

FBI-NES-88-007
12 January 1988

29

ARAB AFRICA

Al-Qadhdhafi Cited in AL-SAFIR Interview
NC041050 Beirut AL-SAFIR in Arabic 1 Jan 88 pp 8, 9

[Interview with leader Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi by AL-SAFIR Chief Editor Talal Salman and correspondent Walid al-Husayni in Tripoli; date not given]

[Excerpts] [AL-SAFIR] We are about to begin a new year and the world is moving toward a new phase in international relations after the Washington summit. Some see this as a great step toward peace, while others consider it a triumph of Gorbachev's policy. A third group views it as a Soviet retreat before the U.S. onslaught. What about us, the Arabs? How do we view the summit, particularly as our basic causes, the Palestinian issue and the Arab-Israeli conflict, were not officially on the agenda?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] It is wrong to view the Gorbachev-Reagan summit as a peace summit. It has nothing to do with peace at all. It was merely a meeting to discuss the removal of weapons that pose a threat to the United States and the USSR, since the two superpowers are the only parties capable of deploying them in Europe.

It is true that this step did ease European anxieties regarding nuclear arms, but Europe still faces the danger of conventional forces overrunning it in the event of a Soviet-U.S. conflict. In such a case chemical as well as other Soviet weapons would be used. This means that Europe is still under threat. The two giants have eliminated part of the danger. However, the purpose of the summit was not to relieve European anxieties but to remove a danger to the USSR and the United States. They succeeded, but the issue was not connected with world peace.

The Soviet Union enjoys superiority in conventional weapons and is doing its utmost to halt the arms race at this stage in order to maintain its superiority. Meanwhile, the United States clings to the Star Wars program. Something in return for something else, exactly as it was in the Kennedy-Khrushchev agreement at the time of the Cuban crisis—a U.S. base in Cuba in exchange for acceptance of the Communist regime there.

[AL-SAFIR] When there is a reduction of tension between the superpowers, does this not have a positive effect on the world?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] Absolutely not. A reduction of tension between the two giants signifies the exportation of disturbances to the world. If we restrain the impulses of the two superpowers they must have outlets elsewhere in the world. This is actually happening now. Immediately after the summit, Reagan announced the extension of the siege on Libya which was due to end next month. He said that Libya poses a danger to the vital foreign national interests of the United States. This appeared in the text of a message which he sent to Congress.

We have addressed ourselves to the UN Security Council and General Assembly and have also asked that a meeting of the EC be convened in order to discuss how Libya poses a threat to U.S. vital interests, and in what sense Libya has a terrorist policy when our people eat, breathe, build, and live on their land? Does the conquest of the desert, the construction of a great man-made river, and the building of factories pose a danger to the United States and its foreign interests? We want an answer to this. We want to know if any secure people living on their land can worry the United States and threaten its interests. If we or any other people like us cause so much worry and such a threat to the United States, then that means that it does not want anything else to live on the planet.

Had world peace been the focus of the summit, Reagan would not have dared to extend the siege on Libya. Gorbachev would have told Reagan that when the two superpowers were meeting at the highest level to prepare to eliminate nuclear arms and take the world toward peace, it was not fitting for the United States to fight the poor Libyan people and threaten such a small country.

Gorbachev said nothing of the sort. For this reason, Reagan left the meeting to declare the extension of sanctions against Libya and to carry out hostile military activity against us in the Mediterranean by forming a U.S.-Egyptian aerial umbrella. On our radar, we monitored an Israeli sortie approaching Libya. This means there was a training mission carried out by Egyptian and U.S. planes to cover a possible Israeli operation that might be carried out now, or in 1 or 2 years' time.

This is what the United States did after the summit with the Soviets and this is what Egypt did after the Amman summit; namely, these two countries gave further aid and support to Israel. This is what Egypt offered to those Arabs who restored relations with it. Relations were restored and coordination was increased with the Zionist enemy against an Arab country at the same time. Is this not a sign of shame and obloquy?

[AL-SAFIR] This confirms your slogan "We do not seek peace from them. We just want them to leave us in peace."

[Al-Qadhdhafi] Exactly. Note the massacres to which the Palestinian people were subjected after the Gorbachev-Reagan summit. They are a provocation to Arab dignity and they expose the superpower summit. It is also another big scandal for the Arab countries which resumed relations with Egypt. Does the Gaza Strip not belong to Egypt? Why, then, does Egypt remain silent over the massacre of the Palestinians? Why does it massacre the Nasirites in Egypt at the same time? Is it not because it is a true ally of Israel?

