

V. 24-Jan 86

## NORTH AFRICA

Q 1

## ALGERIA

**Foreign Ministry Statement Laments PDRY Conflict**  
*LD231250 Algiers Domestic Service in Arabic*  
 1200 GMT 23 Jan 86

[Text] Concerning the events in PDRY, the official spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs made a statement which said in particular that Algeria is following up with great concern the tragic events in PDRY, which are leading to huge human losses, in addition to inflicting considerable damage to the achievements of the South Yemeni people and through them to the achievements of the entire Arab nation.

The Foreign Ministry spokesman added that President Chadli Bendjedid has continuously followed up these tragic events through telephone calls which he had with PDRY officials, and through various other contacts. He pointed out that these conflicts between the brothers distract the energies of the fraternal Yemeni people from their mission of building their country, and they also harm the national unity which was deepened during the war of independence and development.

The drama faced by the PDRY worsens the heavy dissensions which affect the Arab world in such a dangerous manner at a time when the need for the unity among the ranks and of action to answer the challenge assumes a common destiny. Algeria is all the more affected by this tragedy of division because it has always found in the PDRY a comrade-in-arms concerned above all things with ensuring a rally of Arab potential and putting it into the service of our sacred causes. It is precisely in the name of this sacred cause, the spokesman concludes, that Algeria calls for the immediate cessation of the futile bloodshed and for the restoration of internal peace in respect of the unity and sovereignty of the people of the PDRY, and this through the fraternal dialogue within the framework of the legitimate national institutions of the country.

LIBYA

QADHAFI

*Al-Qadhdhafi Interviewed by Lebanese Weekly*  
*PM231110 Beirut AL-NAHAR AL-'ARABI WA AL-DUWALI*  
*in Arabic 20-26 Jan 86 pp 22-26*

[Interview with Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi by Jubran Tuwayni, 'Abd al-Wahhab Badrakhan, Wadi 'al-Hilu, and Nabil Barakis in Tripoli; date not given]

[Text] Question: Do you believe that the measures which the United States has taken against Libya are tantamount to a declaration of war on the Jamahiriyah, and if so do you consider that Libya today is in a state of war with the United States?

Answer: They can be considered an economic war. They cannot be regarded as war in the sense defined in international law, which means the legitimacy of one party resorting to violence against another. In other words, when the rule of law reigns, acts of violence become legitimate and nobody can then protest against violent actions directed against him. But what is happen-

ing now is not the direction of violence by one party against another but rather a war in a different field, the economic field. Therefore, Reagan has declared a state of national emergency in the United States and we know that such a state is declared when U.S. foreign policy or national security is threatened. Reagan declared that they are actually threatened by a Libyan danger and that in view of this danger a state of national emergency is being declared. Under these circumstances the U.S. President has the right to take presidential decisions without referring to Congress or anybody else. These decisions include imposing sanctions against Libya, blockading it economically, and banning dealings with it. This is the present state of affairs -- an economic war.

Question: Does Libya consider itself to be in a state of war with the United States?

Answer: Yes, war in the same sense, that is, economic war. But we do not consider that Libya alone is in a state of economic war with the United States but also the Arab nation because the United States did what it did against Libya because of Libya's Arab and national stand. There is no bilateral problem between us and the United States; rather it is the United States that is trying to punish us because of our pan-Arab stand. It wants us to put aside the Palestinian problem and the liberation of Palestine and to abandon the cause of Arab nationalism, Arab unity, and liberation of the Arab nation. It does not want anybody to say anything about these problems because the United States has it in mind to contain the Arab homeland and divide it into zones of influence as a basis for it to use in its strategic conflict with the Soviet Union. For this reason it has decided that Libya is the number one danger, after which comes the Soviet Union. When Reagan was asked how it is that he considers Libya, a small country, to be the number one danger, he said it is because the United States is not expecting to occupy the Soviet Union but it is expecting and indeed it is a certainty that it will occupy the Arab homeland. In order for the United States to reach the Soviet Union there are strategic places in the world which must first be occupied and have bases set up in them. When you are proceeding toward a major target and you find a small resistance in the way to reaching it, the priorities change in order to take care of this little resistance. Therefore, Libya is a priority to be dealt with on the grounds that it is the number one enemy which, when overwhelmed, will enable the march toward the big target -- besieging the Soviet Union -- to continue. For this reason our struggle is in fact equal to that of the socialist camp, because while we are defending our country we are at the same time hindering the advance of the enemy, an enemy that is advancing toward the socialist camp. When the socialist camp defeats or weakens imperialism this will have a positive effect on us because it weakens an enemy against whom we too stand because it is occupying our lands. Therefore, Libya's national stand has prompted the United States to adopt this hostile attitude toward it. Even if the problem was Libyan-American the Arab nation cannot possibly abandon one of its peoples, a small people that is being confronted with a major imperialist onslaught, even if it goes to help it out of chivalry. We are one nation and one family because what is happening to Libya today could happen to any Arab country tomorrow. The U.S. plan is aimed at enabling the Israelis to occupy or smash every Arab country individually so that eventually the whole Arab nation will be smashed militarily.

