THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

The Anatomy of State's Enmity and War of Vendetta:
A Thematic Analysis of Western Military Interventions in Iraq and Libya

Okibe Hyginus Banko
Lecturer, Department of Political Science, Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Nigeria

Abstract:
The study focused on a thematic analysis of western wars in Iraq and particularly Libya, with occasional references to other victim states. It examined them from broader perspective within a conceptualized western war of vendetta based on state's enmity against other state's rival leaderships. The essence is to reconstruct the wrongly held notion that every act of western intervention in the third world is justified. The 2003 invasion of Iraq and Arab Spring provided an explanatory thesis, using the theory of modern imperialism as framework for analysis. Though widespread violent protest against sit tight and autocratic regimes was common phenomenon across the Arab nations, it created different outcomes. In each case, several approaches were adopted, both internal and external, to suppress the uprising. These were mixtures of repressive and diplomatic methods aimed at silencing the vociferous opposition movements. The problem identified by the study is that in some cases, it manifested in war campaign hidden under the cloak of intervention to avert humanitarian crisis. In both Iraq and Libya, no-fly zone was applied. In Libya, in particular, the doctrine of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) was enforced for the first time, but selectively. This is because at the very moment of the enforcement, similar situation in human rights violations existed in Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Syria, etc. The study investigates the rationale for the selective wars and what it denotes. It found out that war of vendetta was visited on Iraq and Libya to oust Presidents Saddam Hussein and Muammar Gaddafi and forestall the claimed threats they posed to western countries. None was truly motivated by the bandied humanitarian crisis in the countries. These were made evident in the level of destruction inflicted on the country's infrastructure and human lives, surpassing what both leaders were alleged to have committed. It recommended that there should be absolute respect for sovereign integrity of nation states as enshrined in the UN Charter and immediate stoppage in demonstration of might is right jab in exercise of national power. This is imperative in a world that has not completely erased memories of colonial stigma, with the consequent global divisions and attendant crises. It is only on that platform that world peace and security would be sustainable.

Keywords: Anatomy, State's Enmity, War of Vendetta, Thematic Analysis, Iraq and Libya

1. Introduction

The state system exists and survives on the basis of rivalry and competition. This gives birth to polarization of the world into vicious circles in which one part is constantly demystified as third world and contemptuously viewed as inferior, underdeveloped/developing or dominated; and the other part as advanced world with superior, developed and domineering status. The attendant relationship between the divides naturally takes the form of master-servant type. Among the third world are Africa and the Arabs, which are exposed to this global divides with varying degrees of impact on their polity and economy. Both regions are endowed with abundant resources that have remained alluring to the western world and causing variegated pattern of relationship borne out of the policy thrusts of each country towards another. Even though Libya is among the World's largest oil economies with approximately 3.5% global oil reserves, more than twice those of the U.S (Chossudovsky, 2011), the indigenization of most arms of the oil operation by the regime of Gaddafi which aimed at limiting external overbearing influence in the oil sector triggered western animosity towards his government. The impact of the policies on the western oil firms operating in Libya was momentous such that ''the moves were widely interpreted as Gaddafi using oil resources as a political weapon'' (ElWarfally, 1988).

Presidents Saddam Hussein and Muammar Gaddafi were termed controversial leaders mainly on account of their resistance to western modern imperialism and challenges to western bossy posture that stops at nothing in subjugating weaker nations to accomplish both political and economic interests. Due to their fierce opposition to the west, they were each alleged to be playing strategic roles in the resurgence of terrorist activities around the Arab region and beyond, in which many western countries were victim in one way or the other, thereby, expanding the scope of frayed nerves against each regime. The outbreak of Arab spring opened the floodgate for coordinated action plans to hunt for Gaddafi, the same way listing Iraq as poised to developing weapons of mass destruction and essentially the allegations of terrorist network linked to Afghanistan and Iraq rendered their countries vulnerable to western assault. Despite the fact that direct western military intervention consequent upon the outbreak of Arab Spring was the least-hoped-for, the

intervention in Libya changed the tide. There is always a shared view that every western intervention in any third world country is a selfish venture. This mindset is borne out of past experiences.

It has been pointed out that the trend towards intervention, especially for humanitarian and other motives, has not been enthusiastically welcomed in post-colonial Africa. The ad hoc and sometimes seemingly arbitrary nature of the interventions that have taken place in the past has given many governments and commentators cause for concern, and the stakes in the intervention debate are therefore extremely high, especially for Africa (Samkange, 2002). The reasons are obvious; it radiates quest for political and economic power, and on the other hand, conspiracy with internal opposition elements to dethrone a leader and install a puppet or western crony. It is sometimes a manifest proof of war of vendetta whenever opportunities crave for pay back for grudges and offenses held against a particular state leader by enemy state (s). It is against this backdrop that this study investigates the causative factors that most significantly influenced western interventions in Iraq and Libya, (as was the case in Afghanistan); whether they were solely for humanitarian interest or motivated by western long desire to demonstrate state's enmity with regimes of Saddam Hussein and Gaddafi through war of vendetta.

The research is a qualitative and analytical inquiry, aimed at reconstructing the widely held but presumptively wrong notion about the debuts and nature of western military intervention in Libya, Afghanistan and Iraq. Secondary data was mainly used for the study, with analytical methods applied in the discussion of the topical themes. The study argues that western military actions in the third world is bereft of sound judgements and in most instances, carry the stain of vendetta associated with state's enmity with rival state leaderships.

2. Theoretical Discourse

The theory of Modern Imperialism is adopted for the study. This theory is an amplification of the works by Marx and Engels (1848), in the writings of neo-Marxist scholars that emerged in the '1960s and the '1970s. Prominent in the categorization include the works of Smith (1981), Smith (1982), Arrighi (1994), Amin (2001), Petras (2001), Brenner (2002), Harvey (2003), and Panitch and Gindin (2004), etc. According to them, imperialism generally is studied from the point of view of its historicism, periodization and objects of attention. The first dwells on the analysis of early development of capital in human history, leading to many nation states, all at the same time, to look for geographical expansion and control of other areas, and participate in the ''imperial project''. The period spanned between 1880 and 1910, during which inter-imperialism rivalry gained momentum as to become the primary motive of foreign policy of many competing states and interlocked Europe in serious competition (Stathakis, 2008).

