

Thursday
29 January 1987
Vol V No 019
Annex No 008

Annex

~~pls share~~
w/ DB

pls pullout
articles for
processing

Daily Report

MIDDLE EAST & AFRICA

The information printed on these Annex pages preceding and following the standard Daily Report cover bears the caveat FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Users may detach the outer pages and treat the Daily Report as unclassified and unrestricted.

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

ANNEX CONTENTS

LIBYA

Al-Qadhdhafi Interviewed on Regional Situation [Madrid CAMBIO 26 Jan] 1

NIGERIA

NAN: 1,500 Libyan Refugees To Be Repatriated 3

ZAIRE

U.S. Reportedly Helping Mobutu Build Military [JEUNE AFRIQUE 21 Jan] 3

LIBYA

Al-Qadhdhafi Interviewed on Regional Situation
PM271619 Madrid CAMBIO 16 in Spanish
26 Jan 87 pp 56-59 — FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Interview with Colonel Mu'ammur al-Qadhdhafi by Randa Taqiy al-Din; date, place not given]

[Text] Question: Following the breaking of the Oujda agreement — which united Libya and Morocco in 1984 and was denounced by King Hassan in 1986 — do you plan to support the Polisario actively again?

Answer: Our stance is clear: We do not want for the Polisario an independent state for only a few thousand inhabitants. In fact we support the Polisario as a revolutionary movement in the Arab Maghreb, irrespective of the relations we have with Morocco. What matters to me is to see a force emerge in the region capable of destroying artificial monarchical feudalism and U.S. power.

Concerning this, I believe it will be necessary for the Polisario and the nationalist party of the Canary Islands to set up a united political party. Incidentally, I will point out that this is the first time I have made such a proposal. In fact Western Sahara and the Canary Islands are part of the same geographical area. They should join forces to defeat Spanish imperialism and merge in a single true state.

Question: Does Algeria support this suggestion?

Answer: It will have to.

Question: Would this new state be linked to Morocco?

Answer: No, it would be an independent state. After all, the inhabitants of the Canary Islands are immigrants from the Sahara, and it must not be forgotten that Spain has no right to those islands.

Question: It is said that when you signed the Oujda union with King Hassan you promised him you would discontinue all assistance to the Polisario.

Answer: No, I never renounced the idea of organizing a referendum of the Saharan people. I even asserted with respect to the Arab-African Union that people's right to self-determination. As far as the Oujda treaty is concerned, I expressed some doubts about its duration. How could a reactionary and feudal sovereign create a lasting union with Libya? The contradictions between our two political systems are too great. Moreover, I told King Hassan: "The United States and Israel will not allow you to act in this way with me." He replied that he was the sole master of his decisions. Now it is clear that was not true. They ordered him to put an end to that union, and he broke his commitments to Libya.

Question: Was King Hassan right to receive Shim'on Peres in Morocco?

Answer: In receiving Shim'on Peres the king wished to please the Americans and the Israelis. This visit proves that my analysis is correct: Hassan implements the policy that Washington dictates to him. I view this event as a defeat and a betrayal which will lead to his ruin.

Question: When the United States bombed your country in 1986, it justified its action by accusing you of actively supporting terrorism in the world. What can you say in reply?

Answer: Washington is conducting a disinformation campaign to deceive the U.S. people and world public opinion. In fact the U.S. attack's aim was to strike the Arab nation as a whole to force it to abandon the struggle for the liberation of Palestine. It was a matter, essentially, of achieving the physical elimination of the man who is leading this struggle. The United States believes that by ridding itself of me it will end the Arab revolution. It is profoundly mistaken, and its intervention has produced an effect contrary to what it was hoping for: It has only increased the Middle East's anger; the Arab revolutionary movements are determined to show themselves even more intransigent.

Question: You have not answered my question. Are there terrorist training camps in Libya? To prove your good faith, would you accept an international investigating committee in your country?

Answer: If there must be an investigation, it should be conducted first in the United States, Britain, and in the other Western countries. It is there, we are sure, where the terrorist training

V. 29 Jan 87

2

MIDDLE EAST & AFRICA
ANNEX

camps operating against Libya, Syria, Algeria, and all the progressive Arab countries exist. We have proof of their existence; those who accuse us have none. We have even detained terrorists who were operating against us. Thus we know exactly that the Americans and British are organizing subversive operations in Syria. Hundreds of innocent people have been killed in those countries because of attacks perpetrated by terrorists trained in the FRG and in Britain.