FB-MEA-86-016

V. 24 Jan 86

Q 2

NORTH AFRICA

Then economic sanctions will be imposed and U.S. pressure, threats, and sieges will be applied against the Arab countries one by one until eventually we will find that the whole Arab nation is finished. The principle of self-defense should impel the Arab nation to stand against this onslaught.

Question: Do you not think that the U.S. onslaught against Libya is due to Libya being a Soviet position?

Answer: (laughing) No, if this was the case...

Question: They would have attacked you...

Answer: (still laughing) You said it.

Question: What effect have Reagan's economic measures had on the Libyan economy?

Answer: In fact they have not had a great effect, but they will certainly have an effect. Maybe they will have implications in the future. For this reason Libya is now in need of the Arab nation economically in order to confront the United States with the same weapon so that it will go back on its stand and compensate Libya for any losses it may suffer as a result of the U.S. measures.

Question: The United States has ordered its citizens to leave Libya. Will Libya take measures that would affect these citizens?

Answer: I do not think that the Americans will comply with Reagan's order. This is not the first time that he has issued such an order to them. They will blow Reagan a raspberry. This is because they live in an atmosphere that is different from that in which Reagan lives. Perhaps he imagines that the situation and life in Libya are as portrayed to him by Zionist propaganda. The Americans live here and know that Libya is the country of security, freedom, and popular democracy. But they are free. If they want to go we will not be affected and if they wish to stay they are welcome.

Question: Were there any contacts between Libya and the United States after the Rome and Vienna operations and before Reagan declared his measures?

Answer: No, no. The United States is refusing any contact and any understanding.

Question: When the United States adopts stands against Libya how does it convey this to you and which party carries U.S. messages to Libya and Libya's messages to the United States?

Answer: U.S. policy, particularly under Reagan, is infantile and rash. It is not in the least reasonable because as an actor Reagan deals with world politics in an actor's manner; he views the international theater in the same way he views a stage. In acting you can do anything on the stage but in the final analysis it is only acting. But when you apply this to the real international theater it ceases to be acting. He is now moving naval units and aircraft carriers as if he were on stage, as if explosions could occur without causing harm, while on the actual stage they could cause a disaster. Reagan has this problem because acting is guiding his

policy. His policy is therefore unrealistic and illogical. During a crisis like this -- particularly in view of the fact that the United States is a superpower -- consultations should have been held with Libya and investigation of these events should have been carried out. When a state is disturbed by a particular incident it can investigate it and can approach Libya and then wait for Libya's answer through a third party or directly. But Reagan did not go through this process. Any war that takes place is preceded by a warning. It is stipulated in international law that no war can take place without a warning. In the case in which we are concerned there should have been a series of negotiations and give and take until one of us decided what he deemed fit as a result of the negotiations. Reagan did not go through these stages. Suddenly he threatened us with fleets and concentrated 41 ships against us. A few days ago we were in a state of war and at dawn we were informed that scores of U.S. ships, including aircraft carriers, were in the Mediterranean heading south toward Libya. Had they continued their advance war would have broken out. For this reason we mobilized the Air Force, the Navy, and the air defense and all the commanders went into the operations room. We were waiting for the ships to cross the 32.5 degree line of latitude that marks the beginning of the Gulf of Sidra. This was the red line which, if they had crossed it, would have begun the clash between us and them. But before midday the danger vanished and the ships dispersed and retreated. They did not come close to this line.

Question: What in your opinion was the cause of this retreat?

Answer: First, any adventure in the Mediterranean would be a serious adventure because Libya can, even with one blow, inflict a real defeat on the U.S. 6th Fleet. Also we can inflict damage on U.S. bases which are within our reach in the Mediterranean. After that it [the United States] could do anything; it would definitely occupy Libya. But there is no doubt that Libya could, before the whole world, destroy a considerable part of the U.S. power in the Mediterranean. The United States is avoiding this and is being very careful. When we realize that we are going to be finished we will act crazily and we will sink their units: Let it be on me and on my enemies, Oh God! We can sink one aircraft carrier or two, even if we have to send 50 or 100 aircraft against each. Libya has about 1,000 planes of various types and they are wary of this. Certainly the United States has thousands of aircraft and its own strategy, but a country like Libya can do something very effective in the Mediterranean with a thousand planes. We have threatened that we will turn ourselves into suicide squads, both us and our friends. We will plant these squads in Europe and America and everywhere. If war breaks out then we shall fight in any place and set off explosions. They are wary of this, too. On the other hand we cannot deny the effect of the Soviet attitude when matters reach a very dangerous point. The United States is a superpower and so is not allowed to act unilaterally in this world. When small countries fight, the area of the conflict remains limited, but when one of the superpowers becomes involved in the game it creates the opportunity for the other superpower to intervene. I would tell the Americans: You must reckon that there is a 50 percent chance that the operation would be a very serious adventure and that Libya could do something very effective in the Mediterranean. The other 50 percent may be attributed to the international attitude, particularly the Soviet Union and the socialist camp as well as European pressure. [as published]. This action threatens tourism, trade, and