The second period was the era of decolonization and cold war politics which sudden decline resulted in the emphasis of imperialism focusing on the relations between developed and underdeveloped countries. As Stathakis (2008) observes, America became a leading imperialist during the period and exercised power through direct or indirect economic, military and political means. It aimed at preventing the communists from gaining any influence over the emergent nation-states, thus leading to extensive American involvement in Latin and Central America, South East Asia, Middle East and Africa. Nonetheless, the shift from inter-capitalist rivalry of the theories of old imperialism, which stemmed from the rise of national monopolies, leading to militarism and war, to the theories of the new American imperialism, based on dependency and the extraction of surplus, dwelt strongly on geopolitical premises. Imperialism thus, revived the continuation of colonialism and sharpened the structures that were formed under hundreds of years of European colonialism, with a new version of American domination. It is the links between the periphery and the center that are of the most crucial importance (Stathakis, 2008).

The third phase, which reflects the intendment of this paper, is the era when imperialism is identified with "robbery". This was when the "American bourgeoisie rediscovered what the British bourgeoisie discovered in the last three decades of the nineteenth century, "the original sin of simple robbery" which made possible the original accumulation of capital (Arendt, 1968). The 'New Imperialism' appears as nothing more than the revisiting of the old, though in a different place and time" (Harvey, 2003). It gave rise to formation of three economic centres (U.S., Europe, and Japan) and the unchallenged hegemony of the U.S. in the military and political front. This grand scale world reorganization was a feasible project under the specific historical circumstances and the U.S. has maintained the track through crusade for democratization and economic liberalization.

The primary focus of each center was to seek ways of emasculating the economies of the developing areas. This is always preceded by politics of conditional grants, technological transfer, direct foreign investment (DFI), dictatorial monetary policies and exploitative activities of multi-national corporations. In extreme cases, sanctions and military options are applied to coerce nonconforming leaderships of states at the periphery to open their economies for European penetration and exploitation. Occasionally, they connive with some willing local bourgeoisie class to plot the removal of an unbending leader either through the ballot, coup d'état or stage-manage internal crisis that pave way for external intervention. In essence, those countries are perceived and treated as enemy states by the west. This bears out the assumption of the theory; that state actions are motivated primarily by economic interests expressed in terms of expansion of influence externally for the sole purpose of maintaining and controlling territories overseas for capitalist domination and exploitation.

Oil has remained a very powerful strategic resource that empowers nation's industrial growth and economic development. Africa and Arab regions are richly endowed with this resource which is alluring to Europe and America. The relationship between and among states forming the international system derives from the amount of resources each possesses, its military and economic power and level of technological development. While Africa and Arab lag in military and technological developments that steam up national defence and economic growth, western countries have comparative advantage and use both to subdue them and embark on pillage of their resources long after granting them political independence. It marked a repulsive transition from old imperialism and colonialism to new imperialism and neo-colonialism, which is identified with "robbery".

Africa and Arab has remained in bondage to the west that taunts their political and economic independence and exponentially threaten their governance and freedom. Theotonio (1971) and Gunder (1972) captured the devastating effects of imperialism and colonialism on Africa. These were acknowledged and corroborated by Rodney (1972), Amin (1976), and Offiong (1980). They share the view that forces of capitalism which came on the heel of imperialism and which many developing economies were forcibly integrated into disorganized their development path and stunted the growth of their economic willpower. With the awkward development, Africa and Arab nations in particular graduated to satellite states; serving as European feeding bottle for raw materials and cheap labour. The consequent variation in technological development rendered their economy porous for western exploitation. Nearly all attempts to wriggle out of this outlandish entanglement are often diplomatically rebuffed or violently resisted by the west and this is the central theme in the analysis of intervention in state's internal affairs.

The domination of these developing states by European countries and America significantly widen the gap of disparity in their development process and governance. These lopsided structures persist, thereby plunging the affected states into peripheral status, and relegating them to mere suppliers of resources for further development and growth of Europe, either by consent, manipulation or outright coercion through all means at the behest of western countries. The search and competition for these resources has reduced the frontiers of the developing nations to experimental grounds for demonstration of western technological superiority and military power. This explains why they dominate, monopolize and exploit the economies of the weak nations; in addition to meddling in their political leadership and economic organization for their selfish advantage. It is argued that the major powers have an interest to exploit the world jointly, rather than struggle over the division of this world (Kautsky, 2004). According to Davis (2016), internationalism has been replaced by American narcissism and an inverted nationalism that is deadly ironic, given that the misreading of U.S. intentions has led anti-imperialists to embrace multiple forms of imperialism, including that practiced by the enemy at home. The pro-western bourgeoisie class operating in Libya, Afghanistan and Iraq signify this description. In other words, the collaboration between European countries and America under the umbrella of NATO or in individual alliances to usurp the powers of developing states and undermine their sovereign integrity by subjecting them to economic and military torture, are not only amazing but represents exercise reminiscence of robbery. This is new imperialism in its stark naked form and practicality.

3. Debates on Intervention and Non-Intervention in Internal Affairs

Arguments on intervention and non-intervention particularly in the internal affairs of states are sublime. They are not only controversial but challenges the fundamental principles of international laws, the enforcement mechanism and most importantly, absence of shared understanding of the intendment of laws regulating international relations. This has been an area that jeopardizes the sovereign status of most weak states in power politics at the international level. However, the United Nations Charter, Article 2(7) provides for non-intervention in internal affairs of states (The UN Charter, 1945). The essence is to preserve the sovereignty of each state which Article 2(4) emphasizes based on equality of all states irrespective of population, size, resources and military power. Despite the fact that the UN Security Council is empowered to determine cases that are of exponential threat to international peace and security, internal affairs of states are excluded. The idea is that each state has its domestic laws that deal with most internal issues and would be meddling role to engage external interference. This has not been fairly managed on matters pertaining to the developing countries with their non-representation in the UN Security Council which results in some decisions inimical to their national interests. In that vein, their internal leadership and economic problems are diametrically exposed to external interference.

Though most of the crises are conditioned by the invisible hands of western instigation, the reduction of the countries as synonymous with theatre of war, terrorism and abuse of human rights becomes ridiculous. It is around this absurd description that arguments for intervention in internal affairs find solace, with particular emphasis on humanitarian crisis. In this regard, the consequent policy thrust aimed at providing safety nets for those trapped in violent conflicts within state boundaries metamorphosed into Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine approved at the World Summit of 2005 (UN, 2005).Court (2011) argues that the doctrine of R2P rest on three pillars. Firstly, it is the primary responsibility of states to protect their own population from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crime against humanity. Secondly, the international community has the responsibility to assist the state in meeting those responsibilities; and thirdly, the international community has a responsibility to take timely and decisive actions in cases where a state has manifestly failed to protect its own population from these crimes. Unfortunately, the case of Libya did not show significant efforts by the international community to assist the state in meeting those responsibilities. Nonetheless, Goodman (2006), Gibbs (2009), Rieff, (2008); Ross, (2011); and Thakur, (2011) disapprove of intervention which ends up serving national interests of the intervening states. Though they acknowledge that some of regime crimes necessitating intervention are inhuman in themselves, their view is that the causes and nature of the crisis are of equal importance to enable observers have deeper and better insight on the processes resulting in external intervention. They further opine that the sanctity of state's sovereignty which lies beneath unceasing penchant for its violation by power hungry states was contemplated by the UN Resolution 2131 which provides that:

  i.   No State has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. Consequently, armed intervention and all other forms of interference or attempted threats against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements, are condemned.
  ii. No State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights or to secure from its advantages of any kind. Also, no State shall organize, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist or armed activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the regime of another State, or interfere in civil strife in another State.
  iii. The use of force to deprive peoples of their national identity constitutes a violation of their inalienable rights and of the principle of non-intervention.

