completely drawn into the spiral of misguidance and are trying to drag the whole country with them. A return to the previous situation is no longer possible. It would be necessary to recognize its wrongs and the heavy consequences that this implies. But there are deaths, many deaths and considerable damage.

At this point, can their conscience wake up and consider reparations? Is it possible to say "enough is enough, we have done enough, we are getting out"? But if we let the Libyan authorities defend themselves and restore order, the rebels will be arrested and identified. It will be discovered that they have nothing to do with the Libyan people, that there were no massacres by Gaddafi. The time will come for investigations and questions.

The change of regime is therefore a necessity for the representatives of France. So the politicians and the media deceive us with principle number 3: Repetition. They repeat again and again that Gaddafi is a monster and an avalanche of false information is poured out to convince us of this. And the whole French war machine is under the control of one person, the president of the French Republic. Our institutions give him the gigantic means available within the army to act... for three months. But Gaddafi resists. The regime resists... beyond these 3 months.

Thus, the mechanism for stopping a war is activated after 3 months. The National Assembly is composed of 577 deputies, each representing one of the country's electoral districts. These deputies vote on laws and have investigative resources and parliamentary attachés, allowing them to study the issues they vote on. The assembly must therefore vote on whether or not to continue the war. Well, it did. It asked the president and his government to continue the destruction of the Libyan regime. It should be noted that with a score of more than 95%, they supported or let it be done, and only 4.67% said no. It is therefore not a man who failed but a system. It is therefore also important to note this date: on July 12, 2011, the representatives of the French people have voted for the unconsciousness of the president who is ravaging a country.

The British Parliament, for its part, investigated and clearly disassociated itself from the then Prime Minister, but 5 years later. The report denounces decisions based on false information and without foreseeing their consequences. Here is the summary from the report:

"In March 2011, the United Kingdom and France, with the support of the United States, led the international community to support an intervention in Libya to protect civilians from attacks by forces loyal to Muammar Gaddafi. This policy was not informed by accurate intelligence. In particular, the Government failed to identify that the threat to civilians was overstated and that the rebels included a significant Islamist element. By the summer of 2011, the limited intervention to protect civilians had drifted into an opportunist policy of regime change. That policy was not underpinned by a strategy to support and shape post-Gaddafi Libya. The result was political and economic collapse, inter-militia and inter-tribal warfare, humanitarian and migrant crises, widespread human rights violations, the spread of Gaddafi regime weapons across the region and the growth of ISIL in North Africa. Through his decision making in the National Security Council, former Prime Minister [...] was ultimately responsible for the failure to develop a coherent Libya strategy."

We will now give some perspective on the meaning of this act. I must now tell you about ancient Rome, and its end. The Roman Empire was a huge empire stretching all around the Mediterranean Sea and reaching as far as England. From the 5th century, the empire reorganized itself to manage its immensity. Two entities were created: the Eastern Roman Empire and the Western Roman Empire. But, in less than a century the Western Roman Empire disappeared while the Eastern Roman Empire survived for more than a thousand years. The date 476 is considered as the date of the collapse of the Western Roman Empire, but this date is only the abdication of a 14 year old Roman emperor, which nobody pays attention to. It is a non-event. It is just that we notice, afterwards, that on this date, nothing and nobody could incarnate the grandeur of Rome anymore. Yet shortly before, Rome survived the sacking of the capital in 410. Rome then had to face and bring to heel rebellions of the peoples in all of Western Europe. At the same time, Rome had to face the barbarian invasions and the Huns of Attila. And Rome came out victorious from all these challenges. It is then 453. How did Rome succeed? The answer is simple: by being Rome. In its very essence. That is to say a power based on its army, its military art. This art was based on technical innovations with sophisticated weapons, discipline, fighting techniques and great strategists. Rome had also developed a civilization with construction techniques, the mastery of water treatment with aqueducts and sewer systems, and a representative political system with an emperor at its head. The army subdued the peoples and offered them the integration of their culture with the Roman civilization in provinces that the Roman army was protecting. And this grandeur of Rome was perfectly embodied by the generalissimo Flavius Aetius from 430 to 454. He was the head of the army of the Western Roman Empire and he subdued the peoples and negotiated their vassalage in the empire. He defeated the army of the Huns with a smaller army composed mainly of peoples he had federated shortly before. However, the Huns were very vigorous warriors who inspired terror. History tells us that before the decisive battle Attila and his army had criss-crossed and ravaged Gaul. But thanks to the prayers of Saint Genevieve, Paris had been spared. Aetius by his victory with an considered inferior army puts in light his great qualities of strategist. He surprised all the witnesses by sparing Attila's life and giving the Huns the possibility to withdraw. The Huns will not attack Rome afterwards. Perhaps Attila was transfigured by the nobility of Aetius' soul, just as Jean Valjean, the hero of Victor Hugo's novel *Les Misérables*, finds redemption through the intervention of Monseigneur Myriel.

