

What exactly the U.S. strategy is at this point vis-à-vis the nuclear issue in South Asia can be gleaned from U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Robin Raphel's recent congressional testimony.

U.S. strategy

A multi-prong strategy, which includes a declaration of a fissile material cut-off by the five nuclear weapons states (United States, Great Britain, France, Russia, and China) prior to the convention to extend the NPT and a call for the CTBT, will be buttressed by an indefinite extension of the NPT in April. If India joins the five nuclear weapons states to back a freeze of fissile material, it will no doubt be considered a triumph of Washington's nuclear diplomacy. But the Indian position on the CTBT and freezing of fissile material is as old as its opposition to the discriminatory clauses of the NPT.

From that angle, New Delhi has not in fact conceded much, so far.

There is also little doubt that India sees no reason to loosen its case on its principled position against the NPT. Pressure on India to join the NPT from Washington has tapered off significantly, which has helped the Rao government politically. What some others point out is that there always has been an unwritten understanding between the nuclear weapons states that India would not campaign against the NPT, and, in return, they would not press India to join. However, from time to time, this understanding had broken down and the Non-Proliferation Treaty was used by both sides to make some political statements and exert political pressure. There are indications that Washington is now going about in a circuitous way exerting pressure on the issue.

Despite Prime Minister Rao's statements, the Indian Foreign Office maintains that "until a satisfactory convention to prohibit the production of fissile material for weapons purposes enters into force, there is no question of India unilaterally capping it or accepting restrictions on the program for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy."

Peaceful nuclear program at stake

Notwithstanding these clarifications, what is at stake is India's nuclear program for peaceful use. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, if and when it comes into force, will bring all of India's plutonium production, a natural by-product in India's power reactors, under the control of international safeguards. Considering the current role of the U.N.'s International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the matter raises serious concerns. On the other hand, the next phase of India's nuclear program calls for use of thorium; yet, it is likely that India will find much less maneuvering room to pursue the program. In addition, the nuclear weapons states, awash with highly enriched uranium and plutonium, will have nothing to lose with the signing of the cut-off treaty. One wonders what India will actually gain out of it.

War escalates against Rwandan refugees

by Linda de Hoyos

Bujumbura, the capital of Burundi, where the murderous Tutsi military is taking back political power under the benign eye of United Nations Commissioner Oud Abdallah, was the scene on Feb. 15-17 of an international conference to determine best how to induce refugees from Rwanda—now numbering approximately 2 million—back to Rwanda. The conference was jointly sponsored by the United Nations and the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees and the Organization of African Unity. There are approximately 500,000 refugees in Tanzania; 500,000 in Burundi; and slightly under 1 million in Zaire—a massive exodus caused by the Ugandan-backed invasion of Rwanda with the backing of British intelligence (see *EIR*, Oct. 28, 1994, p. 48).

The conference was held amidst a growing drumbeat in the western press that the Rwandan refugees must be forced home. The argument, as put forward in a commentary in the *Los Angeles Times* by former aid worker Mary Jane Marcus, is that the "humanitarian presence"—giving aid to Rwandan refugees—has had a "damaging effect on the prospects for peace and reconciliation." This is because the camps reportedly continue to be under the political control of the leaders of the former Rwandan government of the murdered President Juvenal Habyarimana, and because, according to her, these leaders were guilty of genocide against the Tutsi minority in Rwanda in the spring of 1994. The case has been most strongly stated by Alain Destexhe, secretary general of the group Doctors without Frontiers, who is demanding a U.N. military deployment into the camps to ensure that the perpetrators of the genocide are brought to account in a U.N. tribunal, and that the refugees are forced back home.

In a press conference at the United Nations on Feb. 6, Roger Winter, director of the U.S. Committee on Refugees, charged that the only reason Rwandan refugees stayed out of their country was the harassment and intimidation coming from members of the former Rwandan Army, who, he claimed, "force them to stay on as magnets for aid." The U.N. secretary general has a "duty to confront what has been the most organized, ruthless, and efficient genocide since the Holocaust," said Winter, demanding a U.N. force to clean out the refugees. Winter held the press conference jointly with the Rwandan Patriotic Front's (RPF) ambassador to the United Nations.

