

Unprofor is acting against the U.N. resolution. Unprofor is just there to appease, castrated on one side by Karadzic, on the other by their own leadership.

EIR: The war is part of British geopolitics.

Sacirbey: . . . Major is for the embargo; he cannot escape condemnation of history for this. We will have a dark memory of [former French President François] Mitterrand. . . . [Former U.N. negotiator Lord] David Owen is the author of apartheid.

What would happen if in the United States someone tried to divide Catholics from Protestants, or from other ethnic groups? . . . The idea of racial apartheid is an idea from *Mein Kampf*—it's Karadzic's idea of the superior Serb race.

All Catholic and Muslim places of worship under the control of Karadzic have been destroyed. All Greek Orthodox places of worship under Bosnian control have been protected and preserved . . . [as have] human rights, the dignity of human beings.

EIR: Are there signs that France and Russia could go in a different direction than Britain?

Sacirbey: I believe, yes . . . Russia and Serbia are historically friends and we are in favor of that friendship, but we do not want Russia to identify Serbia with Karadzic's deeds and followers. They should realize that they are not supporting the cause of the Serbian people. It is the fascist conception of Karadzic that every human being has to condemn.

EIR: What is the reality of the attempt to free Sarajevo, your capital?

Sacirbey: Since April 8, no plane has landed at the Sarajevo airport with humanitarian aid. For more than two months, no convoy, no delivery of food, has come through the so-called blue road to Sarajevo. We don't have enough medicine, and there is no water. The situation is impossible for us and the Unprofor forces.

Consequently, we have no choice but to attempt to open Sarajevo in order that food and medicine can be brought in. We are not making a general attack on Serbian lines, for military reasons that I do not want to discuss here, but we have to try to cross Serbian lines and to eventually bring in food, medicine, and electricity. We would prefer that this would be done by peaceful means. . . . It is generally known that our soldiers are better motivated, but our hands are almost tied because of the arms embargo. The arms embargo, imposed against Yugoslavia in 1991, is basically implemented only against Bosnia and Hercegovina. We do not have arms.

When our Army tried to do something, Karadzic reacted by bombing Sarajevo, which is held hostage to their brutality, people who ignore international law and the norms of war. The Geneva Convention says that civilians should be protected; unfortunately, the peace forces are observers, and history will remember who did what.

Egypt, Algeria steered toward confrontations

by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach

When assailants mounted an assassination attempt against Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak on June 26, just prior to the opening of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) summit, Lyndon LaRouche denounced it as an operation orchestrated by British intelligence, aimed at setting the Egyptian President on a confrontation course with neighboring Sudan. Furthermore, LaRouche detailed in an *EIR* interview, the incident was geared to sabotage several high-level meetings which would have taken place at the Adis Abeba summit, including talks between Sudanese President Gen. Omar Al-Bashir and Mubarak, as well as discussions related to the Algerian civil war, around perspectives for finding a solution through government talks with the opposition movement Islamic Salvation Front (FIS). Both processes of rapprochement, crucial to the stability of the region, have been aborted in the wake of the assassination attempt, and a dynamic leading to escalated military confrontation has been unleashed. The name of the game in both, is the "Clash of Civilizations," the term coined by British geopolitician Bernard Lewis to designate the scenario for destabilization run under the rubric of "religious" conflict.

Since the Adis Abeba assault, President Mubarak has fanned the flames of conflict by charging Sudan, and specifically Sudanese spiritual leader Dr. Hassan al-Turabi, with responsibility for the assassination attempt. Sudanese government spokesmen cautioned against attributing blame until investigations conducted in Ethiopia had yielded evidence, but Mubarak used the mass media to trumpet his charges, whipping up the population against their southern neighbor, and creating tensions also with Ethiopia. The investigations carried out by Adis Abeba authorities contradicted Mubarak's claims, indicating that the assailants had been not Sudanese, but Egyptian nationals. At Mubarak's insistence that the assailants had nonetheless been "sent by and from" Sudan, the Ethiopian authorities responded that the assailants could have entered the country by any of the five bordering nations with which it maintains open borders. Furthermore, Egyptian investigators who had travelled to Adis Abeba to provide assistance, were so heavy-handed in their attempts to steer the direction of inquiry, and, according to one source, to bribe the Ethiopian officials, that the host country sent them packing back to Cairo. Instead, it was

reported, an FBI team was working with the Ethiopian investigators.