V. 24 Jan 86

Q 3

NORTH AFRICA

communications because there are in the Mediterranean gas pipelines extending between North Africa and Europe and telephone, broadcasting, and telecommunications lines and potential oil pipelines and other projects. All this would be destroyed.

Question: It is observed that on the Arab and international levels Libya is stronger than before. This is evident in Arab solidarity with it and in the Soviet support for the Libyan stand. Do you believe that the Arab and Soviet support Libya has received counterbalances the U.S. threats?

Answer: With regard to the Arabs we can say nothing about them as we are now waiting for the Arab League meeting on 22 January. Then we can say if the Arab response is equal to the U.S. threat or not. With regard to the Soviet Union we are grateful for its stand and consider it to be an excellent stand.

Question: In this economic war Libya is expected to respond by threatening U.S. economic interests in the Arab world, Europe, or anywhere in the world. Will Libya's action be confined to isolating the U.S. community and the U.S. companies or will it be a party to this [worldwide] war?

Answer: Of course Libya will reciprocate the U.S. action; it will do everything to respond to it and to obtain compensation for ourselves for any damage we might suffer as a result of the U.S. attitude. But Libya does not wish to act single-handedly because the response should be Arab since the root cause is Arab. The United States did not behave the way it did because of a Libyan problem but because of a pan-Arab problem which Libya symbolizes. The U.S. punishment is being directed against all the Arab nation. If there is a blow to be dealt then it is aimed at the Arab nation. For this reason we do not wish to preempt 22 January and we will wait to see what the Arab nation will decide.

Question: What in your opinion is the real U.S. objective behind this campaign, especially since it was rumored earlier that U.S.-Libyan relations were experiencing a certain improvement? It then appeared as if the Rome and Vienna operation had adversely affected this course.

Answer: What is happening now is not out of line with the prevalent trend, namely confrontation between imperialism and the Arab nation. The U.S. aim is to swallow up the area and then hand it over to the Israelis so that eventually it will incorporate it in its international strategy. There is a kind of vacuum in the Arab area, Africa, Latin America, and some parts of Asia. Power is precipitating toward the weaker point in the line of resistance. The conflicting powers now tend toward the weaker resistance spot. The United States is looking for bases and places where its fleets can go and for strategic locations from Bab el Mandeb, to Gibraltar, to the Suez Canal, and to the Mediterranean and its southern shores.

Obviously the United States is seeking to weaken the Arabs. The Israelis are exploiting this so that Zionism will eventually dominate the Arab nation and we will become like the Palestinians in Palestine under the British mandate between 1920 and 1936. America is creating a new British mandate. Let us imagine that all the Arab nation becomes Palestine under a British mandate. They will then hand it over to the Zionists, and the Arabs, like

the Palestinians, will become refugees in camps. The same thing will be repeated. The United States is doing everything and is using an iron fist in order to impose a mandate on the Arab homeland. Under this mandate the Arab homeland will be handed over to Zionism, in which case we the Arabs will find that the whole Arab homeland has become like Palestine. In this regard Libya stands as a resistance point warning against this danger. Even these words I am saying are a danger to the United States because it does not want the Arabs to hear them or draw attention to them. In its view anyone who draws attention to this danger must be silenced. Therefore, the United States wants to silence this voice, this resistance, and this new instigator who is mobilizing the masses, unleashing the masses, and is in control of the state of the masses. It wants the Arab world to be governed by 20 rulers so that it will get together with them individually and every one of them will sign and sign, each one of them giving it a base, a zone of influence, and so on. If there were 50 million Arabs and each one of them had power, wealth, and arms the United States would be unable to contain them. For this reason Libya represents a dangerous phenomenon. The masses must win; the masses are in the battle; no longer can anyone alone sign on behalf of the millions and ignore the will of the masses. If the Libyan call spreads and the masses in the Arab homeland rise, the United States will have no hope of swallowing up the state of the masses because then it will not find a ruler ready to sign. Before this flood strikes, the United States wants to eliminate its source.