Question: Iran and Syria, which are intensely hostile to the United States, have suffered no direct attack. What, in your opinion, is the reason for this relative U.S. restraint with respect to those countries? Why strike Tripoli and not Tehran or Damascus?

Answer: With their attack the Americans have experienced a severe military defeat and have no desire to repeat this failure. If they had succeeded in Libya, they would not have hesitated to attack Syria or Iran. In any event, they have announced that in the future they will have recourse to other means, especially attacks. It is a method that has already been used against me. Does not the former French intelligence chief reveal in a recent book that they attempted to assassinate me?

Question: What is your opinion of the recent wave of attacks in Paris, attributed to the 'Abdallah family'?

Answer: I have already expressed my astonishment at these events. I cannot understand the reasons for this surprising violence in France. Is it linked to domestic or foreign causes? I ask myself what France has done to deserve this fate. Moreover, it is not certain that those cited as responsible are the real culprits.

Question: How do you explain the fact that the United States, which has many enemies, does not suffer violence similar to that assailing France?

Answer: It is very simple: The United States protects itself by using Europe as a shield. This means either that Europe lacks discernment or that it is defeated and powerless. In the next world war it will be on the front line of the Soviet-U.S. conflict: It will receive the first Soviet nuclear missile. In my opinion, a confrontation between West Europe and the United States is inevitable, since Washington's obsessive fear of communist military power will eventually be taken for what it really is — a big lie and a betrayal whose aim is to lead the old continent into a conflict with the USSR.

I am convinced that Western Europe and Eastern Europe could live in peace and give up their missiles if they ceased to undergo Washington's pernicious influence.

Question: In October Britain severed its diplomatic relations with Syria, which was accused of being involved in a terrorist plot to blow up an El Al airliner in flight. The United States also recalled its ambassador to Syria, whereas France refused to do so. How do you interpret these different decisions?

Answer: Britain is totally dependent on the United States, contrary to the case in France: Paris has proved its indepen-

dence by denying the U.S. bombers that came to attack Libya the right to pass through its airspace. It is clear that there is an alliance between the U.S. and British Atlanticists, directed against the Arab nation, against Islam, against Arab semitism. It is a racist policy. Can you explain to me what concern the United States has in bilateral problems between Britain and Syria? Why has the White House recalled its ambassador in Damascus, out of solidarity with London? When Syria reestablished relations with the United States, did it link that agreement to its relations with Britain?

Question: What is your opinion of Soviet policy in the Middle East?

Answer: It is certainly more rational than Washington's policy. However, the Soviets' recent change of attitude toward the United States is not positive. Compared to Gorbachev, who seems like a dove with his proposals for peace and reconciliation, Reagan's United States is confirming its image as an eagle by constantly threatening war and militarist escalations.

Question: Has the USSR sent military experts to Libya?

Answer: Of course we have Soviet experts and arms.

Question: So why did they not react when the United States attacked Libya?

Answer: What could they have done? In any event, they did not fail in their duty. We still have confidence in Soviet policy toward us.

Question: Do you hope for an early reconciliation between Libya and Tunisia?

Answer: I have never understood the reason for the rift. Economically our two countries are complementary, the problem lies in the fact that our political systems are radically different. We are a genuine Jamahiriyyah (state of the masses) and not a U.S. subsidiary. We should have confined ourselves to economic cooperation, since the political incompatibilities were foreseeable. Tunisia has severed all ties with Libya.

Question: If the situation in Tunisia worsens, would you intervene?

Answer: No, we would intervene only if the Tunisian people asked us.

Question: Every time you have attempted a union within the Maghreb your efforts have failed. How do you explain this?

Answer: Undoubtedly we did not follow the right path. Moreover, I do not believe all our efforts have been vain. They have had at least the merit of promoting a spirit of unity in the Maghreb, which was isolated from the rest of the Arab world.

Question: Is it true that many Palestinians are returning to Lebanon?

V. 29 Jan 87

3

MIDDLE EAST & AFRICA
ANNEX

Answer: Yes. The resistance must reestablish itself there. This is glaring proof of the failure of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, whose aim was to expel these Palestinians.

Question: Should the PLO be regarded as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people?

Answer: 'Arafat represents only himself. The PLO remains a militant vanguard, but it needs to act really as a liberation organization...