iv. The strict observance of these obligations is an essential condition to ensure that nations live together in peace with one another, since the practice of any form of intervention not only violates the spirit and letter of the Charter of the United Nations but also leads to the creation of situations which threaten international peace and security.

v. Every State has an inalienable right to choose its political, economic, social and cultural systems, without interference in any form by another State.

vi. All States shall respect the right of self-determination and independence of peoples and nations, to be freely exercised without any foreign pressure, and with absolute respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Consequently, all States shall contribute to the complete elimination of racial discrimination and colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

vii. For the purpose of the present Declaration, the term "State" covers both individual States and groups of States.

viii. Nothing in this Declaration shall be construed as affecting in any manner the relevant provisions of the *Charter of the United Nations* relating to the maintenance of international peace and security, in particular those contained in *Chapters VI*, *VII* and *VIII*. (UNGA Res. 2131 (XX) 1965)

Malanczuk (2002) shares the same line of thought, arguing that for several decades, state sovereignty has been the core of interstate relations as well as a foundation of world order and it is rooted in both customary law and the United Nations (UN) Charter. Therefore, state sovereignty is one of the most important doctrines in international law and it plays a critical role in maintaining peace and order in the world. The foregoing view indicates' that R2P approach, which creates room for intervention in internal affairs, is in violation of these fundamental laws. It is of utmost importance to note that the growing unlawful western meddling roles in the developing nations are absurd, so much so that the very laws which they enacted and pretend to promote mean nothing but abstract concepts. Most interventions ultimately mismanage and worsen an already bad humanitarian crisis, as exemplified in the case of Libya and in other instances create humanitarian crisis that was previously nonexistent, as the cases of Iraq and Afghanistan portray. Gibbs and Berube (2012), argue that ''the cause of humanitarian intervention clearly has become a moral crusade for liberal intellectuals, who seem infatuated with the idea of righteous violence. But it is a peculiar crusade, given the appalling history of interventions in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the former Yugoslavia, and probably, in Libya as well''. According to them, ''these interventions have absorbed vast amounts of resources that could have been better used, for more genuinely humanitarian purposes, while they have increased human suffering in the targeted countries.

A similar case analysis by Davis (2016) shows how external intervention in Syria has quadrupled their humanitarian crisis. Human beings were dumped in a hole, along with corpses on streets and under rubble in and around Manbij that could not be afforded even a mass burial, thus bringing the civilian death count from U.S.-led airstrikes in the area up to at least 190 since May 31. Further claim shows that the number is at least 368 and the death toll on July 19 alone was "more than 150 people, mostly women and children" who were "killed while in their homes''. This is presented with photos of women and children being buried in a mass grave, "human beings like all of us," he said, whose only offense was living in a town occupied by terrorists from abroad. There are credible reports of between 682 and 942 civilian deaths, meaning that nearly a third of what the military terms "collateral damage" has occurred in the last two months. It has gotten "so bad," "that we are nearing Russian levels" (between 1,098 and 1,450 "likely" dead civilians since September 2015). The implication is that intervention serves no humanitarian purpose, thus requiring that each state's sovereignty should be respected in the conduct of their internal affairs.

Most literatures on intervention hovers around the causative factors ranging from economic, political and military strategic interests and none has specifically captured the upsurge from the perspective of war of vendetta based on state's enmity. This is an area this study will contribute to the growing debates on the subject matter, and Iraq and Libya serve as focal reference points.

4. Revisiting State's Enmity and War of Vendetta Iraq Experience

Iraq war occurred in year 2003. Before the war, there had been other remarkable developments that exposed Iraq to western state's enmity. There was Gulf War from 1990 to 1991. It was caused by military conquest of Kuwait by Iraq. Nonetheless, Iraq was subsequently subdued in a military operation known as ''Operation Desert Storm'' which the United States and other countries numbering about 39 launched against it (David, 2004). What attracted the west was interests in oil, which they consolidated by stopping Iraq's colonial expedition in Kuwait. However, Iraq was viewed as treading on the path that portrayed it as trying to equate her armaments and potential for warfare with the west and these set the tone for western state's enmity with Iraq leader, Saddam Hussein. Since then, he was tagged a threat to world peace and security by the west.

Moreover, Iraq was accused of developing weapons of mass destruction which the west showed stiff opposition and was ready to capsize the ship of Iraq government and leadership. This was despite the fact that there were evidences which showed that a biological weapons (BW) program in Iraq had begun in the early 1980s with help from the U.S. and Europe in violation of the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) of 1972. Details of the BW program - along with a chemical weapons program - surfaced in the wake of the Gulf War (1990–91) following investigations conducted by the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) which was charged with the post-war disarmament of Saddam's Iraq (Kochler, 2004). The investigation did not indict Iraq of further resort to the chemical weapons program after the war. However, the fact that the U.S. and Europe connived with Iraq to secretly embark on the program for selfish interests in violation of the regulatory laws questions the powers of UN over United States and her European allies. Iraq was subjected to humiliation on a matter the U.S. and Europe was accomplices, thus simply demonstrating that only western countries have rights to develop or acquire weapons of mass destruction and not their subject states.

Notwithstanding, the U.S. and its allies kept President Saddam Hussein in check with military actions such as Operation Southern Watch, which was conducted by Joint Task Force Southwest Asia (JTF-SWA) with the mission of monitoring and controlling airspace south of the 32nd Parallel (extended to the 33rd Parallel in 1996) as well as using economic sanctions (William, 2002). It created

palpable fear that the western countries were nursing a regime change plan in Iraq. As Wright (2007) observes, this plan became official U.S. foreign policy with enactment of the Iraq Liberation Act in 1998 after the expulsion of UN weapons inspectors. The Act provided $97 million for Iraqi "democratic opposition organizations" to "establish a program to support a transition to democracy in Iraq (Brent, 2007). This legislation contrasted with the terms set out in United Nations Security Council Resolution 687, which focused on weapons and weapons programs and made no mention of regime change (Kochler, 2004), and United Nations General Assembly Resolution 2131 that outlaws supporting or financing of opposition elements with the ultimate aim of affecting the government and governance of a state negatively (UNGAR 2131). The immediate result was the 1998 American bombing campaign in Iraq – ''Operation Desert Fox''.