The Western Roman Empire disappeared, but a basic trend was established throughout the West. The idea of universal brotherhood and salvation of the soul

through justice that Christianity conveys has touched the entire population of all peoples. Leaders joined their people behind these aspirations and pledged spiritual allegiance to the Pope, the Bishop of Rome. France, as well as other countries in the West, was born on these new foundations following the Roman Empire.

Now, in order to try to understand the significance of France's action in Libya, we must consider taking a few steps back. To do so, one must consider the work of Patrick Mbéko in his book " Objective Gaddafi ". Just as it is necessary to understand the military campaigns of Aetius in order to understand the significance of his murder, so we need to understand Gaddafi's dealings with Libya in the years preceding his assassination. Patrick Mbeko gives us the investigation he conducted on the Libyan leader. From his birth to his death and the state of Libya 5 years later. Everything that has been said and published about Gaddafi has been referenced and sourced. Some witnesses have been interviewed. We can thus have the decisions and statements of Western politicians in the media, the decisions and statements of the courts, the recall of events, the explanations that intelligence agents give in the publication of their memoirs, the official or declassified archives, the point of view of opponents, of lawyers on the litigations, an in-depth study of the facts that are reproached to Gaddafi. Thus, with a minimum of interpretation but a work of investigation and in-depth analysis, appears clearly the misinformation that the population of the West undergoes by its media, involving also communication companies in public relations and even sometimes intelligence services. We discover that for 42 years all the elements have been shown to us in a biased way, some are totally false and that many essential elements exonerating Libya have been passed over in silence. One wonders if the communications agencies and the intelligence services are not working directly in the media.

We discover a Gaddafi growing up in one of the poorest countries in the world. His country has oil resources that generate extraordinary wealth for foreigners and a few rare Libyans while the population lives in poverty. Gaddafi is outraged by this plundering and this misery. He is obviously not the only one to dream of justice. He federates a group of young people, inspired by the ideas of the Egyptian Arab president Nasser, to overthrow the established order. Gaddafi is based on moral values, reinforced by his religion of Islam. This is how he recruits and gets his group members recruited. He is consistent with his values and thus has the trust and respect of others. The group enrolled in the army and took power in 1969 without any foreign support, and almost without resistance. Gaddafi is 27 years old and the members of his group are not much older than him. They have big dreams and ambitions for Libya but they start from nothing, nobody knows them and others want to take their places by all means. Gaddafi will prove to be an exceptional negotiator. He gradually obtains everything that Libya is legitimately entitled to get. His strength lies in the respect of his interlocutors and his independence. His regime is not beholden to anyone. He knows that his country does not have the technology to extract resources from its subsoil, the only wealth it has in the short term. He wants partnerships that benefit all parties, especially Libya, which he represents and whose interests he defends unflinchingly. After taking control of the country's institutions, his