Question: Do you expect the economic war to be a holding action pending military action or do you believe that the danger of military action has receded?

Answer: The United States has threatened to take military action. All this is in preparation for military action.

Question: Therefore, a U.S. military strike is expected.

Answer: The strike could take place at any moment but it is dependent upon calculations and upon the impact of the strike on the United States as well as its effect on Libya itself. For it might turn Libya into something totally different and probably have an effect similar to that of the tripartite aggression against 'Abd al-Nasir.

Question: If there is going to be a U.S. military action where do you expect it to be?

Answer: One of the major problems for the United States is where to strike. There is nothing specific as a target. First there is no regime to overthrow because overthrowing the regime in Libya means overthrowing the people's congresses and the people's committees; these are the Libyan people. In my view Lebanon's experience was very useful. Lebanon at present is a state of the masses; a natural jamahiriyah. The government and the Army are weak and so the people act together. Therefore, someone like Sana' Muhyadali could turn herself into a booby trap without taking orders from a military commander, a civilian, or the border police. She commits suicide and by so doing kills the enemies. Such initiatives taken by ordinary people in Lebanon were spontaneous. Nobody gave them orders or told them what to do. This is the dangerous thing. One fellow strapped

V. 24 Jan 86

Q 4

NORTH AFRICA

explosives to his body and killed 300 U.S. soldiers. Who gave this man his orders and who is his boss? He did not ask anyone's permission. He was an ordinary citizen who wanted to express himself and so he mined himself with explosives and went to the enemies. The *New Jersey* bombarded but it achieved nothing; it retreated and fled from Lebanon vanquished. In Libya the United States will find problems. This is a state of the masses with thousands of people's congresses and people's committees. Each person considers himself a Mu'ammarr al-Qadhafi. Therefore there is not only one Al-Qadhafi. So there is no known target. There is no party to be overthrown so that it can be replaced by another party. You cannot overthrow all the Libyan people. Overthrowing the Libyan people means eliminating all Libya. So let the United States come with its nuclear bombs and drop them on Libya; perhaps this will be the solution for it.

Question: In your view, what U.S. action would turn the state of economic war into a state of military war?

Answer: Logically, in fact, there is no legal justification for a military war but there is a U.S. intention to destroy the Arab nation. The U.S. policy is a rash unreasonable policy. That is why war could break out at any time. All the United States has to do is look for any pretext to launch a war. We can no longer look for what is legally reasonable in this confrontation.

Question: What U.S. action would, in your opinion, shift the conflict from the economic to the military arena?

Answer: We cannot guess.

Question: What if a U.S. aircraft entered Libya's airspace?

Answer: It would be brought down, of course.

Question: Would that be considered a passing incident or would it be considered the beginning of a confrontation?

Answer: We will strike anyone who violates our waters or space. What happens after that would depend on the other side. Would that side decide that it was wrong to enter a prohibited area and that the penalty was that it was hit and would therefore retreat, or would it use the incident as a justification for launching war? We are ready for all eventualities.

Question: Can Libya face a U.S. aggression alone?

Answer: Surely there is no comparison between Libya, a small state, and the United States, which consists of 50 states combined in one; but that does not mean that we should surrender. If we must die we will die standing on our feet.

Question: Would you not expect Arab support in this case?

Answer: If a war broke out we would expect the Arab military and the Arab youth to join Libya in the war, otherwise the regimes which oppose such participation in the war would fall, which would change the map. Some armies would decide to join, but if their rulers prevented them from doing that they would rebel.

Question: When you say that some armies would act, do you base that on contacts with these armies or on definite information about their willingness?

Answer: We rely on both. We rely on the pan-Arab stance. That would be the expected and certain outcome.

Question: Do you have faith in the pan-Arab position?

Answer: Yes, I do. Furthermore, there is no lack of contact. Over 16 years in the life of the revolution we have built strong open and secret relations in the Arab homeland.

Question: In your contacts with the Arab leaders what did you ask of them for meeting the U.S. challenge? Has Libya, for example, called for an Arab summit conference and does it intend to complain to the United Nations?

Answer: No, we have not submitted a complaint to the United Nations but we have informed it of what is going on so that the aggressor will be held responsible. We have not called for an Arab summit conference.

Question: Why not?

Answer: The foreign ministers conference will be sufficient. They will come with instructions from their governments.

Question: Will you not try the Security Council or do you not believe in the Security Council and the United Nations?

Answer: Without doubt the Security Council and the United Nations have a role to play, but because of the right of veto we do not depend on them. So long as anyone can use that right and cancel the will of all the United Nations we cannot rely on the United Nations. We call on the small nations to form a new united nations where there would be complete equality or where all the member states would have a right of veto or where the general assembly would have a right to object to such a veto. An amendment of this kind should be introduced; otherwise we would never depend on the United Nations.