On the wake of invasion of Iraq in 2003, there were varied opinions on the reasons that prompted the war. These opinions were borne out of the fact that, unlike Libya, Iraq was not completely enmeshed in ungovernable political impasse except seemingly autocratic nature of Saddam's regime in handling opposition elements and terror attacks within her territory, most of which were more of religious than political. Some blamed the war on Saddam Hussein's persistent indulgence in weapons of mass destruction program; others placed greater emphasis on the impact of the 11 September 2001 attacks, and the role this played in changing U.S. strategic calculations, and the rise of the freedom agenda (Reynolds, 2005). The latter has to do with western claim that Saddam Hussein was sponsoring terrorism. These were speculations tossed around to justify war against Iraq.

Evaluating the case situations, the first was denied by some long-standing U.S. allies, including the governments of France, Germany, and New Zealand. Their leaders argued that there was no evidence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and that invading the country was not justified in the context of UNMOVIC's 12 February 2003 report (Brent, 2007). On the second issue, Ricks (2006) argues that the alleged links between Iraq and al-Qaeda were called into question during the lead-up to the war, and were discredited by a 21 October 2004 report from U.S. Senator Carl Levin, which was later corroborated by an April 2006 report from the Defence Department's inspector general. These reports further alleged that Bush Administration officials, particularly former undersecretary of defence Douglas J. Feith, manipulated evidence to support links between al-Qaeda and Iraq. It is more so as American diplomat Joseph C. Wilson investigated the contention that Iraq had sought uranium for nuclear weapons in Niger and reported that the contention had no substance (Wilson, 2003).

In other words, what appears glaring is that western countries are in the habit of giving leaders of enemy states, particularly in developing world bad names in order to hang their targets. This was justified by Hassan (2012), quoting U.S. President George W. Bush and UK Prime Minister Tony Blair, that the coalition mission was "to disarm Iraq of weapons of mass destruction, to end Saddam Hussein's support for terrorism, and to free the Iraqi people. According to Blair, the trigger was Iraq's failure to take a "final opportunity" to disarm itself of alleged nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons that U.S. and British officials called an immediate and intolerable threat to world peace (Williams, 2011). Observers saw this as ordinary premeditated ploy to dethrone Saddam Hussein and bring ruins of unwarranted warfare on Iraqi people and that was exactly what happened in 2003; fighting government and people who committed offence the west is notoriously known for without any commensurate or significant deterrent action against them by the UN.

The western conspirators won the war and gruesomely murdered President Saddam Hussein, to boost the conquest of vassal states and leaders, to their admiration. Ever since then, Iraq has not been the same. Essentially, vast amounts of resources and human lives were consumed by the war. It destabilized Iraq, created insurmountable humanitarian crisis in the country and left Arab region in serious security crisis. It bred all manner of terrorist activities, including the emergence of Islamic States of Iraq and Syria that torments the world immeasurably. The former British Prime Minister Tony Blair later recognized this fact and apologized for his 'mistakes' over Iraq War and admitted there were 'elements of truth' to the view that the invasion helped promote the rise of ISIS (Osley, 2015). This aggressive and forceful regime overthrow was extended to Gaddafi, another target leader and which is given deserving consideration in this paper.

5. Background of Gaddafi's Enmity with Western Leaders

The emergence of Gaddafi in 1969 introduced vociferous type of leadership in Libya that condemned the western meddling roles in the politics and economy of Africa and the Middle East. The regime became vulnerable to recurring friction with western powers who felt their national interests were being threatened by Gaddafi's unfriendly policies and actions. The policies were of different dimensions and intensity but pursuing common goal of defending an ideology focusing on promotion of self-esteem and national pride. Firstly, Gaddafi appointed himself as the defender of Arab nationalism, and embarked on closure of all the American and British military bases in the country'' (ST. JOHN, 2010). As a result, the growing western enmities with both his regime and person kept resonating as he maintained ardent support for Jihad, to strengthen Arab unity and there from seek the freedom of the oppressed and slaved Arab people, first of all Palestinians. Secondly, he created the Jihad Fund in 1970, to support the armed struggle for the liberation of the Arab territories occupied by Zionists (ST. JOHN, 2010).

In other words, Gaddafi showed avid interest in supporting Palestine in the war against the Israeli's occupation of their territory and was desirous of eliminating the entire state of Israel, along with the Western colonialist presence all over Africa. He demonstrated this mission, first by helping Yasser Arafat's PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization) both militarily and economically (BOCA, 2010). In the same vein, he sent Libyan soldiers to Lebanon in 1971, in order to support the government against the Israeli incursion in the country. The Libyan presence in Lebanon was also reinforced in 1978, when Gaddafi equipped the Libyan army with missiles apt to discourage aerial Israeli raids (BOCA, 2010). In Africa, he supported the Eritrean Liberation Front; the African National Union in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe); sent armaments to Guinea, threatened by the neighbour's countries. In addition, he supported groups such as the Irish Republican Army, sending its members a huge amount of armaments in 1971 (BOCA, 2010).

Apart from his rigid oil regime which targeted the Western cartel, Gaddafi's actions were viewed as portending direct confrontation with western interests. The unwavering supports to these liberation struggles earned him the enmity of most Western countries thriving in colonial empires. These were further aggravated by his linkage with terrorist activities, which sometimes snowballed into open hostility or violent confrontations between Libya and the US. The war trigger was refreshed after,

- the Arab Nationalist Youth for the Liberation of Palestine, which Gaddafi founded, was found guilty of the attack at the Athens' international airport on the 5th August, 1973, and Fiumicino airport on the 17th December 1973 that claimed many lives, including the injured (BOCA (2010).

The west presented several similar cases to buttress the increasing spate of rascality in Gaddafi's government. Firstly, the CIA Annual Report on International Terrorism (1981), states that only in 1980, seven hundred and sixty terrorist attacks occurred and that this increase was due to the role of the government of Libya in Middle East terrorist organizations. The report specified that Libya had launched new tendencies in the terrorist field, killing the political opponents migrated to Europe and diplomats in Middle East (CIA Annual Report, 1981)). Secondly, there was the issue of the Pan Am Flight 103 explosion over Lockerbie (Scotland) on December 21st, 1988, in which 259 people on board died and Libya was linked to the terrorist attack. It was perceived as a direct attack against the United States of America (Rosenberg, 1988). Thirdly, France accused Libya of the breaking up of the French UTA DC-10 over the Sahara Desert in 1989 (RONEN, 2008). Fourthly, the US Department of State published a White Paper on January 8, 1985, detailing the terrorism acts perpetrated by Gaddafi. It stated that the dictator had used terrorism as one of the main tool of foreign policy and that he supported groups and organizations using terroristic attacks (BOCA, 2010).

