

## Iraq charges U.N. with war crimes

*On Jan. 24, Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz sent a communiqué to U.N. Secretary General Javier Pérez de Cuéllar holding him personally responsible for war crimes committed by the United States in the name of the United Nations and the "new world order." The indictment concludes with a listing of numerous civilian facilities bombed by the U.S.-led forces, including food storage warehouses, medical clinics, residential areas, and poultry farms. Excerpts follow:*

Since the imperialist United States, NATO, and Zionist aggression began at 2300 hours on 17 January 1991, the attacking forces have been committing heinous premeditated crimes against Iraqi citizens and against the economic, cultural, scientific, and religious assets of our great people, which is one that has made a centuries-old contribution to human civilization.

On all occasions—in the course of our meeting at Amman on 31 August 1990 and during your visit to Baghdad on 11 and 12 January 1991—we have constantly indicated and have explained to you in a clear and detailed manner that the basic fact with regard to the events which preceded and followed 2 August 1990 is that the imperialist United States, NATO, and Zionist alliance and its treacherous adherents among the regimes of the region have had the objective, as they continue to do, of destroying resurgent Iraq, which is pursuing a free and independent policy and which proudly rejects imperialist and Zionist hegemony over the region and over its resources. Everything that has happened has taken place within the framework of a conspiracy hostile to the hopes of peoples for freedom, sovereignty, independence and relations of equality, which are the very principles and objectives for the achievement in defense of which the United Nations is supposed to have been established. . . .

The deliberate and brutal attacks launched on behalf of the United Nations by the forces of the criminal Zionist-imperialist alliance on civilian, economic, humanitarian, medical, cultural, and religious targets and on citizens and their families in all parts of Iraq—documented examples of which are provided to you in the present letter—give cogent proof of the fact that the governments participating in this alliance have the sole objective of taking vengeance on the proud people of Iraq and its militant leadership because of their opposition to the imperialist goals of those governments.

It is indeed shameful for the United Nations that these premeditated crimes should be committed under the cover pro-

vided by resolutions adopted by the Security Council. . . .

Hundreds of millions of people in the world, in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, who have suffered from the oppression and the crimes of the former colonialists and the new imperialists, are today finding the so-called new international order of which the arrogant former colonialists and the new imperialists are speaking to be a dark age of intimidation and threats against those peoples aspiring to freedom and independence and fighting for relations of equality. The removal of the balancing role formerly played by the Soviet Union opens wide the way for the arrogant former colonialist and new imperialists once again to impose hegemony and intimidation, not only by the use of new and innovative methods, as is well known, but also by the old methods, namely aggression and open military occupation. What is new is that the colonialist technique as witnessed in past centuries has this time been used under the cover provided by iniquitous resolutions fabricated in the name of the United Nations which the governments of the imperialist colonialist alliance succeeded in having adopted by means of pressure, intimidation, blackmail, and bribery.

The states that endorsed those resolutions did so for the motives indicated and you, personally, bear responsibility to history and to mankind for the heinous crimes being committed against the free and militant people of Iraq.

---

### Interview: Rifaat el Saeed

---

## Bush blocked road to peaceful solution

*Rifaat el Saeed is a member of the Egyptian Parliament and the official spokesman for Egypt's seven opposition parliamentary parties. These parties, in addition to his own Democratic Alignment, include the Labor party, the Liberal party, the Green party, the Young Egypt party, the Muslim Brotherhood, the Communist Party, and the Nasserite party. He was interviewed by telephone by Joseph Brewda on Jan. 29.*

**EIR:** According to the statements of George Bush and the U.S. media, the Arab world stands fully behind the U.S. Persian Gulf policy. The Egyptian people, Bush claims, support what the U.S., France, and Britain are doing right now against Iraq.

**El Saeed:** It is a big lie to say that Egyptians support what is going on in Iraq right now. I just returned from a city where hundreds of journalists at their club were announcing their

condemnation of the dirty war that Mr. Bush has launched against Iraq.

Many Egyptians were against the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. I am one of them—I condemned the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. But at the same time, I am one of those that know that the invasion could have been solved by peaceful measures and that Mr. Bush blocked the road to reaching a peaceful solution. What is going on now is a monstrous war against Iraq—it is not the liberation of Kuwait. It is a war designed to destroy an Arab country, its manpower, its war machine, its economy, and so on.