Flying in the face of facts unearthed by the police investigations, the Egyptian press continued orchestrating a campaign preparing for war. According to leading Egyptian intellectuals who spoke to *EIR* on July 12, a military move in Halaib is expected, "unless wise people can stop it at the last minute." "You can smell it coming," one said. Hostilities had broken out in the contested triangular region of Halaib right after the assassination attempt, as the Egyptian military attacked and killed several Sudanese police officers stationed there. Halaib is the place where such clashes have occurred in the past when tensions between the two countries reached the boiling point. Yet this time, according to the editor of one leading Egyptian press organ, a military campaign opening in Halaib could be part of a wider campaign against Sudan, possibly including international sanctions. In this context, military maneuvers conducted on the Red Sea in the second week of July were viewed with suspicion as part of a broader scenario.

Practice for a blockade

The British-American-Egyptian maneuvers, although reportedly planned for a year, were made public only a week prior to their commencement. Furthermore, the purpose of the maneuvers was to exercise the imposition of a blockade. As they took place off the coast of Port Sudan, they were viewed in Khartoum as rehearsing a naval blockade against that country. A further consideration supporting the hypothesis that sanctions may be on the agenda, relates to recent changes in Egyptian legislation regulating entry of Sudanese into the country. Whereas earlier, Sudanese and Egyptians could freely come and go to and from both countries without a visa, now the Egyptians demand a visa of the Sudanese to enter, and a sojourn permit to remain there. The change in the law could be a preventive measure in case a blockade were imposed: This would prevent Sudanese, who would want to flee an embargo, from entering Egypt.

Sanctions against Sudan are the standard demand of a plethora of institutions and persons engaged in the British crusade against Khartoum, such as Deputy Speaker of the British House of Lords Baroness (Caroline) Cox, U.S. Rep. Frank Wolf (R-Va.), Amnesty International, the Society for Endangered Peoples, and so forth. The aim of sanctions would be to destroy the country's economy, foment the domestic discontent which would predictably result from such hardship, and prepare a coup d'état against the current government.

If the Egyptian President is embarking on a full-scale military adventure against Sudan, he is playing with fire. Contradictory reports issuing from press organs and from government bodies over the past week indicate confusion and discord within the Egyptian establishment, which does not unanimously support the rampage Mubarak has embarked

on. War against Sudan would be a catastrophe for Egypt as well, transforming the severe internal crisis of the depression-wracked country into outright civil war.

The second war of Algeria

The other major crisis which would have been discussed at the OAU summit, indeed had already been the subject of private talks between Mubarak and Algerian President Liamine Zeroual, was the civil war in Algeria. It is known that Zeroual had briefed Mubarak on the dialogue that he had opened with representatives of the FIS inside the country. Zeroual had been virtually forced to talk to the FIS, by pressure exerted from abroad, by the Clinton administration and the new Jacques Chirac regime in France. Yet, in line with the anti-Islamic rhetoric issuing from Cairo, Zeroual soon changed his tune as well, returning officially to a confrontationist policy. On July 5, he delivered a speech commemorating the country's independence, and promised to "eradicate" or "uproot" the opposition. The hard-line military behind Zeroual, who are committed to annihilating the opposition, are known as the "eradicators." On July 12, Zeroual announced that talks with the FIS had "broken down," allegedly due to the intransigence of his interlocutors. The deadlock came, according to the government, because the FIS would not agree to a cease-fire until the government released its leaders from detention.

According to the FIS, which issued a communiqué in Germany, the Algerian government refused to accept the notion of Islam as the inspiration of law "although the [Algerian] Constitution stipulates that Islam is the state religion." The FIS stated, this showed that the government was not serious in its attempt to find a negotiated solution to the war. Sources inside Algeria told *EIR* that Zeroual had tried in the negotiations to split the FIS spokesmen into three separate groups, in a "divide and conquer" tactic. Zeroual's earlier claims to progress in the talks are viewed as government propaganda, intended to reassure European political forces and the International Monetary Fund that the situation is under control.

A dramatic declaration of policy

What the Algerian government aims truly are, was manifest in Paris the same day, when a leading FIS personality was mowed down in cold blood. Sheik Abdelbaki Sahraoui, an 85-year-old Algerian co-founder of the FIS, was shot by two assailants who entered his mosque on Rue Myrha and opened fire with machine-guns, shooting him in the face. A second person, who tried to protect the old imam, was also riddled with bullets.