regime, while collaborating with foreign companies, will prevent the establishment of foreign military bases and take control of the oil companies operating in Libya. At the same time, he is redistributing a large part of the oil revenues to social programs and education. He also spends a lot on the military. He is in a virtuous circle for Libya, which allows him to demand an increase in the rate charged on a barrel. This gives ideas to other oil exporting countries and significantly impacts world prices. Gaddafi, then, appears as a very serious threat to the West. And he is not under Soviet influence either. He is therefore uncontrollable and unpredictable. In this book, we discover a very important aspect of Gaddafi. It is the vision he has of his country. Libya is delimited by the divisions of the colonial empires where some tribes are located. It became independent in 1951 with a monarchical regime but is under Anglo-Saxon military and oil influence. Gaddafi sees his country as belonging to both Africa and the Arab Muslim world. He would have liked to merge his country with Egypt if the regime were to be Nasserian. Thus his wish for development is not limited to Libya, but to all his African and Arab brothers.

His project is not imperial, but fraternal or humanistic. It wants justice and development for everyone. Thus, the Libyan regime supports many opposition movements throughout Africa, the Arab world and other places. This support is very negatively perceived by the established powers, especially since some movements are armed. He supports, among others, the ANC of Nelson Mandela in South Africa. He made many friends, but also many enemies. But for the West, it is a priority that his insubordination does not spread. It became strategic to get rid of Gaddafi, or at least contain him. This involved making him beyond the pale. Patrick Mbéko tells us in his sourced investigation everything that was tried against him. And by the word 'everything', I mean everything that has come up. And it is already a huge and incredible list.

I won't go into details, but I think it's important to mention a few highlights. First of all, we must address what is often blamed on Gaddafi: the terrorist attacks on the American Pan Am plane and the French UTA plane that exploded in flight at the end of the 1980s, killing hundreds. I try as much as possible not to name the people or countries involved, but you can find them, along with the evidence, in Patrick Mbéko's book. Thus, during the first two years of the investigations into the plane crashes, there was no evidence to suggest that Libya had any involvement in these attacks. But, as I said earlier, it became strategic for a great power to make Gaddafi beyond the pale. The investigations were then redirected against Libya. Secret services used their influence to bring in suspicious elements, even to fabricate evidences. Gaddafi did not give in and took the time necessary to obtain guarantees that the facts could be judged impartially. This took years of long negotiations and brought concessions. Libya had to endure an international embargo for several years, which caused it to lose tens of billions of dollars. Libya agreed to compensate the victims in exchange for the removal of the ban, but without acknowledging its involvement. The trial for the American plane ended in the conviction of a single defendant with the recognition that the trial had violated the rights of the defendant. The convicted person was released on humanitarian considerations, as he was in

poor health, and there was no appeal. In other words, the whole diplomatic and intelligence world knew that Libya and the Libyans were innocent, but the face of the accusers was saved because the proceedings had ended in a conviction. But Gaddafi did not stop there. Once relations with the international community had been normalized, he demanded that oil companies with lucrative contracts in Libya pay the last part of the compensation to the victims. Then there was the case of the Bulgarian nurses. Dozens of children died in a Libyan hospital where foreigners were working, including Bulgarian nurses, who found themselves condemned under dubious conditions. A strong international mobilization demanded the release of these nurses. Gaddafi, as a formidable negotiator, demanded a treatment similar to that imposed on Libyan nationals: \$10 million per dead child in exchange for the release of the Bulgarian nurses. Libya had been forced to pay \$10 million per passenger victim in the 2 plane attacks to free its innocent nationals and normalize its relations with the international community. Libya finally obtained that the families of the child victims be compensated by a Western power. Thus Gaddafi, with time, managed to make his positions accepted, no matter how embarrassing they were for the Western leaders.

It is important to know that Gaddafi has faced very violent attacks that have had collateral damage, such as the death of one of his daughters during the bombing of his residence in 1986. Westerners, in number, have also been collateral victims on other occasions...to be discovered in Patrick Mbéko's book.