Libya became vulnerable to war of vendetta committed against it by the west based on the misconstrued anti-western roles of Gaddafi. The USA launched air strikes in Libya capital, Tripoli in response to what it termed ''the continuous Libyan aid to terrorist groups''. The primary purpose was to degrade the military capability of Libya and forestall further destructive expeditions by Gaddafi's terrorist network. It explains why the targets were the military and "terrorism" centres in Libya, including the Gaddafi's headquarter. In response, Libyan patrol boats fired missiles at the US communication stations in Lampedusa, Italy (BOCA, 2010). The bestial onslaught enveloped Libya in war of self defence against the festering colonial nuisance of the west. It aggravated the western hatred for Gaddafi and exposed their unceasing penchant for war of vendetta against Libya.

Arab spring demonstrated this objective and evidently showed that rather than an intervention to preserve the peace and unity of Libya, the ''Western nations were at the onset of a process which they, hope, culminates in the departure of Gaddafi in a regime change plan'' (Adujie, 2011). Earlier, Gaddafi had accused the West of launching a war crusade against Libya. It was for the same reason that the state-appointed Tripoli's Imam called for a jihad to defeat the West (RONEN, 2008). This was borne out of the belief that each western intervention in internal crisis in the developing nations is disguised in either protection of national interest or prosecution of war of vendetta and not necessarily the protection of the people against massacre. In other words, the western foreign policy objectives are bias and it explains the reasons there exist differences in their form of relationship with other nations, both friends and enemies and plays out in many ways.

6. The Anatomy of State's Enmity: A Thematic Analysis

Many scholars and policy analysts from across geographical divides argue that ideologically speaking, even as it is significantly evident in action,

- The western criticism of foreign human rights abuses is politically motivated, highlighting that while the US were intervening in Kosovo, they were simultaneously supporting the governments of Turkey, Colombia and Indonesia, all of whom were involved in widespread human rights abuses and ethnic cleansing. This conforms to the US government's belief that it should take part in ''preventive war'' against states who threaten its global hegemony, despite the illegality of these actions under international law (Chomsky, 2003).

This is viewed from the fact that western forces intervened not to protect Albanian Kosovans from Serbian aggression (as they claimed), but to humiliate and weaken Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic, who had remained resistant to western demands for years (Chomsky, 2003). Using the 2003 invasion of Iraq as another example, Chomsky shows how the US government and the media portrayed the Iraqi government of Saddam Hussein as a threat to the US and other Middle Eastern states (Chomsky, 2012). This grotesque perception rationalized the war against Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi citizens. Thakur (2012) corroborates the foregoing view, pointing out that, Western failures to defend the dignity and rights of the Palestinians under Israeli occupation have been especially damaging to their claims to promote human rights and oppose humanitarian atrocities universally instead of selectively. Okibe (2014), (2015a), and (2015b), espoused a similar proposition, condemning the complacency of UN Security Council in allowing NATO the platitude to violate state's sovereignty and expose the affected citizens to severe humanitarian crisis. Citing instances from Libya, he argues that state's sovereignty is sacrosanct and non-representation of Africa and Arab regions in the UN Security Council has made the western countries invoke wars of vendetta on any target leadership in the regions, thereby widening global polarity and insecurity.

There are varied opinions about the nature and character of western interventionist activities, especially in the third world countries. Some scholars have sought to dissociate it from any negative notion but rather focusing their analysis on the growing culture of oppressive governance and the rising resistance in most developing countries that usually metamorphose to violent conflicts and war. Intervention derives its essence from cumulative situation analysis which requires in-depth examination of the background of the originating crisis, the kind of mechanism that is adopted to address it; whether it is repressive or palliative; the nature of public reactions towards it and the probable or likely consequences of the crisis on global peace and security. In this direction, Rieff (2008), Thakur (2011), and Adujie (2011) opt to summarize the set of issues involved in framing international intervention in Libya into three.

These are the military capacity, legal authority and political legitimacy. Using them as indices for assessing the resourcefulness of state's firepower and practicality of overpowering aggression with less damage on the intervening states, it is argued that,

- Only the West has the requisite assets and operational capacity for military intervention in Libya; so the responsibility fell on the West to handle that. The legal authority was provided by the UNSC resolution while the political legitimacy was achieved with the support of the Arab League and African Union.

This forms the basis of arguments by Qutait (2011), that some anti-interventionists are intent on justifying their stance at all costs, to the extent of looking or minimizing the atrocities committed against Libyan citizens by the Gaddafi regime, so as to bolster arguments against the intervention. She opposes the positions of anti-interventionist who accuse the West of double standards and selective intervention. It was her view that, ''the case of Libya was obviously different from other Arab countries experiencing revolution like Tunisia; Egypt etc. Unlike in other Arab countries, where regimes at least made pretence of understanding the demand for greater freedom, in Libya there was a blatant demonization of protesters as rats and cockroaches'' (Qutait, 2011).

Nevertheless, there was clear evidence that the, ''*Coalition countries made it no secret that they were aiming at Libyan oil reserves and at establishing spheres of influence in the region, bypassing the UN. Libya is seen as a valuable trophy, and it is up to those who dropped bombs on it to distribute the trophies'' (Garibov, 2011).*Based on the foregoing, it is amazing to draw the rationale for the intervention merely on verbal threats as Qutait's proposition indicates and it raises some questions; firstly, what situation existed in other Arab nations and lacked in Libya that necessitated external intervention? Secondly, when does act of threat on opposition elements and rebel forces that threaten subversion of state's sovereignty become a measure for visiting war on another state? Thirdly, what criterion determines such act of unprovoked aggression by external forces in the domestic affairs of states? There are incidences where threat languages are employed to communicate state powers to rebel or opposition elements with proven cases of human rights violations in some instances without external interference but solidarity. The U.S. in particular uses such demeaning languages on enemy states; the same with British Prime Minister Tony Blair and later David Cameron; North Korea supreme leader – Kim Jong-un; President Putin of Russia and President Assad of Syria, just to mention but this few.