Why does the Egyptian regime detain the Nasirites? Because they fought the Israelis inside Egypt. Is that not so? Why does the Egyptian regime remain silent over

FBIS-NES-88-007
12 January 1988

30

ARAB AFRICA

Israel's treatment of the Palestinian people? Because they—the Palestinian people—are resisting the occupation. Isn't that so? Therefore, the Egyptian regime rejects any action against the Zionist enemy. This gives us the right to question the reasons which drove the Arabs to return to Egypt.

This does not mean we have gone off the subject. The massacres in occupied Palestine took place after the superpower summit, exactly like the extension of the sanctions against Libya. I expect further strikes against the Lebanese people, and against Angola, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, SWAPO, and Nicaragua. Why did Gorbachev declare an end to assistance to Nicaragua immediately after the summit?

[AL-SAFIR] Perhaps in return for something in Afghanistan?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] This is possible. At any rate, they tried to save themselves and sacrificed the peoples of the entire world.

[AL-SAFIR] The Amman summit was the epitome of Arab retreat and submission to American hegemony. The summit's resolutions and its final statement in particular were a literal implementation of the memorandum from the U.S. ambassador in Amman to the Arab League secretary general. Where are the Arabs heading after the Amman summit?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] I have made many attempts to repair Arab divisions through the Arab union plan. I have made many attempts to end the Gulf war and I have succeeded in preventing it from spilling over into Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and other Gulf states. We have extended help to Mauritania, Yemen, and other countries. Then, unfortunately, the Amman summit came and restored Arab relations with Egypt. The goals that we were pursuing and which were almost achieved were lost. They went to Egypt. Let them go and seek help from Egypt. They have no right from now on to ask for my help, either economically or militarily. What we have repaired exploded at the Amman summit. Hence I expect violence to erupt in Arab capitals in the future: liquidations, revolutions, demonstrations. I tell them all now that I have nothing to do with this. But who can prevent the revolutionary forces in the Arab homeland from getting underway? I believe that many heads will roll in the coming years.

[AL-SAFIR] Do you believe that the Amman summit marked the beginning of the transformation of the Iraqi-Iran war into an Arab-Persian war?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] That was in fact the general atmosphere in Amman. Libya alone stood against turning the war into a Persian-Arab one. The stands of the conferees in Amman were indeed against Iran and the revolution. But this does not affect matters in any way. Iran was not worried by the Amman meeting because it knew well that it was a meeting of losers.

[AL-SAFIR] What is your assessment of the role of influential Arab parties in the Amman summit?

[Al-Qadhdhafi, interrupting] The role was the U.S. ambassador's.

[AL-SAFIR] Do you have a clear idea of what is taking place in Lebanon? What is your concept of what it could be in the future?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] My concept is always one of jamahiriyyah. If we want to keep Lebanon united, then it must be a jamahiriyyah. There is no solution for the sectarian Lebanese situation except a jamahiriyyah system, where the government is canceled and the power struggle ends because there will be no ministers, deputies, or army. The alternative to all this is direct democracy, the establishment of popular conferences and popular committees and the arming of the people.

[AL-SAFIR] The jamahiriyyah invests abroad. Why don't you take the initiative by investing in Lebanon, for example, in Tripoli, Al-Biqa', Sidon, West Beirut, and south Lebanon, and help the Lebanese people overcome their economic catastrophe, particularly as there are a number of projects which could be economically useful?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] This must in fact be done and it should also include projects in East Beirut and all parts of Lebanon, without discrimination. I will look very closely into this matter.

[AL-SAFIR] Following the conference of Arab opposition parties and after the convening of the conference of the ruling parties, will there be any attempt to benefit from the atmosphere and trends of the two conferences by calling for a united Arab movement?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] A united Arab movement will naturally emerge if we continue along this line, and the Arab parties will be unified. There is the Arab people's congress and there is the pan-Arab command of the Arab revolution forces; that is, there is a fighting force and political leadership. A united Arab movement will emerge automatically when further meetings have been held.

[AL-SAFIR] The Palestinian issue must be dealt with. You have a basic role in this. After all that has taken place, and particularly after the Amman summit, what program can be worked out to deal with this subject?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] We consider the unity of the Palestinian resistance, under the PLO, to be a pan-Arab demand, but the PLO now means Yasir 'Arafat, and whoever opposes Yasir 'Arafat appears to be against the PLO. This situation is not right and a line should be drawn between the two. I insist on the unification of the Palestinians within the PLO; otherwise, we will not be able to find a solution to the Palestinian problem.