Now, we must see the interior balance sheet of Gaddafi, and it is hardly believable. The investigation informs us that water and electricity were free for everyday use, medical care was almost free, gasoline was 15 times cheaper than in France for everyone (8 cents a liter), education was free, even abroad thanks to scholarships. The Libyan state granted loans to the whole population to buy a house without interest and without any time limit. And all of this under an embargo. Other measures were in preparation and were announced at the beginning of the insurrection. It seems to me that the Yellow Jackets in France would like to be able to benefit from such treatment.

On a purely economic level, Gaddafi built up a 144-ton gold reserve, made no debts and built up sovereign wealth funds worth nearly \$200 billion for his country, whose population was, at the time, 6 million. Although it is not in the book, I give below, for comparison, the record of the French leaders, during the period of Gaddafi's power, for a country of 65 million people. The French leaders gave monetary power to private banks, which caused the country to be in debt to the amount of more than 2,000 billion dollars, sold 737 tons of gold, as well as most of the state-owned companies that were flagships in electricity, gas, water, oil, banking, telecommunications, engineering, highways

You will learn that Gaddafi was a pious Muslim but was not fooled by the terrorists who hide behind a religion. He was the one who issued the first international arrest warrant for the leader of Al Qaeda... long before the New York bombings.

This book, written by an African from Congo, also describes Gaddafi's contribution to the African continent. His concrete achievements such as the financing of a

telecommunications satellite, but also his investments throughout the continent so that Africa learns to transform its raw materials. The author has of course identified Gaddafi's will to give political weight to Africa by being a driving force in the creation of the African Union, but especially by preparing financial institutions that could free Africa from dependence and submission to endless usurious loans. The author, like many Africans, is grateful to Gaddafi who was offering them a way out of the long tunnel of misery and exploitation. He clearly associates this exit opportunity with the fall of Gaddafi. This episode confirms to Africa that it is still colonized and sends a very clear message to those who would not agree.

Finally, the author gives us a completely different version of the war, with the Arab springs that were intended to set regimes that would have tolerated the infiltration of Libya by terrorist militias or mercenaries passing through their territory. Technological means of information manipulation were used to make it appear that Gaddafi was attacking his people when in fact he was facing an armed external attack that he had contained. There were fewer casualties than in the so-called non-violent revolutions in neighboring countries.

The author also reports on Libyan initiatives during the war to end the conflict and avoid the drama that is still unfolding. Thus, from the beginning, Gaddafi reached out to the insurgents and the international community. From the beginning, he made it known that he was ready to leave power. Journalists, soldiers, lawyers and diplomats from several countries involved in the conflict were warned. As the conflict progressed, he agreed to many concessions, such as holding elections where all stakeholders could stand. He then offered to withdraw on the condition that the country not be left in the hands of terrorist militias. He finally offered to leave the country without conditions. He was told yes, only to be bombed as soon as he departed.

It is possible that you, the reader, will fall from the sky. I invite you, especially the skeptics, to get hold of Patrick Mbéko's book and to compare the treatment of the information poured out in the West and the work of an African author done according to rigorous investigative practices. You will be able, for example, to identify who is using the misleading principles described in the previous chapter. You will also be able to do your own verifications.

Now that you have the necessary elements, I can give you an interpretation of the historical and civilizational significance of this event.

France was built on the meeting of a leader and the people around the values of progress for all while respecting each one. There was first Clovis who was baptized to join Christianity in its original spirit of human brotherhood, Charlemagne who "invented" school for all, Saint Louis who rendered justice, François 1er who developed arts and letters, Napoleon with the concretization of the ideas of the Revolution of liberty, equality, fraternity and universality, and finally De Gaulle who reminds France that all its values make its greatness, that the sovereignty is to the French people and that the State must ensure the basic needs of the people:

education, health, life's hazards and security for each individual and taken care of by the collective. This is how the notion of the welfare state takes shape.