While threats with ominous consequences could require proactive preventive measures, none has actually assumed the situation in Libya. Despite the volatility of Arab Spring and the scapegoat decoy, ''nobody denies the fact that after the Libyan Air Force was completely annihilated, the continued 'humanitarian' bombing shows that the west, through NATO, intended to impose their interests in North Africa, turning Libya into a colonial protectorate" (Thakur (2012). This is even when Ukraine crisis and Russia's annexation of Crimea was ignored by NATO. Essentially, Eastern European nations like Poland and the Baltic states feel intimidated by Russia and they, including the US ruling class which is not opposed to this in principle, are keen for a show of force against Putin but NATO has reneged (Gliniecki and Alizadeh, 2016). These are notwithstanding proven cases of human rights abuses. It actually illustrates the obvious fact that:

- The West had, for many decades, struggled to engineer a regime change in Libya (revenge of Gaddafi's misdeeds) as it was lately the case in Cote d'Ivoire (perceived anti-French stance by Laurent Gbagbo) as a means of re-establishing its stranglehold on these countries. It thus represents an attempt to further the power of US capitalism, with little interest in the welfare of the people involved (Zounmenou and Loua, 2011).

The argument is whether either Saddam Hussein or Gaddafi's reproaches on rebel elements justify the western intervention that caused much quantum of damages on human lives and infrastructure despite clear signals pointing to the fact that each opposition or rebel groups operating in each of the countries had always and openly desired collaboration with the western powers to oust Saddam and Gaddafi from leadership of their respective countries. Unfolding global events have revealed that interventions are masked in vendetta. The China's State News Agency Xinhua in a reaction to the Report of Sir John Chilcot's Inquiry into Britain's involvement in the planning, execution and aftermath of the 2003 invasion of Iraq, notes that ''Britain's decision to join the U.S. - led war is a blind action to follow its U.S. ally, which spares no effort to intervene in other countries under the cover of democracy. It brings to mind Tony Blaire's note to George W. Bush shortly before the invasion, which the Chilcot Report cited: ''We lose the height of ground by forfeiting the U.N. route'', ''Take it away and this is about U.S. power, naked and in their face''. The invasion was conducted without U.N. Security Council support, (Lowe, 2016). Based on the growing global tendency towards violation of state's sovereignty, there is no doubt that presently,

- There is a very serious threat to global peace: a new cycle of colonial wars, which started in Libya, with the sinister goal of refreshing the capitalist global system, within a structural crisis today, but without any limit to its consumer and destructive voracity (Moros, 2011).

The simple fact that the interventions were in Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya, not in Yemen, Tunisia, Egypt, Bahrain, Jordan, Syria, Saudi Arabia, etc., shows that the sole target was Gaddafi (Adujie, 2011). The same was the case in Afghanistan but more so Iraq where political leaderships who in attempts to manage internal political insurrections (whether real or imagined) or terrorism paid supreme prices for self-defences against external aggression that sought to usurp their constitutional powers. Evidently, many Afghans, Iraqis and Libyan citizens are already aware that the western intervention in internal affairs of their countries exceedingly violated the very initial logic that created support for it. Besides that, the wars were characterized by stupendous loss of lives and infrastructure, the socio-economic, political and religious divides in the countries remain bizarre long after the exit of their leaders. They have continued to suffocate and the western warlords that demonstrated vivacious interest in intervention at the inception of the crisis have not shown commensurate commitment towards rebuilding the war torn country or at best, resolving the political impasse, the unabated leadership crisis and mindless killing spree, which are rated to be far and above what were alleged the leaders committed. The countries are still smouldering in orgy of violence between and among the Islamic fundamentalists, the ethnic militias, various religious sect groups and many other terrorist elements that are competing for power and supremacy.

The development worsens on daily basis to disprove any doubt about the hailstorm the western intervention brought upon Libya, the same way Iraq and Afghanistan are. It made the countries reasonably ungovernable and largely insecure with cache of assorted weapons for terror activities. The UN has been making some redemptive efforts to bring Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya to a stable state. In Libya, just as the case in Iraq, it formed a central National Unity Government from among the rival groups, aimed at wrestling power from splinter administrations operating in the eastern and northern regions and using the central authority structure to deepen the reconciliation and peace initiatives. Remarkably, in the case of Libya that was constituted in February 2016, the efforts seem to crumble with the resignation of four Ministers from the national unity government as announced by its head - Fayez al-Sarraj (Punch Online Newspaper, 2016). The four hail from eastern Libya where a rival administration is based, thereby, threatening international hope that the national government would re-establish stability and stop Islamic State's expansion in the country.

It is the contention of this paper that the whole efforts appear belated. Initial efforts could have vigorously and relentlessly focused on amicable resolution of the crisis at its inception instead of ''no fly-zone'' which UNRES 1973 imposed on Libya, as it was the case in Iraq. Not only did the initiative embolden the western countries under the leadership of NATO to intervene but it was fantastically a western war of annihilation and destruction in that region. These were achieved in collaboration with the internal dissidents which the NATO or the United States' led coalition forces backed. Since the war ended and peace not restored, the citizens and public poll in their supports appeared to have realized that they were either misled or manipulated to support the ignoble wars. Presently, the situation in Libya is as bad as that in Iraq, even Syria, Southern Sudan, etc, and the end to the fuss is farfetched.

Ironically, some ardent supporters of intervention now detour to oppose the very cause they initially bandied with a view to committing vengeance on the target leaderships, which Libya and Iraq typify. It suggests that some western interventions in the third world nations are vengeful. For instance, Donald Trump, the U.S. Republican candidate for November 2016 presidential election in the United States condemned the US war in Iraq, several years after the death of the deposed President Saddam Hussein. While addressing a rally in Raleigh, North Carolina, he criticized the United States' decision to invade Iraq and remove Hussein from office, suggesting it destabilized the region. Though described Hussein as a bad guy who was good in killing terrorists, he notes that today, Iraq is the Harvard for terrorism (Bailey, 2016). It is the same way Libyan war has destabilized both Arab and African regions, which are now safe havens for all kinds of terrorist activities that are promoted and sustained by proliferation of illegal arms. In other words,

- Looking around, the current chronic instability, cycle of violence, and the emergence of extremist groups such as the Islamic State group should be blamed on the hegemonism and interventionism perpetrated by the United States and its Western allies, (Lowe, 2016).

This conforms to the position of this paper that the major motivation for western intervention in the internal affairs of most third world, which cases of Libya and Iraq portray, is to destabilize the country; inflame the blazes of its internal political rivalry and distract the indigenous people from building strong, united and stable government that can fend-off western pauperization of their resources. Political and economic domination are devices which sustain structures that bolster western invasion of third world countries on the same pedestal that would not prompt the same debasing treatment in the developed world. In the main, the European colonizers laid foundation for repressive regimes in Africa, having treated the colonized people as sub-human and deserving of no decent life. There is, therefore, no significant difference between European unprovoked wars of conquest in traditional African communities and deposing of their legitimate rulers for their preferred surrogates during colonial period and the presently refreshed and rebranded aggressive wars of vendetta to humiliate African leaders that are adamant to being re-colonized and by that means instil fears on others that may contemplate resistance to their manipulative tendencies. Intervention in their internal affairs is the means to achieving that end.