Question: You have talked frequently about Mediterranean security and you have threatened to overturn the balance of power in the region if the United States waged war against Libya. What would be the nature of this overturning of the balance of power that you speak of?

Answer: Naturally the alliances in the region would change and we would reconsider our relations with all the international blocs -- the Nonaligned Movement, the Soviet Union and the socialist bloc, and Europe.

Question: Would there be a Libyan-Soviet alliance, for example?

Answer: That cannot be ruled out. Developments carry with them such possibilities. In the final analysis we are defending our existence.

Question: Did you raise this matter during your recent visit to the Soviet Union?

V. 24 Jan 86

Q 5

NORTH AFRICA

Answer: We certainly did discuss all these matters but we decided to leave them until their time comes.

Question: During the recent tension on the Egyptian-Libyan borders Syria declared support for Libya and that the Union of Arab Republics was still valid. Now, in connection with the U.S.-Libyan tension, what role could Morocco, to which you are joined by the Oujda treaty, play? Would it intercede to regulate U.S.-Libyan relations or would it slide militarily with Libya against the United States?

Answer: According to the Oujda treaty, from which the Arab-African Union of Libya and Morocco stemmed, any aggression against Libya is an aggression against Morocco and any aggression against Morocco is an aggression against Libya.

Question: Has the Moroccan stand been true to that context?

Answer: No war has broken out for us to determine whether or not Morocco would implement the treaty.

Question: You have expressed a desire to end the Iraq-Iran war. Does this mean a change in Libya's attitude toward Iran, and are you thinking of embarking on a new initiative to end that war?

Answer: No, our attitude toward the Iranian revolution has not changed, and that is not because it is an Iranian revolution. We generally do not betray revolutions and we do not betray the revolutionary people. I personally instigated revolution against the Shah and a revolution did take place and my call was fulfilled. Those who carried out the revolution were people who had been in detention camps. They had heard my speeches and the instructions in them which had a major effect on the revolution. It is not right for us now to betray the revolution. Our attitude toward Iran does not change at all but I have asked permission to play a part in ending the war so that all the guns could be aimed at the real enemy and the real danger threatening the Arabs and Muslims.

Question: What is the role of the Libyan-Syrian-Iranian alliance in the current crisis with the United States?

Answer: It is very important. It is the most effective alliance both psychologically and materially. If we were to make any material request for anything from Syria or Iran, it would be granted.

Question: What is the nature of the initiative you intend to make to end the Iraq-Iran war?

Answer: I have sent a message to the Iranian leaders on this matter and we are awaiting the reply.

Question: There has been much talk about holding an international conference to settle the Arab-Israeli conflict. What in your view should be the basis of a settlement in the Middle East? Elimination of Israel, restoration of the Arab territories, or...?

Answer: Even if the Palestinians and the Israelis recognized one another and even if they reached understanding we would still not feel assured when it comes to the existence of so-called Israel because it would then turn its sights on the rest of the Arabs and

would threaten our existence. The existence of so-called Israel is in conflict with the Arab nation's existence. It is not simply a Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Even if they recognized one another and solved their problems it does not mean that the Arabs should rest assured. On the contrary, they would have more to fear because it would mean that the Palestinian trench has been overcome and contained, enabling Israel to turn to what is beyond Palestine.

Question: Are you for the elimination of the state of Israel?

Answer: Of course. This is an aggression which must end, but I accept the Palestinian Jews. Israel consists of Europeans, Americans, and Asians. Let them return to Ethiopia. [as published] Let the Libyan and Yemeni Jews return to their respective countries. We do not accept them in Palestine. They must return to their countries, and if they are persecuted there the pressure must be on these countries. We are not against the Jews because they are Jews wherever they may be. We are against those who came to our land of Palestine and occupied it. We should not pay the price for Hitler's crime or for the persecution of the Jews.

Question: You are renowned for your support for the world's liberation movements, some of which are accused by the United States of involvement in terrorist operations. Could you describe to us the nature of your relations with the Palestinian organizations, and do you consider what some of these organizations do to be acts of terrorism?

Answer: The Palestinian organizations are not terrorist organizations. If the Israelis strike at the Palestinians outside Palestine it is the right of the Palestinians to hit the Israelis outside Palestine. Why should the Israelis hit them in Tunisia and Lebanon, and perhaps Yemen? Is it right for the Israelis but wrong for the Palestinians? The Palestinians do not have aircraft to hit military targets, and Palestine is surrounded and protected by the Arabs, who guard Israel. The Palestinian expresses himself by hitting the Israelis everywhere.

Question: Has Libya asked the Palestinian factions to suspend external operations for some time?