FBIS-NES-88-007
12 January 1988

31

ARAB AFRICA

[AL-SAFIR] You support the existence of a strong liberation organization, then. But what will the situation be if the organization is strong and leads the Palestinians to direct negotiations? Or, as is now hapening, it leads to direct meetings with the Zionist enemy?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] The liberation organization cannot lead the Palestinians to treason. One person is betraying and leading the organization in this direction. Therefore, the organization must overthrow him; he must not overthrow the organization.

[AL-SAFIR] You have met with PLO leaders several times. Did you sense any hope that the PLO will revert to the bases of the Arab-Zionist conflict?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] Whoever comes to us shows readiness to fight and to engage in armed struggle. One-upmanship is intense. However, we can talk about this only after the unification of the Palestinians. That is when we will be able to introduce these tendencies to the program of a unified PLO. As I have mentioned, the shortcomings are not in the PLO because its program provides for the elimination of the Zionist entity and for the complete liberation of Palestine; the defect is in the persons who lead the PLO.

[AL-SAFIR] For 2 or 3 years, you have made intensive attempts to reunify the PLO. However, there were more than two political concepts. The dispute was not personal. Political disagreement put some of the Palestinian factions outside the framework of the PLO Executive Committee, but not outside the PLO itself. For this reason these factions did not participate in the PNC meeting in Algeria, and consequently did not participate in the Executive Committee. Do you believe that the PLO can be unified without resolving the political conflict among the various tendencies?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] According to my experience of this problem, 'Arafat is the PLO and the PLO is 'Arafat. We cannot conceal this fact in any way. Therefore, the factions that are outside the PLO left because they are against Abu 'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat]. This made them appear as if they were against the PLO, while in fact they are not. Abu 'Ammar inherited the PLO and became its owner; it is now his voice alone.

[AL-SAFIR] Therefore, inter-Palestinian reconciliation is impossible?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] Certainly, there can be no reconciliation as long as 'Arafat dominates the PLO. From this statement I do not want it to be understood that I am talking about misgivings about 'Arafat; I am talking about the Palestinian state of affairs. This problem will continue until the PLO becomes one thing and Abu 'Ammar another.

[AL-SAFIR] Can this be achieved? In a sense, will Abu 'Ammar become a person and not an organization? Will the PLO come to mean Palestine and not individuals?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] The solution lies with the Palestinian people.

[AL-SAFIR] Where does your view and that of the Syrians coincide on this subject? Where do you agree and where do you differ?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] The Syrians have the same analysis.

[AL-SAFIR] Therefore, reconciliation between Yasir 'Arafat and the Syrians is also impossible as long as this confusion between the person of Abu 'Ammar and the PLO exists. Syria's objections, like yours, are political and not personal. Is there no possibility of reducing these disputes?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] The only possibility is to make concessions. When we accept and shake hands with King Husayn, we might accept and shake hands with Yasir 'Arafat. Syria is aware that King Husayn is a traitor and has been secretly negotiating with the Israelis since the days of Golda Me'ir and Moshe Dayan. But Syria established a relationship with him so that he will not go to the enemy and enter into direct negotiations that will result in another Camp David accord. It is acting under duress and not out of conviction. It might also be compelled to shake hands with Abu 'Ammar. That this could happen politically is unlikely but it is not impossible. [passage omitted]

[AL-SAFIR] Libya's enemies are the enemies of the Arabs, and from this point of view we could understand the arrival of Lebanese and Palestinian troops to fight alongside the Libyans. However, some parties are trying to depict the struggle as an Arab-African one, and this issue has surfaced in many African countries that have Lebanese communities. The campaign in such countries is based on the allegation that the Lebanese came to Libya to fight the Africans, and, therefore, they must be deported from these African countries. How should this campaign against the Lebanese be dealt with?

[Al-Qadhdhafi] The Lebanese leaders have explained this issue before. However, Libya is the headquarters of the national command for the Arab revolutionary forces, the charter of which stipulates the defense of any part of the Arab homeland that comes under threat, particularly the revolutionary areas. Libya is now under threat, not from Chad at all, but from France and America. An alliance has been formed against Libya that comprises, in addition to America and France, Egypt, Israel, Zaire, and the Ivory Coast. Chad is merely the land used by these hostile forces. The French brought a black military division into Chad, and so did the Americans. The arms come from Egypt and Israel and the training officers come from Egypt, Israel, America, and France. Fighters and arms come from Zaire and other places. We are

FBIS-NES-88-007
12 January 1988

32

ARAB AFRICA

actually confronting armies and Habre is only a mask. For this reason, the Arab revolutionary forces rushed to defend their headquarters, Libya. They did not come to fight Chad. Some of the commanders of these fighters told Habre that the Labenese and Palestinian fighters did not come to fight against Chad, because there is no problem between Libya and Chad, but only to fight against imperialism. These commanders even advised Habre to get rid of imperialism, as this would resolve the Chadian problem. However, the decision is not up to Habre; it is up to the United States, which asked Habre to fight against Libya in return for financial, food, military, and training assistance.