Question: How is it possible for you, a champion of Arabism, to support a non-Arab country — Iran — against an Arab country — Iraq?

Answer: The important thing in this conflict is that a revolutionary force is confronting a nonrevolutionary force. The countries supporting Iraq against Iran, such as Jordan, Egypt, and the Gulf countries, are all reactionary. That said, I very sincerely want an end to the war.

Question: What solution do you propose to end the Lebanese crisis?

Answer: Any settlement must be made within the framework of a republic in which Muslims and Christians live together and in peace. I am opposed to the slogans about an Islamic republic or the idea of cantons and small states. Those ideas terrify the Arab Christians and drive them into allying themselves with the enemy. Those who preach an Islamic republic are mercenaries who give Israel the justification for attacking Lebanon.

Question: What role does Libya intend to play in Chad?

Answer: I want peace and unity for Chad, but I will on no account accept the setting up of a hostile regime. We will not tolerate those who wish to destabilize us. The French presence in Chad is imperialist and petty. What France must do is abandon its military bases throughout the African continent.

NIGERIA

NAN: 1,500 Libyan Refugees To Be Repatriated

AB231714 Lagos NAN in English 1126 GMT 23 Jan 87 — FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Text] Lagos, Jan. 23 (NAN) — The Federal Government has initiated measures to repatriate about 1,500 Libyan refugees stranded at Maroe [as received] in Lagos the minister of internal affairs, Col. John Shagaya, announced in Lagos yesterday. He told the *News Agency of Nigeria* (NAN) that the federal government had already held consultations with the Libyan authorities over the issue, and that it was working out a contingency plan to effect the repatriation. He said that the Libyans were being looked after by the Emergency Relief Agency pending their repatriation.

The federal attorney-general and minister of justice, Mr. Bola Ajibola, yesterday told newsmen that there were about 55,000 refugees from Chad, Libya and other countries now living in the

country. He said that the AFRC [Armed Forces Ruling Council] had already passed a draft of a proposed decree establishing a national refugee council which would take care of refugees.

ZAIRE

U.S. Reportedly Helping Mobutu Build Military

AB210728 Paris JEUNE AFRIQUE in French 21 Jan 87 p 25 — FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Text] In principle, Zairian President Mobutu Sese Seko is to return to the United States next February. During the visit, he will not only defend Zaire's cause at the White House and with IMF and World Bank officials, but he will also meet with American businessmen. Mobutu's recent visit to Washington (6-11 December 1986) resulted in a half-success since Ronald Reagan assured Mobutu that his administration would support him in the negotiations between Zaire and the IMF. In fact, it was a half-success because some members of Congress who are interested in African problems still disapprove of Mobutu's regime, despite Nguza Karl-i-Bond's support of it. After bitterly criticizing Mobutu for so long before U.S. public opinion, Nguza Karl-i-Bond, after his appointment as Zaire's ambassador to Washington, became Mobutu's firm advocate.

Yet, Mobutu Sese Seko's best supporters are Ronald Reagan's best friends. According to those in charge of the Heritage Foundation, the group of Reaganites who had campaigned for U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO, the Zairian president is the "best ally of the United States in Africa." They willingly recall that, for many months after assuming power in November 1965, Mobutu held various daily working sessions with U.S. diplomats accredited to Kinshasa.

According to the same source, during his meeting with President Ronald Reagan in December 1986, the Zairian president called on the United States to rehabilitate the former Kamina military base in northern Shaba. During the Belgian colonial period, this base was among NATO's holdings in Africa and it was from Kamina that, in November 1964, Belgian paratroopers were taken by U.S. aircraft to attack a rebellion against the central government in Stanleyville.

Since the end of the civil war, all that remains of the Kamina base is empty barracks and some sheds used from time to time by the Zairian Air Force. It comes under the authority of the first military region, whose headquarters is in Lubumbashi. The reopening of the Kamina base, this time for the Zairian Armed Forces, would confirm that President Mobutu is achieving the ambition he has cherished for 5 years — to once again turn Zaire into the great African military power it was in the early 1970's. The Israelis have helped him in this direction by resuscitating the Kamayola Division, which lost a large portion of its troops during the Angolan war and in 1975. Reaganites are presently inciting the United States to supply him with all necessary material resources, including an important military base. But Americans give nothing without receiving something in exchange. They might request authorization to use the Kamina base, for instance, as a staging ground for a rapid intervention force to protect U.S. interests around the world.