Answer: The Palestinian organizations do not take their orders from Libya. We only support them. What they do and how they do it is their own business.

Question: How do you view what is taking place in Egypt and the appearance of certain phenomena such as the Sulayman Khatir phenomenon? Also, you persistently urge Egypt to abrogate the Camp David agreement. How do you suggest it do that?

Answer: The reasons which led Egypt to become a party to the David stable (Camp David) should be eliminated. The Arab nation should give Egypt whatever it can to enable Egypt to leave it. I do not believe that Egypt is satisfied with its present situation. It is trapped. Husni Mubarak is not Al-Sadat but we believe he is trapped and cannot break loose. The Arab nation should help rescue him, but Egypt does not have a mercenary desire for us to give it something in return for getting out of its present situation. This is Egypt's cause, and the major effort should come from it with our help. It is not in Egypt's interest to be involved with the

V. 24 Jan 86

Q 6

NORTH AFRICA

Americans and the Israelis. It is finished and is no longer an independent state. It is independent in name only. The United States controls it economically and militarily and the Israelis have ruined it and have planted themselves everywhere. Do you recall what the holy book said about the exodus? What is happening now is a return of the Israelis to Egypt, to the pre-Moses situation until there is another exodus at the hands of another pharaoh. They left Egypt in the days of Moses and now they have returned to it. Begin even said that the pyramids were built by the Israelis. In his cable to Carter after the David stable signing he said: "You have made efforts equal to the efforts of our forefathers in building the pyramids."

Question: The national resistance in the south [of Lebanon] and the Amal movement are carrying out heroic operations against Israel. What is your attitude toward these operations?

Answer: We support them and could participate in them. This is a liberation battle and it is our pan-Arab duty to support it.

Question: Do you support the tripartite agreement signed in Damascus recently?

Answer: We support Syrian steps in Lebanon.

Question: If Syria took the step of annexing Lebanon would you also support it?

Answer: We support that in principle but we underscore the freedom of the Lebanese people, the Lebanese masses, and the position of the masses there.

Question: Do you support that in the context of Arab unity?

Answer: We even support the principle, that is, the principle of annexing Lebanon to Syria and the principle of unity of the two countries. At the same time we care about the freedom and the atmosphere of the masses in Lebanon, which should not be quelled by the annexation.

Question: What is the state of your relations with the Lebanese legitimate authorities?

Answer: They are good. I have spoken with President Al-Jumayyil on the telephone. His position is excellent. He is very nice.

Question: Are you optimistic about Lebanon's future?

Answer: It is a very complex situation.

Question: In the past Libya considered Israeli threats to Lebanon as threats to Libya. Will Libya, which is under threat now, ask anything of Lebanon or the Lebanese masses?

Answer: If a war broke out with the United States or the Israelis we would ask the Lebanese masses to do everything they can. Their bravery is now well known. Like the Vietnamese, they now frighten the United States.

#### Interviewed by KURIER

AU230940 Vienna KURIER in German 23 Jan 86 p 5

["Second part" of "exclusive" interview given by revolution leader Al-Qadhdhafi to KURIER reporter Heinz Nussbaumer in a tent "south of Tripoli," "last weekend"]

[Text] [Nussbaumer] Colonel, once more clearly and unequivocally, is there any connection between Libya and the events of Vienna and Rome?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] Clearly and unequivocally, Libya has absolutely nothing whatever to do with these events.

[Nussbaumer] But the Americans have just claimed that they now possessed concrete indications....

[Al-Qadhdhafi] They should put them on the table at last, and give us the lie -- for all the world to see. But the truth is, this kind of propaganda is psycho-terror. I have a clear conscience, and I go still further: Libya, nor any Arab country, nor Iran, have anything to do with it.

[Nussbaumer] Let us stay for a moment with the subject of Abu Nidal: Is he still alive at all, or is he dead, as many say?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] He is alive, believe me. That is certain. (laughs heartily)

[Nussbaumer] And his people -- are they actually being trained in Libya?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] To clear this up, once and for all, the camps that existed in Libya were 'Arafat's camps. When we broke off relations with him, he closed down the camps and left Libya.

[Nussbaumer] You mean the camps are now completely empty -- no one is there any more?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] Yes, they are completely empty.

[Nussbaumer] You mean to say that not a single Palestinian is here any more?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] The only ones that are still here are civilians: -- teachers, students, peasants, and workers.

[Nussbaumer] And not a single armed fighter?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] There is no need for any training in Libya. There is no Palestinian camp in this country.