It is interesting to note that the moment of De Gaulle's departure to France coincided with the arrival of Gaddafi in Libya in 1969. These two men participate in the construction or reconstruction of their country on their deep values which turn out to be universal. They are both military and defend their country and people by arms against foreign tutelage. Both of them will be called terrorist, dictator, both will suffer assassination attempts and will be harsh towards the conspirators. On virtuous human values, they built the prosperity of their country and the neighboring countries benefited from it. But France after De Gaulle has lost the convergence between the people and their leader on the destiny of the country. An invisible enemy, reduced to being inoffensive under de Gaulle, has infiltrated and taken power, the idea of taking advantage of the other through cunning and domination, embodied in usury. Successive leaders offered themselves, and France with them, to usurious finance. The country has become morally and economically depleted, and is now at the mercy of stateless high finance. On the other side of the Mediterranean, Gaddafi had identified the evil that was eating away at his continent but also at the West and a large part of the world. With his tiny country, whose Muslim culture knows the prohibition of usury, he preserved and developed his country. He was on his Way to rescue Africa and was waiting for the Arab world to respond to his offered hand. France was invited to share the prosperity. But France lacked the humility to recognize its moral and economic weakness. Its leader, badly assisted, wanted and demanded a lot, right away. France hoped that by killing the golden goose, we would have the money to hide our weaknesses. But we exposed them. Our representatives have slandered, lied and colluded with unrepresentative opponents, stateless terrorists and have violated international law. The consequences have been the destruction of a country, the despair of a continent and the loss of the ally that has the antidote to our evil. France sat on its values of justice, dialogue, fraternity, humanism, universality and respect for the law. All of this for the greater benefit of stateless dominating interests that are bringing France to its knees, among others. The French representatives have killed the spirit that animated France, and the people have given their consent. The representatives have committed a crime against civilization and the people have allowed it. There can be no salvation without this awareness.

Yet the warning signs were big. First by the law on the end of freedom of expression of July 13, 1990. Then by the cancellation in 2008 of the people's decision to reject the European Union constitution in 2005. And what we have done in Libya is not an accident. Unfortunately, France continued after Libya, despite a change of representatives, by attacking Syria. It slandered the current President Bashar El Assad and encouraged and supported opponents of whom we know nothing, in the least devaluing hypothesis. I quote our Minister of Foreign Affairs, the head of French diplomacy: "I am aware of the force of what I am saying: Mr. Bashar al-Assad does not deserve to be on earth". Are we going to let it go on for much longer? Evil is still plaguing us. We have lost our values and the words that

designate them are used to attack those who could help us. This is the inversion. The populace has taken over the people. But now the same forces of predation that have fallen on the Libyan people are falling on the French people and Europe. The CETA treaty provides the legal framework for this predation to take place without us really realizing it and without us being able to react. We can see little by little that the end of the month is more and more difficult for more and more people. It is a progressive and ineluctable transfer. The French house is collapsing because it has no more foundations. Reforms will not change anything. Because they are led by puppet representatives who only fill the cracks in the façade. Puppet, the same nickname that was given to the Roman emperors after the death of Aetius, because they had no power. They had become the puppets of the army. Today, the power that controls our rulers is usurious high finance, and we have come to admit that reform is necessary and that it is bound to be painful. But it is only the law of the exponential of usury, always more is needed for those who have a lot. These people now have the means to deceive you and make you admit anything. War, reforms, contradictions, inversion. When the reform responds to a need for justice, it is not painful. The one who used to profit too much accepts that an unjust profit cannot be eternal. But care must be taken to explain. For the others, it is a progress and the former profiteer must be invited to it as well as the others. If it is still painful for some, it is because there are other underlying injustices. Allowing the strong to submit the weak is an injustice. At some point, we will have to discuss the need for free trade, even if some people have to reduce the growth of their wealth. Otherwise, you will be put in competition with those who have no vacations, no pensions, no care, no education, no solidarity. And you will have to align yourselves to survive. The norm will be misery. There is a profound antagonism between the historical aspirations of the French people and the central objective of the European Union, which imposes free trade and the confiscation of monetary power. When will we ask ourselves where the mistake is?