The assassination of the imam is a dramatic declaration of policy. Sahraoui was a moderate, the only FIS leader given the right to reside in France, and an unofficial liaison to the French government. According to a profile in the Paris daily *Le Monde* on July 13, before taking part in the foundation of

the FIS in 1989, Sahraoui had been a teacher of Arabic in Algiers, and, after emigrating to France in 1956, had worked in the trade union movement, to integrate Algerian workers. Following independence in 1962, he returned home to continue his teaching career, and entered politics. A co-founder of the FIS, he became its vice president, and supported the democratic method of gaining political power through the electoral process. In June 1991, following clashes in Algeria, he moved to France, where he lived in exile. He was the honorary president of the FIS executive abroad and FIS spokesman in France. Sahraoui was regularly interviewed on French television, to analyze political events in Algeria, and repeatedly spoke out against the murder of civilians by the Armed Islamic Group (GIA). This earned him the reputation of a moderate, even among the most visceral anti-Islamists of the French police apparatus, including former Interior Minister Charles Pasqua. During the raids against Algerians and other Muslims residing in France, Sahraoui was never disturbed, a fact which points to a special relationship he enjoyed with the authorities. This raises the disquieting question: If he was smiled upon by Pasqua, why did he not have any protection from French security forces?

At his mosque on Rue Myrha, Sahraoui was known to dedicate his energies to social problems. He is quoted in *Le Monde* as laughing off the label "fundamentalist": "Our main role is to approach the [Muslim] communities and to fight against delinquency and drugs."

Killing Sahraoui, while at prayer in a mosque, was a declaration of war by the Algerian "eradicators." This was the first time that an Algerian FIS member in exile had been killed, and as such, is a warning to other leading FIS representatives in Europe and the United States. Eyewitnesses described the assailants as Algerian military security types, but press accounts say they were from the terrorist GIA, which, according to the London-based *Al Hayat*, claimed responsibility for the murder. Attributing it to the GIA is a way of igniting internal strife within the FIS and the Algerian opposition as a whole. It is known that the GIA has been infiltrated and manipulated by Algerian security forces, who often perpetrate atrocities then blamed on "the Islamists."

The dramatic turn in Algeria cannot be viewed as an "Algerian" decision. Just as the road to dialogue was opened last December by the intervention of forces outside Algeria—in that case, by Catholic circles who organized a conference of the opposition parties in Rome—so the confrontation course has always been steered from abroad. The policy has been mapped out in London, and French forces associated with the former government have been complicit. This complicity was best illustrated in the close cooperation Pasqua maintained on Algeria policy with his British colleagues.

Unless energetic action is taken outside Algeria to pressure that government to accept negotiations for a peaceful solution, the civil war which has bled the country over the past three years threatens to become a second war of Algiers.

African patriots gather in Paris

by Odile Mojon

Most of those invited by the Schiller Institute to a July 11 conference on Peace, Development, and Human Rights knew from the outset that this would be a historic event. In addition to former President of Uganda Godfrey Binaisa, it was announced that there would be a Nigerian delegation led by Chief Odumegwu Ojukwu of the National Constitutional Conference (NCC) of Nigeria. Those who know even a little bit about Africa, will recall the role played by Ojukwu in the independence struggle of Biafra, which he proclaimed following the massacre of the Ibos. In addition to this delegation, including Chief Abiola Ogundokun of the NCC, Dr. George A. Abiozor, director general of the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Sen. Ali Sharif, and Baba Adi, participants were honored by the presence of Prof. G.O. Olusanya, the Nigerian ambassador in Paris.

If, during the 1970s, there was still hope that Africa could, sooner or later, get back into the mainstream of economic and political development, 25 years later, this hope has faded and given way to cynicism. That was a point that former French Presidential candidate Jacques Chirac stressed in his introduction, explaining how, "whereas yesterday's rejection of racism, colonialism, and financial neo-colonialism would appear to be a banality to an honest man, we hear today more and more justification of a recolonization which is returning—without any fanfare—to establish virtual slavery."

The picture he painted of the situation in Africa allowed the 170 participants to see how, in order to create this neo-colonialist Frankenstein's monster, hands and feet have been grafted on, in the form of the International Monetary Fund and regional wars. As for the monster's brain, this clearly comes from those who are manipulating, fostering, and propagating the ideology that justifies the triage that Africa is subjected to, whether in the "hard" version—blatant racism, which is acting in a manner that would have been unthinkable 30 years ago—or in the "soft" version—persistent manipulation of the media and hypocritical use of human rights and of democracy, where these words are debased in order to abolish independence.

That is why, if one attaches some value to the rights of man, and if one truly wishes for Africa to heal its wounds, one must acknowledge the primary human right, that is, the