[Nussbaumer] In view of your great interest in the Palestinians' fate, what is your proposal for resolving the Middle East conflict?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] There is no solution. The only solution would be to have all Jews who were not born in Palestine return to where they came from. Then the Palestinians could return to the cities and villages which they were driven out of. This solution will certainly not be accepted by either the Americans or the Israelis. Therefore, there is no other choice for the Palestinians than to

V. 24 Jan 86

Q 7

NORTH AFRICA

wage an armed struggle for their fatherland.

[Nussbaumer] Colonel, you mentioned 'Arafat a little while ago: If an Arab summit were to materialize after all in the near future, are you ready to sit down at the conference table with all those Arab statesmen with whom you have an open quarrel -- even with 'Arafat?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] If there is an Arab summit and I decide to participate, then this would also mean that I am ready to meet with all the people who are there.

[Nussbaumer] And are you actually ready to appear there?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] Who knows, perhaps....

[Nussbaumer] Do you actually fear that one of your numerous enemies in the region might organize in the near future an act of so-called "Abu Nidal terrorism" in the West so as to provoke the United States to deal a blow to Libya?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] First of all, in principle, if anyone carried out an operation under the name of Abu Nidal, then this would certainly not be an adequate reason for attacking Libya of all countries. Naturally it is possible that someone is planning a thing like that, so as to pin the blame on us. But this should show how far we have digressed into the irrational: If a war in the Mediterranean region were to depend on such a conspiracy....

[Nussbaumer] Now a question that is perhaps somewhat bold: At times I cannot help wondering whether you personally regret a confrontation such as that with the United States, or whether you do not perhaps also enjoy it a little, because it seems to confirm that your role is greater than Libya's geographic importance.

[Al-Qadhdhafi] We have certainly not sought the problems; they have come to us -- certainly not for the first time...

[Nussbaumer] But now you are obviously using the opportunity to pass on your message to the largest possible audience.

[Al-Qadhdhafi] It is a fact that a crisis induces more people than normal to listen. And should there be an aggression against us, we will not only repel it with every firmness, but we will then also automatically get even more attention than now.

[Nussbaumer] There is a terrible war of words under way between you and President Reagan. One is calling the other a "barbarian," a "second Hitler," a "stinking, rotten crusader," and an "aging third-class actor." Could you not tone it down a bit?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] But this (laughs at length) is political rhetoric. Seriously, I stick to my opinion: Reagan is a "second Hitler." He wants to colonize the world by force -- on the same pretext that Hitler used for occupying the Sudetenland: That he had to protect the people in this region. It is very important that you give this some thought. Hitler was finished, though, as soon as the other countries allied themselves against him with the Soviet Union. And Ronald Reagan must be finished in the same way....

[Nussbaumer] Do you mean "liquidated"?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] I mean his era must come to an end; I don't mean "liquidate."

[Nussbaumer] In other words, for you Reagan constitutes the actual problem, not the Americans?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] The main problem is imperialism. But Ronald Reagan has undoubtedly driven imperialism to the most dangerous level.

[Nussbaumer] Excuse my saying so, Colonel, but in the past few years I sometimes could not help feeling that you are actually cultivating something that one might call a hidden love-hate relationship with the United States....

[Al-Qadhdhafi] Very well, I am going to tell you now how things stand: I like the Americans, as individuals and also as a nation. But I hate that country as an imperialist center. And I hate their foreign policy, especially under Ronald Reagan.

[Nussbaumer] Then this leaves only the question: Would you, if worse came to worst, meet with this Ronald Reagan personally?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] In principle I do not refuse such a meeting. I'll go a step further: Rather than having the world slide into a catastrophe, such a meeting would be a downright necessity for me. The problem is that to negotiate with Hitler was pointless -- can one negotiate with the "second Hitler"?

#### **Al-Qadhdhafi Receives PFLP Official for Talks** *LD232106 Tripoli JANA in English 1850 GMT 23 Jan 86*

[Text] Tripoli, Jumada Awal 11, Jan. 23, JAMAHIRIYAH NEWS AGENCY -- The leader this morning received Taysir Qubba'h, the Central Committee member of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. He renewed the standing of the Front by the side of the Libyan people in its brave confrontation with U.S. threats and economic measures.

Taysir Qubba'h confirmed the high regard the Palestinian people and its fighting cadres have for the pioneering nationalistic steady stance of the Libyan Arab people and its great revolution towards the Palestinian cause. "This honourable stance was the real reason for all the terrorist practices and successive conspiracies the world imperialism plotted against Jamahiriyyah and its Arab revolutionary people".

#### **JANA: Al-Qadhdhafi Visits Natural Gas Field** *LD202019 Tripoli JANA in Arabic 1830 GMT 20 Jan 86*

[Text] Tripoli 20 Jan (JANA) — The brother leader of the revolution yesterday paid an inspection visit to the gas field "Attahaddi" [challenge] recently discovered by the Sidra Oil Company. The brother leader inspected the excavation work underway to develop this field at Al-'Aridh, which is thought to be the biggest natural gas field discovered so far in the Jamahiriyyah.