France itself is worried about the U.S. role and has told us of its concern. It is the United States that is leading this war against Libya from Chad. The United States wanted to settle accounts with Libya and found in Hissein Habre a pliable tool. As for France, it has no interest in the outbreak of war between Libya and Chad, because it has made a commitment to the Africans to defend Chad at the 16th parallel. As for the Americans, there is no commitment that can restrict their adventure. If the forces of the anti-Libyan alliance succeeded in fomenting war against us, and consequently, exhausting us militarily, the United States would thus have fulfilled its sabotage role. On the other hand, if Libya managed to take Chad, the United States could retreat and pull itself out on the pretext that it has no troops in Chad and is not committed to defend it. It is an embarrassment for the French and an adventure that may succeed or fail.

As for the Lebanese working in the African countries, we believe that any harassment of them is a dirty racist action. Libya is an African country that is fighting with the South African revolutionaries against the racist regime. Libya is the chief source of finance for SWAPO. Therefore, no one can accuse us of an ethnic war, while those who level such an accusation are being used as fuel for this war, which is created by the United States.

Jabir Meets USSR's Kondakov, Sudanese Minister
LD111825 Tripoli JANA in Arabic 1745 GMT
11 Jan 88

[Text] Tripoli, 11 Jan (JANA)—Abu Bakr Yunis Jabir, commander in chief of the Libyan Arab Armed Forces, today received Lieutenant General Kondakov, chief of the 10th Directorate of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, and the delegation accompanying him.

Colonel Abu Bakr Yunis Jabir also received Nur al-Da'im, the minister of agriculture of fraternal Sudan.

Jallud Hails Current Palestinian 'Uprising'
LD081003 Tripoli JANA in Arabic 0800 GMT
8 Jan 88

[Text] Tripoli, 8 Jan (JANA)—Staff Major 'Abd al-Salam Ahmad Jallud has hailed the youth, the women, the girls, and the children of occupied Palestine who are

confronting with sticks and stones the Zionist enemy's machinery, which is supported by the United States with the most sophisticated means of destruction.

In an address at a solidarity meeting last night, he said that this uprising has been a honor to our nation and an honor to our great people in occupied Palestine. The Palestinian people have proved that their resistance is increasing and that they are qualified to shoulder responsibility. He pointed out that the Arab masses in occupied Palestine have been waiting for liberation. However, they have now shouldered their responsibility and taken the initiative; this uprising is basically a reply to the Amman summit conference.

Staff Maj 'Abd al-Salam Ahmad Jallud warned Arab reactionary regimes not to plot against this uprising or to look for capitulationist solutions in order to liquidate the pan-Arab struggle of our Arab nation which is, as a whole, being targeted by imperialism and Zionism. He also saluted the Arab people in Lebanon for their courageous confrontation and heroic fight against the Zionist enemy. He added that the the Arab people in Lebanon have accepted the destruction of every Lebanese house, street, and village for the sake of the Palestinian cause, the pan-Arab cause of the Arab nation.

Staff Maj 'Abd al-Salam Ahmad Jallud pointed out that the uprising of the Arab people in occupied Palestine and the confrontation of the Arab people in Lebanon is an escalation of the armed struggle and an affirmation of the dictum that peoples cannot be defeated, because the Palestinian Arab people have triumphed, thanks to their faith and resoluteness, over the most sophisticated Zionist-NATO weaponry.

Staff Maj 'Abd Al-Salam Ahmad Jallud also hailed the Arab people in Egypt who demonstrated in solidarity and support for the uprising of the Arab people in occupied Palestine.

Staff Maj 'Abd al-Salam Ahmad Jallud affirmed that the uprising in occupied Palestine played an effective role in activating and inciting Arab reality in a number of Arab countries. He called on the Arab masses to unite with the Arab people in occupied Palestine and to carry out a popular action for collecting donations and money. He also pointed out that the duty of progressive working forces and democratic and peace forces in the world is not just to be in solidarity with the Palestinian people, but also to set up an international campaign to support the Palestinian Arab people and to stand by them as they did with the Arab revolution in Algeria, and with the Vietnamese people in their struggle against colonialism.

He also said that our people in the occupied territories do not expect words and praise from us, but they do require us to be with them in the battle and to be a natural extension of their struggle. They are fighting in our defense in the forward trenches and are fighting for our existence and our pan-Arab identity.