

foundations were lavishly funding environmentalism and zero-growth ideology by now), Scharping was one of the very first who coordinated demonstrations and protests against the Mühlheim Kärlich atomic plant in Rhineland-Palatinate. The plant got shut down as a result. Scharping was among the first who actively protested against the "Rhineland Palatinate Aircraft Carrier," and against the stationing of chemical weapons and cruise missiles by the United States on German soil. When the first cruise missiles were stationed in Hunsrück, he called for demonstrations.

Meanwhile, he began to junket abroad, both into the communist East and to the United States. In 1987, he traveled with an SPD state parliamentary group into the German Democratic Republic, where he met SED communist top leaders Erich Honecker and Hermann Axen, and where he gave a press conference about how, in the future, both the SPD and SED could work to prevent chemical weapons. The same subject he discussed a year later in Moscow with Vadim Zagladin, first deputy of the international section of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

Meanwhile, in 1984 he made his first visit to the United States, at the invitation of U.S. Ambassador Arthur Burns. He again got invited in 1986 by the AFL-CIO, the Foreign Service Institute, the Institute for Defense Analysis, and Stanford University. In November 1989, he called for the cancellation of the NATO Troop Statute.

A typical SPD 'yuppie'

Aside from being an anti-nuclear fanatic, Scharping is the typical expression of the SPD "yuppie" generation. These people talk about the need for a paradigm shift—a mixture of media culture and media literacy, and localist romanticism. Scharping once said in an interview, "While in former times people would judge a politician according to his backbone today they judge him by the tie he wears." He likes to portray himself as a man of deeds and not words.

A party whose leaders have no cultural tradition, which always goes with the "mainstream populist thought" in taste, will only enlarge the terrible spiritual vacuum that has afflicted the minds of the young generation. The mere rhetoric that a new beginning, a "new deal," is needed, without any real vision of what Germany's role should be in the future, and with the lack of creative ideas, could turn out to be a very dangerous mix, paving the way for those who wish to exploit the fact that most youth in eastern and western Germany are worried about having no jobs.

In contrast, the Civil Rights Movement-Solidarity slate led by Helga Zepp-LaRouche is making a programmatic intervention into the election, which points to the real strategic problems which Germany will have to face in the future: the disintegration of the financial markets, a reform of the national bank, and a Eurasian reconstruction plan with the emphasis on infrastructure, as well as the fight to defend Classical culture.

Interview: Adel Hussein

Cairo a 'bad surprise for U.S., Egypt'

Adel Hussein is secretary general of the opposition Labor Party in Egypt, and publisher of the opposition newspaper As Sha'ab. In a discussion with Muriel Mirak-Weissbach in Amman, Jordan on Sept. 17, he gave the following evaluation of the United Nations International Conference on Population and Development which took place in Cairo on Sept. 5-13:

Hussein: Surely what happened was a really bad surprise for the American administration and also for the Egyptian administration. They thought that it would be an easy job, and that they could use the influence of the Egyptian government and the status it enjoys among Arab nations, to impose the U.N. document as it is and have all the developing countries, and the Islamic countries in particular, swallow this document.

What happened, as you know, was the opposite, and, accordingly, as I said, it was a bad surprise for the American administration and the Egyptian government, and also their allies. I can say that this happened thanks to the initiatives of the Vatican and also the very positive role of the Schiller Institute; this effort initiated the opposition in our countries and it enlightened us to a great extent about what is really planned, and supported us with serious information. Accordingly, the counter-campaign started.

If we look at Egypt, in particular, I refer to the influence of Egypt and its role among Arab and Islamic nations. When I say that, I mean the cultural influence and weight of Egypt traditionally in this area. In this regard, we should refer particularly to Al Azhar, which is the famous Islamic institute. Although the role of Al Azhar has undergone erosion as a result of different political considerations, and consequently the traditional weight of Al Azhar among Islamic nations is less than what it used to be, still it is influential. Inside Egypt, surely Al Azhar has a special weight and influence.

What happened, according to what we published and what we initiated—and I think we are quite satisfied and proud of the role of our party, the Labor Party, and our paper, *As Sha'ab*—it happens that it was we who initiated the campaign and explained the different concepts and dangers

implied in the [U.N.] document. Al Azhar picked up the case and understood the dangers which we referred to, and, accordingly, it held a meeting and issued a famous memorandum condemning the conference and the issues raised in the document. [See *EIR*, Aug. 19, 1994, "Time Is Running Out for Cairo-Maniacs."]