V. 24 Jan 86

Q 8

NORTH AFRICA

The estimated reserves of the field are in the range of 50 trillion cubic meters of gas. The field will make it possible to supply the needs of all the gigantic projects based on natural gas, including the ammonia, methanol, and urea petrochemical plants and the liquid gas plant.

This field will also supply power plants in Sidra, Ras Lanuf, Zlitan, and Al-Khums with their natural gas needs by a pipeline extending from Al-Briga to Al-Khums.

**Al-Qadhdhafi Sends Message to Italy's Craxi**  
*LD231142 Kuwait KUNA in English 1006 GMT 23 Jan 86*

[Text] Rome, Jan 23 (KUNA) — The Libyan leader, Colonel Mu'ammr Al-Qadhdhafi, has informed the Italian Government of his readiness to "form an alliance with the Mediterranean countries to stop any support for terrorism in the region", official sources said here Thursday.

Sources of the Italian Government said Al-Qadhdhafi's message was conveyed by the Maltese premier.

They added that the Libyan leader expressed his country's desire to have good relations with Italy and affirmed that Libya does not support terrorism.

Al-Qadhdhafi also requested the Mediterranean countries not to allow the use of their military bases against neighboring states, the sources said.

The same sources, who are close to the Italian Premier Bettino Craxi, said Craxi has expressed satisfaction over the contents of Al-Qadhdhafi's oral message, particularly his anti-terrorism stance.

Craxi affirmed to the Maltese premier that the Italian Government is currently studying the possibility of holding a meeting between the Mediterranean countries to discuss the current tension in the region, according to the sources.

**Arab Foreign Ministers to Discuss Boycotting U.S.**  
*LD241013 Tripoli JANA in Arabic 0717 GMT 24 Jan 86*

[Text] Tripoli 24 Jan (JANA) — JANA has learned that the emergency Arab foreign ministers meeting, which will be held at the end of January to discuss the measures and stances that should be adopted by the Arab countries in solidarity with Libya in its fight against the U.S. economic threats and measures, will include a number of subjects, among them a boycott of the United States in the field of gas exports and petroleum derivatives.

JANA has learned that this boycott will include the petroleum companies that have responded to the U.S. boycott, and that the Arab countries will work toward finding markets for Libyan crude oil, even if this were to lead to them relinquishing some of their oil customers and their markets; they might also increase their oil production and market it on behalf of Libya.

Concerning the financial and investment fields, JANA has learned that the emergency meeting of the Arab foreign ministers will look into liquidating existing investments and refraining from any future investments in the United States, in addition to boycotting U.S. banks, withdrawing Arab deposits from them and imposing new conditions for redepositing them in U.S. banks. This is in addition to boycotting U.S. financial institutions and banks which apply the U.S. measures against Libya.

The Arab countries will also give banking coverage [as heard] for deposits of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah in any other banks whenever this is necessary.

In their emergency meeting, the Arab countries will also discuss the possibility of compensating the Jamahiriyah for the assets frozen by the Reagan government in U.S. banks, and also of granting Libya loans and banking facilities.

Concerning the import of goods and services, JANA has learned that the emergency meeting of the Arab countries will discuss a number of options, including boycotting U.S. goods and services, stopping U.S. companies from participating in Arab projects, or stopping any contracts with these companies in this respect, especially companies adhering to the application of the measures declared by the Reagan government. This is in addition to boycotting the companies and individuals currently dealing with Libya. The meeting will decide on responding to what Reagan has announced.

The working paper which will be discussed by the Arab League Council includes boycotting U.S. ships, aircraft and airports and rejecting any agencies working on behalf of U.S. companies.

**Unions Discuss U.S. Freight Loading Boycott**  
*LD231528 Tripoli Domestic Service in Arabic*  
*1330 GMT 23 Jan 86*

[Text] The Executive Bureau of the Arab Transport Workers Union held a meeting this morning in Tripoli. During the meeting debates covered the U.S. imperialist and Zionist threats against the Arab Libyan people.

Participants stressed the need for a unified stand that must be taken by all transport workers in the Arab country in order to face up to all the U.S. measures and the economic blockade announced by Reagan against the Arab nation, and to stand in one rank against the U.S. practices that America wants to impose on the Arab people.

Members of the Executive Bureau of the Arab Oil Workers Union also discussed a number of means likely to put an end to the U.S. practices against the Arab people, including the boycotting of any loading and unloading of all U.S. freight in Arab ports and airports, in solidarity with the Arab Libyan people in their confrontation with the U.S. world Zionist conspiracies.