7. Conclusion

The study critically examined the context of western interventions in the domestic affairs of third world countries, focusing on Iraq but particularly Libya. Many analysts explain the intervention, especially from the backdrop of Iraq and Libyan experiences, as showing tendency towards pursuit of vendetta against a tagged enemy regime. Having regards for decolonization as representing independence and with the recognition of sovereign equality of the emergent states with those of their former colonial masters, the UN Charter prohibited intervention in state's internal affairs. The rationale is to respect sovereignty of states, allow each state free hand to choose what forms of socio-cultural, religious, economic and political systems it likes. However, the forces of modern imperialism embedded in national interests impede the full observance of these laid down rules. The implication is that some states rely on their military and economic powers to assault weaker states whose resources are preyed on.

Some Western countries, in particular the United States, have always tried to force their values on other countries without any respect for their development paths (Lowe, 2016). It causes interference in both economic and political organization of the state, with the attendant consequence that leaders who oppose the pillage of their natural endowments are treated as enemy state. The case of Iraq and Libya substantially illustrates this point. It ensures gradual redrawing of global map to reawaken the memories of colonialism which the previously affected nations will not tolerate any longer. The rampancy of terrorism and militancy are signposts that collective survival is on the edge. The war is impliedly shifting from Africa and Arab soil to United States and European domain and except western connivance with dissident elements to interfere in the domestic affairs of developing world is nipped in the bud, it will reproduce antithesis scenario where the hunters would be hunted and that will mark a significant change in global peace architecture.

8. References

i. Amin, Samir (1976) Unequal Development: An Essay on the Social Formations of Peripheral Capitalism. New York: Monthly Review Press.

ii. Amin, S., (2001) "Imperialism and Globalization", Monthly Review, June 2001.

iii. Arendt, H., Imperialism (New York: Harcourt Brace Janovich, 1968 edn).

iv. Arrighi, G., The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power and The Origins of our Time (London: Verso, 1994).

v. Ben Gliniecki and Hamid Alizadeh (2016) ''NATO and the Contradictions within Western Imperialism''. In Defence of Marxism, International Marxist Tendency, Friday, 22 July 2016 in http://www.marxism.com

vi. Brenner, R., (2002) The Boom and the Bubble: The U.S. in the World Economy. London: Verso, 2.

vii. Charles Davis, (2016) ''The Anti-Imperialism of Fools''. The Daily Beast, 07.21.16

viii. David Gibbs and Michael Berube, (2012) ''Strategic Dialogue: Libya after Gaddafi. Foreign Policy in Focus, January 17, 2012.

ix. David N. Gibbs (2009) First Do No Harm: Humanitarian Intervention and the Destruction of Yugoslavia, Arizona: Vanderbilt, cited Ben Baack, Ben and Edward Ray, ''The Political Economy of the Origins of the Military-Industrial Complex in the United States''. Journat of Economic History, 45, No. 2.

x. David Rieff, (2008) ''The Way We Live Now: Humanitarian Vanities''. The New York Times Magazine; June1, 2008; in http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/01/magazine/01wwln-lede-t.html?ref=magazine, accessed 31/07/2016

xi. David Zounmenou and Reine Sylvie Loua, (2011) Confronting Complex Political Crises in West Africa: An Analysis of ECOWAS Responses to Niger and Cote d'Ivoire, ISS Paper 230, 2011).

xii. DEL BOCA A., (2010) Gheddafi, Una Sfida dal Deserto, Editori Laterza, Bari.

xiii. ECOWAS (2011) Responses to Niger and Cote d'Ivoire, ISS Paper 230.

xiv. EIWarfally, M. (1988) Imagery and Ideology in U.S. Policy toward Libya 1969-1982''. University of Pittsburgh Press,

xv. Fayez al-Sarraj (2016) ''Four Ministers Quit Libya's UN-Backed Government'' - Fayez al-Sarraj. Punch Online Newspaper, July 1, 2016 in www.punchng.com, accessed 07/07/2016.

xvi. Frank, Andre Gunder (1972) "The Development of Underdevelopment," in James D. Cockcroft, Andre Gunder Frank, and Dale Johnson, eds., Dependence and Underdevelopment. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.

xvii. George Stathakis (2008) Imperialism: Old and New Theories''. International Journal of Economic Sciences and Applied Research Vol.1, No.1: 100-124

xviii. Goodman, R. (2006), Humanitarian Intervention and Pretexts for War". The American Journal of International Law 100(1), pp. 107-141.

xix. Harvey, D., (2003) The New Imperialism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

xx. Jennifer Rosenberg, (1988), ''Bombing of Pan Am Flight 103 Over Lockerbie'' 20th Century History, http://history1900s.about.com/od/1980s/a/flight103.htm), access 31/07/2014.

xxi. Josh Lowe (2016) ''China State News Agency Uses Chilcot to Attack U.S. Over Iraq''. China's State News Agency Xinhua in a reaction to an editorial published Thursday 7th July 2016 on Sir John Chilcot's Inquiry into Britain's involvement in the planning, execution and aftermath of the 2003 invasion of Iraq. europe.newsweek.com/china-xinhua-agency-chilcot-iraq-us-478372?utm.

xxii. Kautsky, K., (2004) Ultra-imperialism, Marxist Archives, marxists.org, (orig. publ. 1914).

xxiii. Konstantin Garibov, (2011) ''The War on Libya: NATO Uses And Abuses The United Nations The Role of Russia''. Global Research, August 30, 2011

xxiv. Hans Kochler (2004) The Iraq Crisis and the United Nations: Power Politics vs. The International Rule of Law. Studies in International Relations, XXVIII. Vienna: I.P.O., ISBN 978-3-900704-22-3, Google Print

xxv. Holly Bailey (2016) ''Donald Trump Praises Saddam Hussein for Killing Terrorists''. Yahoo News National Correspondent, July 6, 2016. Accessed in https://www.yahoo.com, accessed 07/07/2016.

xxvi. Malanczuk, P. (2002). Modern Introduction to International Law. Clarendon Press.

xxvii. Marx, K. and F. Engels, The Communist Manifesto, A modern edition, (introduction by E. Hobsbawm), (London: Verso, 1998), (orig.publ. 1848).

xxviii. Michel Chossudovsky, (2014) ''Operation Libya'' and the Battle for Oil: Redrawing the Map of Africa. Global Research, Libyan Free Press, November 6, 2014 http://libyanfreepress.com/2014/11/06/8672/ (First Published March 9, 2011).