One day, we will have to say stop, but it is not on a particular reform that we must focus our efforts, it is on the injustice and the negation of our essential values. And the most striking, the most visible and the most selfless is the injustice suffered by Libya and its leader. We must say that we do not consent to what has happened. We must face the situation with justice. Our salvation cannot come from elsewhere. Recognition, understanding and repair is the way to restore dignity to Libya, but also to ourselves. We will regain our values and build prosperity. Do you doubt it?

Let's look at our history once again. For obscure reasons, the French leaders in 1830 decided to colonize Algeria. Facing the unexpected resistance of the population and their leaders, the French military ravaged the country, destroying every green space so that the resisters would have no place to hide and feed. The French people, who I don't know how much they knew about it, let these inhuman practices go on until the Algerians gave up the struggle in 1847. In France, misery was reigning. The people rose up in 1848 to demand a social and democratic regime. Just as the army had been sent to quell the Algerian resistance, so it was given the task of quelling the people of Paris. It was a massacre of several thousand

dead. The survivors were sent in great numbers to the prison and the rest of the people were left to meditate on their misery. Shortly afterwards, Victor Hugo gave his historic speech on misery in the House of Representatives and in the following years he wrote his novel "Les Misérables". He planted a seed to get us out of this misery that was present at the time and towards which we are heading again. If you let your neighbor be mistreated, the mistreatment sets in and then you will be mistreated. We let it happen in Libya and our leaders wanted to do it again in Syria. Well, don't be surprised that CETA is coming down on us, because the same leaders who attacked Libya and Syria are now in charge of the Constitutional Council, the institution that guarantees the respect of the French constitution. It is likely that very few people have read this text, but the Constitutional Council, whose mission it is, has read it and yet has assured us that CETA respects the constitution. For those who do not understand the betrayal of the CETA text, I invite you to read or read again the chapter dealing with this subject. Our ancestors let their leaders massacre in Algeria, but our leaders are no better and we still let them do it and today they validate our financial colonization. French friends, learn about our history with Algeria. Algerian friends, tell your History and remind the French that France has started again in Libya. Understand that this will end badly. It is necessary to refuse these acts. And I am not content with calling on you to react, I propose in this book concrete solutions which are discussed in a later chapter. But it is necessary to understand that the subject must be approached and decided by all the French.

Think of a family where the father of the family regularly violates one of the children, to the point of causing physical and psychological after-effects on the child. But the father says he does this for the love of the child. Do you think the family is functional? Do you think the other children will be able to grow into balanced individuals if no one says anything. It is necessary for a voice to tell the whole family that the father's behavior is profoundly harmful. Tongues will be untied and solutions can be found. In 1848, at first, the revolt had rumbled. As a general with a reputation for killing innocent Parisians was about to be appointed to quell the insurrection, the national guard refused to obey. The political leader of the time resigned. Favorable measures were granted to all the peoples of Europe for fear of failing to contain their anger. Simply because the national guard in France said "no" to obeying a butcher. If the lives of the Algerians could have been considered in the same way as those of the French, the guard would also have refused to obey the general freshly arrived from Algeria who dealt with the Parisians a few months later. Please note that I am speaking in the conditional tense, I do not know how the National Guard considered an Algerian. It is possible that the soldiers who composed it did not know what was going on in Algeria. I am saying that if the same reasoning could have been applied to the behavior of a general towards Algerians as to the behavior of the first general towards Frenchmen, the soldiers would have also refused to obey the person who then unleashed the massacre of Parisians.

To conclude, what is essential is first to formulate together that what happened with Libya is contrary to what we are. The victims must know this, but also the leaders, the representatives, the journalists and also our allies.

I leave you to meditate on the lyrics of the song "Né En 17 à Leidenstadt" by Jean-Jacques Goldman written in 1990 who wonders what he would have done in the context of a war crime.

"Born in 17 in Leidenstadt"

"We'll never know what we really have in our wombs.

Hidden behind our appearances

The soul of a brave or an accomplice or an executioner?

Or the worst or the most beautiful?

Would we be those who resist or the sheep of a herd?

...

And that we are spared to you and me if possible for a long time

From having to choose a side".