As for the opposition in Egypt, I can tell you that all the opposition parties, except the Waqf party, are against what is going on in Iraq. I think that millions of Egyptians are supporting us, not because they are Arabs, or Muslims, but simply because Egypt has 1 million Egyptians living in Iraq. This means that 5 million Egyptians have a husband or a brother or a father in Baghdad. It means that one-tenth of the Egyptian population has relatives working in Iraq and Kuwait. And of course they are worried about this Nazi and monstrous war launched against the Iraqi people.

**EIR:** What percentage of the population is against the war?

**El Saeed:** In the beginning there were very few who supported Saddam Hussein. But when this monstrous war launched by Mr. Bush and his alliance began in such a severe way, it showed that Bush was not implementing the decision of the U.N. Security Council, but just carrying out his revenge, to destroy the man who said “no” to the Americans and to him. I think the opposition to the war will increase more and more.

How did Gamal Abdel Nasser gain all his charisma in the Arab countries? Because he once said “no” to the Americans. And now Saddam Hussein is gaining this charisma because he also said “no” to 28 countries trying to force him to accept what he does not want.

Most of the Muslims and Arabs in many places consider Saddam Hussein as a person who can stand up against the Americans, who are just trying to plant themselves in the region in order to control its petroleum and to force its people to accept all of the American illusions. The percentage of the population against the war is very difficult to say, because no one has calculated it scientifically, but millions of Egyptians are against this monstrous war.

**EIR:** It’s our conclusion that the war that Bush launched has nothing to do with Kuwait and is simply a pretext for the U.S. and the British to carry out a war against the entire Arab people, and more broadly against the Third World, in order to prevent industrial and scientific development. What do you think the Bush administration’s motives are, and those of British Prime Minister John Major and French President François Mitterrand?

**El Saeed:** First of all, no one believes that Mr. Bush had come to this region to implement the Security Council resolu-

tion, because we as Arabs know very well that the Security Council and the United Nations had issued hundreds of resolutions which no one is interested in implementing—especially all the resolutions relating to the Palestinian problem. At the same time, we see that the U.N. Security Council had delegated these powers to implement its decision, but that now the Americans are preventing the Security Council from holding a meeting. It is a very strange thing to block a meeting of the council which had delegated you to implement its decision.

Bush and his allies say they are fighting for withdrawal from Kuwait. But at the same time they said “unconditional withdrawal.” It was so simple to have reached a peaceful solution. When Mr. Saddam Hussein tried to have linkage between the Iraqi-Kuwaiti problem and the Palestinian problem, I think he was trying to find a face-saving solution. Why refuse a face-saving solution? The Security Council said “by all means,” and didn’t say “by war means.”

Bush closed all roads for a face-saving solution. He is sacrificing the future of an Arab people and all of its achievements, and is sacrificing the lives of many Americans—simply because he is so arrogant as to refuse to give a face-saving solution to Saddam Hussein. This is a high price to pay.

What is going on now is destroying all the credibility of the United States in the region, and if the U.S. does not know that it is now losing the sympathy of the Arab peoples and the Muslim peoples, it will know later when it finds that all its friends have been swept from the region.

**EIR:** Why did the current Egyptian government agree to send Egyptian troops to Saudi Arabia and to carry out actions which seem to be very servile and compliant with U.S. demands?

**El Saeed:** Our government made a big mistake in sending our forces to Saudi Arabia. At the same time, it is an old mistake. Since the government began to destroy all the productive elements in our society and depend on parasitic activity, and built all its hopes—mainly—on getting financial support from the U.S., it has put itself under the hammer of the U.S. State Department and its instructions.

It was a big mistake for the Egyptian government to send its forces to Saudi Arabia—and not only because Egypt is the biggest Arab country, and had a Nasser, and has duties not to give an umbrella for foreign existence in the region. But also, as I said, we have 1 million Egyptians in Iraq. Many people have one son who is in the Egyptian Army in Saudi Arabia and another son in Baghdad. It means they are asking a brother to kill a brother.

I think it is very difficult for the Egyptian Army to participate in this war. The Army is there, so the blame for what is going on in this dirty war can be put on the shoulders of the Egyptian government. But it is impossible for the Egyptian Army to participate physically in this war.