Politically, the RPF, formerly a section of the army of Uganda's unelected President Yoweri Museveni, will have



Rwandan refugees near Goma, Zaire in August 1994. Today, up to 1 million refugees are in the Goma area, and the U.N.'s World Food Program says that it is running out of food. International pressure is being brought to bear to force the refugees to go home—even if it means going to their deaths.

no credibility in the international community unless Rwanda's refugees return home. As U.S. National Security Adviser Anthony Lake told RPF Prime Minister Faustin Twagiramungu during a visit to Rwanda on Dec. 16, "There is no prospect of economic and political stability inside the country while many people live outside."

Refugees under siege

Wherever possible, the U.N., in alliance with the RPF, is forcing that return. About 1 million displaced Rwandans have been holed up in refugee camps in southwest Rwanda, where the French Foreign Legion established a "safe zone" for those fleeing the RPF blitzkrieg invasion of Rwanda that began within hours of the assassination of President Habyarimana on April 6, 1994.

In December, the RPF began burning down the camps; this action did not bring the refugees home, however, but forced them to flee further into either Burundi or Zaire. In mid-December, while RPF troops surrounded the camps outside, a force of 1,800 U.N. "peacekeepers" swept through the camps looking for known perpetrators of murder and for arms and other heavy weaponry allegedly in the camp, but came up with virtually nothing. "We feel the camps should not be allowed to become hotbeds of militarization, of violence," said U.N. representative to Rwanda Sharharyar Khan. Khan claimed that the U.N. does not favor shutting the camps, but believes that "ethnic reconciliation" is impossible unless the refugees return home.

In mid-January, the U.N. joined in. Aid agencies stopped distributing food to the Cyanika camp in southwest Rwanda, and the U.N. cut off the water supply to the camp. Once again, refugees fled to Zaire or to Burundi, rather than return home.

On Feb. 8, the World Food Program, the U.N. food agency, warned that it was running out of food for the camps

in the Goma area of Zaire, where up to 1 million Rwandans live. Warning that the program's food stocks for Rwanda would run out by April, Deputy Director Daan Everts forecast riots and "grueling scenes of starvation" in the camps by spring. Contrary to the allegations coming from aid agencies, Everts flatly denied that the program was feeding an "army-in-waiting of exile Rwandan militiamen and troops in the camps." A forced registration of all refugees had made food aid more orderly, he said.

Food deliveries to the camps are already being delayed by days due to prolonged checks at the Rwandan border into Zaire, reported a World Food Program representative on Feb. 6. "The justification for the checks by the local [Rwandan] security personnel is to be sure the trucks are not transporting arms," program worker Klaus Muhlsteff told Reuter.

The U.N. has now entered into an agreement whereby Zairean soldiers will directly patrol the camps. This pact was the result of the failure of the U.N. to come up with the 5,000-man U.N. peacekeeping force that had been mandated by the U.N. Security Council in November, for Rwanda. Only one country offered any troops for the job; no one offered money.

Why no return?

"Rwanda is a very secure country right now," Winter claimed at his RPF press conference at the U.N. "It is not an empty country. It is not a country in which vigilante or revenge killings are common."

Refugees are not convinced. After food and water supplies had been cut at Cyanika camp in southwest Rwanda, refugees refused to return to Rwanda. As one woman told Reuter, "If I stay here, I may die, but if I go home I will die, so I have chosen to stay."

Of the very least concern to the refugees is the evidence

that the RPF is seizing the land of those who have fled the country, with many Hutus fearing that going home will return them to the status of "serf," which the Hutus held under the Tutsi overlords throughout the colonial period, when Belgium raised the Tutsi to the status of colonial enforcers.

Of prime concern is the fact that leaders of the RPF government in Kigali have stated categorically that unless there are tribunals for the crime of genocide held in Kigali, where the death penalty prevails, then RPF troops will take revenge on their own. "People who have lost their wives, their children, will resort to other means of revenge," said Maj. Wilson Rutayisire, head of the RPF information office. The U.N. Commission on Refugees, in a report not released to the public, charged in December that the RPF was engaged in revenge killings throughout Rwanda.