This, of course, was quite surprising for the government and all the traditional governmental forces, because they are used to dealing with Al Azhar as a dead institution, which does not move except according to governmental choices and directives. For Al Azhar to take the initiative and to express its opposition to the governmental position vis-à-vis the conference, was really shocking for all concerned circles. Thus, Al Azhar changed radically the balance of forces inside our country concerning this conference.

After the interference of Al Azhar, we were no longer a minority opposing the conference, but, thanks to this position of Al Azhar, the campaign became a real, popular campaign, and all different sectors started to believe that what we were saying was true and that we were not exaggerating when we defined what was in the document.

Before Al Azhar issued its condemnation, government circles and official media had defined what we did as demagogic, alarming. They said that we did not understand the document and were misinterpreting what it said. They claimed that what we said was pure lies. We launched our counteroffensive—that what we say is true and that we understand quite well what is really written and what was really translated. They said the Arabic translation was bad and that the original was not what we thought, etc.

Of course, we proved in what we said and what we wrote the fallacy of all these slanders, but still some people in the middle were not quite sure if we were fair in what we claimed, or not. After Al Azhar's move, these people in the middle were quite clear on the topic, quite convinced that what we said was really true, and that this document was a real catastrophe. So, Al Azhar, in issuing its position, was very important in changing the balance of forces between us and our opponents.

Surely, it was not only Al Azhar as an institution. You can add some of our prominent *ulamas*, the scholars in Islamic doctrine and tradition. These *ulamas*, the most famous of them, supported the position of Al Azhar and confirmed what it said. You can also add to these *ulamas*, different intellectuals of various inclinations and doctrines, who also said that they were against what was in the document, and so the front started to become very large.

What happened inside Egypt, considering the other factors influencing the movement, had its impact in all Arab and Islamic countries. The opposition started to be very great in Egypt, and spread its influence and impact into other Arab and Islamic countries, so that it became a comprehensive movement everywhere. Consequently, governments also started to admit, under this popular pressure, that the

document should be changed and rectified, and the following developments concerning rectifications and new proposals, you know about.

So, I think it was a very successful campaign. Since I left the country before the end of the conference, I don't know precisely what happened in the last days, but I am not now mainly concerned about what happened to this sentence or that paragraph in the different articles of the document. Even if one looks at the details, surely one will see that some important changes were made. But apart from such detailed changes, what is very important for me is the new spirit which was created in the course of this campaign. I think this new spirit will minimize the impact of the document in practice. It will never be implemented with the same success that its authors thought it would be.

What is more, the campaign, as you know, overemphasized—and that's fair and understandable—the very concrete issues of abortion, homosexuality, and the like. This was the starting point, the most provocative points, which pushed the whole campaign. But through the different phases of this campaign, it culminated in the full refutation of the very basic principles of the conference and the document, that is, what they call "family planning."

They succeeded a bit in the 1970s in introducing these ideas, but in the next decades, surely they will not succeed as they did in the past, because of the awareness which has come about in these discussions during the conference.

So, apart from the concrete results, in terms of the rectification of certain articles, I say that the most important thing is that a new spirit is there, a new consciousness is there, and, accordingly, even what has been decided will never be implemented, as it had been in previous decades. The basic idea concerning family planning will be, if not fully demolished, at least really resisted and seriously refuted by our peoples in this area.

The last thing I would mention is the cooperation which took place in practice between Muslim institutions and the Vatican, as well as with other western circles which participated in the campaign on humanist grounds. I think this will be a new start in the struggle of mankind for a better future.

Previously, Muslims and Christians thought in the "classical" way, as they did in the Middle Ages during the Crusades. In spite of many different developments, still these inherited stereotypes continued to influence the attitudes of both Christians and Muslims in this world. I think, after the conference, this will be changed to a very great extent.

Even now, the most classical and traditional Islamic *ulamas* started to discover that we have many things in common with the Vatican and with other churches, and with other people who fight for human values. I think that this kind of coalition, which is still fragile, of course, will get stronger over the next years, and this will influence all different developments in this world.