xxix. Michael L. Ross, (2011) ''Will Oil Drown the Arab Spring''? Democracy and the Resource Curse, Foreign Affairs, September/October 2011, http://m.foreignaffairs.com/articles/68200/michael-l-ross/will-oil-drown-the-arab-spring

xxx. Moros, N.M. (2011) ''Venezuela Condemns U.S., NATO, UN Over Libya War''. Xinhua News Agency, Statement by Nicolas Maduro Moros, Foreign Minister of Venezuela while addressing the general debate of the UN General Assembly at its 66th session to transmit a message from Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez Frias.: September 28, 2011 http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/world/2011-09/28/content_13808818.htm

xxxi. Noam Chomsky (2003) Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance. New York: Metropolitan Books.

xxxii. Noam Chomsky (2012) ''Nothing Can Justify Torture''. An interview of Noam Chomsky by

xxxiii. Stephen Shalom and Michael Albert on the Libyan crisis. Published by Asian Human Rights Commission, http://www.humanrights.asia/news/ahrc-news/AHRC-ART-146-2012/?searchterm=noam%20chomsky.

xxxiv. Offiong Daniel, A. (1980) Imperialism and Dependency; Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co.,Ltd

xxxv. Okibe, H. Banko (2014) ''The Fallacies of North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO)

xxxvi. Humanitarian Intervention and Regime Change in Libya, in 2011''. African Journal of Politics and Administrative Studies (AJPAS) Vol. 6, 1 June, 2014, NIGERIA, Pp. 58-76

xxxvii. Okibe, H. Banko (2015a) ''Non-Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect in Humanitarian Crisis: The Role of UN Permanent Members''. The International Journal of Humanities and Social Studies (IJHSS), Volume 3, Issue 6, June 2015, (ISSN: 2321-9203), INDIA, Pp. 52-58, www.theijhss.com.

xxxviii. Okibe, H. Banko (2015b) ''The Logic of Collective Security and the Eligibility of NATO Led Coalition Forces to Intervene in Internal Affairs of States: The Paradox Of Regime Change In Libya''. International Journal of Physical and Social Sciences (IJPSS) Vol. 5, Issue 8, August 2015, (ISSN: 2249-5894), INDIA, Pp. 56-76. www.editorijmie.gmail.com, www.info@ijmra.us, www.ijmra.us.

xxxix. Oz Hassan (2012) Constructing America's Freedom Agenda for the Middle East http://www.amazon.co.uk/Constructing-Americas-Freedom-Agenda-Middle/dp/0415603102

xl. Panitch L. and S. Gindin, (2004) "Global Capitalism and American Empire", in Panitch L. and C.Leys, The New Imperial Challenge. Socialist Register, London: the Merlin Press.

xli. Paul I. Adujie (2011) NATO, NO FLY Zone for Syria, Yemen, Bahrain? New York: Bergen County Independent, Online Article, http://www.examiner.com/article/nato-no-fly-zone-for-syria-yemen-bahrain. april 26, 2011

xlii. Petras, J., Globalization Unmasked: Imperialism in the 21st Century. London: Zed Books.

xliii. Pitt, William R. (2002) War on Iraq: What Team Bush doesn't Want You to Know. New York:Context Books, ISBN 978-1-893956-38-4.

xliv. Qutait, T. (2011) The Price of the Divide on Libya: Why I supported the No Fly Zone. Heinrich BollStiftung – Book.

xlv. Reynolds, Nicholas E. (2005). Basrah, Baghdad, and Beyond: U.S. Marine Corps in the Second Iraq War. Naval Institute Press. ISBN 978-1-59114-717-6.

xlvi. Richard Osley (2015) ''Tony Blair apologises for 'mistakes' over Iraq War and admits 'elements oftruth' to view that invasion helped rise of Isis, The Independent, October 25, 2015 Retrieved 03 August 2016, www.independence.co.uk/news/people/...

xlvii. Ricks, Thomas E. (2006). Fiasco: The American Military Adventure in Iraq. Penguin. ISBN 978-1-59420-103-5.

xlviii. Rodney Walter (1972), How Europe Underdeveloped Africa, London: Bogle-L'ouverture Publications.

xlix. RONEN Y., (2008) Qaddafi's Libya in World Politics, London, Lynne Rienner Publishers, p. 43.

l. Scowcroft, Brent (2007) ''Don't Attack Saddam''. The Wall Street Journal, 15 August 2002.Retrieved 03 August 2016.

li. Smith, T., (1981) The Pattern of Imperialism: The United States, Great Britain, and the LateIndustrializing World since 1815. Cambridge, Eng.; New York: Cambridge University Press.

lii. Smith, W. D., (1982) European Imperialism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. Chicago:Nelson Hall.

liii. Stanlake, JTM, Samkange, (2002) African Perspectives on Intervention and State Sovereignty,Institute for Security Studies, African Security Review, Vol.11, No.1, pp.8-21.

liv. ST. JOHN R. B., (2010) Libya: Continuity and Change, University of Durham, Institute for Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies, p.50.

lv. Thakur, R amesh. (2011) "Libya and the Responsibility to Protect: Between opportunistic Humanitarianism and Value-Free Pragmatism" Security Challenges. 7(4):13-25 – Journal

lvi. The Annual Report on International Terrorism, CIA (1981) Theotonio Dos Santos (1971) "The Structure of Dependence," in K.T. Fann and Donald C. Hodges(eds) Readings in U.S. Imperialism. Boston: Porter Sargent.

lvii. The United Nations, Charter of the United Nations (1945), United Nations Website, http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/index.shtml, viewed 28/07/2016.

lviii. The United Nations General Assembly, Res. 2131 (XX) 1965. Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty.

lix. The United Nations Security Council, Res. 1973, March 17, 2011, http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1973(2011), access 28/07/2016.

lx. UN Responsibility to Protect - The International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect''. The World Summit of 2005 (UN, 2005). ttp://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/about-rtop/the-un-and-rtop [Accessed: 31 July 2016].

lxi. United Nations General Assembly Resolution 2131 (XX). ''Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty'' (1965).

lxii. United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 Passed on 8 April 1991. Retrieved 03 August2016.

lxiii. United Nations Security Council S/RES/1973, March 17, 2011, http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1973, Retrieved 28/07/2016

lxiv. Williams, C (2011). "Learning to Redress Pre-emptive Deceit: The "Iraq Dossier". SAGE Open. 1(3). doi: 10. 1177/221582440. Based on analysis submitted to the Iraq Inquiry.

lxv. Wilson, Joseph C. (2003) ''What I Didn't Find in Africa''. The New York Times, 6 July 2003. Retrieved 03 August 2016.

lxvi. Wright, Steven (2007) The United States and Persian Gulf Security: The Foundations of the War on Terror. Ithaca Press: ISBN 978-0-86372-321-6.

lxvii. Zucchino, David (2004). Thunder Run: The Armored Strike to Capture Baghdad. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press. ISBN 978-0-87113-911-5.