Within the country, the RPF is now holding 7,000 people in prison on charges of genocide, and RPF Defense Minister Paul Kagame, who led the invasion of Rwanda from Uganda, has stated that the new Kigali government wants to try up to 30,000 people.

The U.N. has already dispatched its prosecutor to Kigali to gather evidence. Richard Goldstone, a judge known to have worked closely with the British mining corporation Anglo-American in South Africa, is heading the team. There has been no word on how a defense of the Hutus might be organized; sources report that while the U.N. will pay for the prosecution, the defense will have to be *pro bono*.

The underlying assumption of the current siege against Rwandan refugees is that the massacres that occurred in Rwanda in spring 1994 were exclusively carried out by Hutus against Tutsis. This is not the case. The Rwandan catastrophe

was sparked by the RPF invasion of Rwanda in October 1990. Despite the fact that the Tutsi-dominated RPF government represents only 15% of the population, the Arusha accords orchestrated by the U.N., Uganda, and Tanzania gave the RPF a 40% share in power in the government of the elected President Juvenal Habyarimana. When Habyarimana was killed, when his plane was shot down in Kigali Airport, the RPF moved quickly from the north of Rwanda, where it controlled a chunk of territory. According to numerous sources, including François Nsengiyumva, press secretary of the democratic opposition to Habyarimana, the murdered Prime Minister Agathe Uwilingiyamina, the thousands of corpses floating down Kagere River into Lake Victoria, were victims of RPF massacres, as they killed their way into the country.

All efforts by the Rwandan Democratic Movement to work with the RPF have been spurned by the RPF, according to Dr. Dismas Nsengiyaremye, former prime minister of Rwanda and first vice president of the Democratic Movement. In a declaration published in December, the social democratic wing of the movement denounced the "assassinations, the massive slaughters, the disappearances, and arbitrary imprisonments of which the RPF army continues to be guilty. In view of the scale of these sad deeds, we cannot put them down to isolated elements of this army giving ways to feelings of vengeance. This argument has proved to be a false alibi."

Until this reality is dealt with, the people of Rwanda will continue to be hideously victimized by the franchise given to the Tutsis by British intelligence, specifically Minister of Overseas Development Lady Lynda Chalker and her "blue-eyed darling Yoweri Museveni," to rule by force and murder with impunity.

EIR warned of Rwanda genocide in 1990

In its Nov. 16, 1990, issue, *EIR* featured an article written by Africa Desk officer Michael Gelber with the headline, "Rwanda Targeted for World Bank Genocide." Reporting on the invasion of Rwanda on Sept. 30, 1990 by 10,000 troops from Uganda, Gelber noted that Rwanda, "with the highest population density in Africa, has long been a target of malthusian population reductionists." The RPF-Tutsi invasion, Gelber reported, came right at the point that the Rwandan government of Juvenal Habyarimana had been forced to go to the International Monetary Fund after years of resisting the Fund's deadly conditionalities. In addition, the invasion followed by three weeks the visit to Rwanda of Pope John Paul II, who had called for regional

cooperation on economic development as the key to the solving the tribal tensions in the area. "The concrete implementation of projects conceived in common will support everybody's activity, whether in technical fields of transportation, the commercialization of basic commodities, credit or scientific research programs, to the struggle against diseases and their prevention."

Gelber further warned that although "Uganda has been one of the parties engaged in cease-fire talks, its attitude in the conflict is highly suspect. As recently as the second week of September, Ugandan President Yoweri Museveni met with the leadership of Rwanda and Zaire, assuring them that no invasion would occur from Uganda. . . . But the soldiers who invaded were led by a member of the Ugandan Armed Forces who was originally a Rwandan Tutsi. Museveni, from a Rwandan Tutsi family himself, was put into power with the backing of Tutsi guerrillas."

And Museveni has remained in power, with the role of East Africa's marcher lord, thanks to British intelligence.