

4. Decentralization: Decrease central power, because when that is too strong, people quickly fall into servitude. So we need more decentralization, more local power, and a greater role for non-politicians in political life.

5. Regional integration: This can help us to build toward a new international monetary system, in which Rwanda and other countries in the region, forming a larger economic entity, can really develop infrastructure and attain strong productive development. We also think that regional integration will help us to solve our big, and small, ethnic problems.

6. Demilitarization: We have seen what catastrophes our armies have created. Since 1990, and still today, we think that a demilitarized Rwanda, together with other such countries of the sub-region, could truly make progress toward peace, leave more financial means for economic development, and prevent any one group from getting a base of power or exerting violence against another group.

These are the basic points for which my association is fighting, and on which we would like President Clinton to urgently take a position, so that Rwanda may finally have a democratic government, with all factions represented, that will give the population greater opportunities and more trust, allow them to strive toward national reconciliation, and lead to justice.

François Nzabahimana

World community did nothing for Rwanda

Mr. Nzabahimana is president of the Rally for the Return of Democracy and Refugees (RDR), and former Rwandan trade minister. He spoke on April 26, and his speech is translated from the French. Subheads have been added.

I will restrict myself to mentioning some facts showing the role of the international community in the crisis and war in the Great Lakes region. I do not want to go into the details which you know better than I do, especially since some of Museveni's ex-friends here know the ins and outs of the situation, and our Burundian friends will complete the picture. In your folder, you have a memo written by Karoli, who sent it from Nairobi because he, unfortunately, could not come himself. We were supposed to present it together; it is the basis of my presentation.

But, first, I would like to read you a letter we received from Bukavu, which relates what happened a few days ago:

"His name is Marc Kasindu: This militarily trained Tutsi played and continues to play a big role in the genocide of Hutu refugees in eastern Zaire, and enjoys considerable support from the HCR [UN High Commission for Refugees], who gives him a frequency band on the HCR communications network, a jeep with the HCR emblem, regular supplies of gasoline, and a monthly salary. Officially, Marc Kasindu is the intermediary between the Democratic Forces Alliance for the Liberation of the Congo and UN agencies and other NGOs [non-governmental organizations]. His job is to identify those places where refugees are to be found, and inform the HCR, who then deploys the NGOs to take care of sending them back home.

"Unfortunately, this man is concretely helping the Tutsi rebels by informing them each time of the precise spot where there are refugees, which they then go to and massacre the refugees. Worse, Marc Kasindu, sitting in his HCR vehicle accompanied by Tutsi soldiers, scours the bush areas where the refugees are hiding, and when they see the HCR sign, the refugees approach. Kasindu takes advantage of that to radio where they are. Then the rebels come and butcher them."

I could continue this report, which arrived this week from Bukavu and shows the involvement of international organizations in the ongoing massacres in Zaire. We cannot talk about the British Empire, or the role of the United States, without mentioning the reality on the ground.

In October, when the RPF attacked Bukavu and then the camps, I was in Zaire, and we clearly stated where the refugees were. There was a runaround over the number of refugees. Nominally, 750,000 refugees were dispersed in the forests and hills along the road. At the time, two missions were under way: There was an American mission taking aerial photographs to identify the whereabouts of the refugees, and the British mission. Canberra took the photographs and sent them off to Kigali. Members of the British Canberra mission visited some African countries and met with foreign ministers whom I personally saw later. They were confused, and told me: "You people in the RDR say there are still refugees, but members of the mission that flew over the area say there are none left there." This was in October 1996, at the beginning of the war. So there was a definite aim to isolate and starve people. President Carter was very clear on this, when he visited the camps in Djibumba in 1995: "We have to find a way to separate the refugees. The good ones will go home, and the others should stay here because they have committed crimes. We will figure out how to solve that problem at a later date."

For us, there is clearly international complicity in what is happening today in Zaire, in the crimes being committed. The first accomplice is the HCR, on the ground, which knew about the attack and which, from the very beginning, was giving computer data about the refugees to the military regime in Kigali. You know, in order to get food rations, the refugees must give their identity—their name, where they are living in the camp, in which hut, which quarter, and so on. So the HCR

can say, Mr. So-and-So lives here. . . . This complicity is a proven fact: There are witnesses, and some members of international organizations are beginning to say it out loud.

Let me go back to the complicity in 1990, in October, when the RPF attacked. The main person behind that attack was President Museveni, as is described in Karoli's document. Military people close to Museveni are clearly also in Zaire today. The chief of operations in the camps, during the 1995 massacres in Kibero, was Colonel Ibingila, the man who had led the operations in April 1996. Colonel Goga, a member of the Ugandan Presidential Guard, is now leading operations in eastern Zaire. So, when we say that Rwanda and Uganda are involved, this is not merely for effect. These are people on the ground, who have been identified, whom we know, and whose methods we are familiar with.

The Arusha trap

The international community did nothing during the war that lasted from 1990 to April 1994. They wanted to solve things in their way, and we fell into the first trap, which was Arusha [regional negotiations held in Arusha, Tanzania in July 1996]. Of course, Arusha let us negotiate power-sharing—honestly, according to European standards. But, in fact, as we realize today, sharing power was not the main problem. Now we understand that the aim was really to get into Zaire, and that is why the Presidents of Burundi and Rwanda were killed. But we did not have the same reading of events in the region at that time. In the Arusha negotiations, one important chapter was missing, although the RPF delegation had brought it up. They wanted to talk about compensation for the war effort, because the war had cost the state budget about 24 billion old francs, and it is estimated that, since the RPF was less structured, it had cost them about 6 billion old francs. Somebody had paid that money. But in the Arusha agreement, the government party did not want to open a debate on the war effort, and whoever was financing the war did not want it to stop, because they thought the sharing of ministerial posts just would not pay. . . .

So, President Habyarimana was assassinated. One week later, the international community pulled out their military men, leaving the way open for what some call genocide—it is still contested in Rwandan circles. In any case, once again, the international community left the Rwandans, the “savages,” to their fate. This week, a Belgian French-language newspaper mentioned information from an *EIR* article, under the subheading: “Depopulate, the Better to Colonize.” Rwanda had been left to itself.

Look at what is happening today in Albania: The Europeans are going in—it's easy, it's very nearby. But in Africa, the blacks are left to die—it's far away. Such an attitude can be considered racist. A resolution could be adopted to send in the Blue Helmets to secure food relief: Several countries agree to participate in this aid, but the United States is against it. The fact that these interventions were blocked has led to the

catastrophes we are witnessing today.

Finally, we are seeing that we always come up against the same men. Kofi Annan [now the UN secretary general] was in Kigali in April 1994, when the Presidents [of Rwanda and Burundi] died, as head of operations, and he decided to pull out the Blue Helmets. His adjutant, Colonel Baril, his military adviser, was later named commander in chief of the multinational force which was supposed to go to Kisangani. In fact, it ended up being based in Kampala, because of deliberate blocking of any intervention. In the end, one begins to think we should probably be talking about an international conspiracy. Many people do not believe in such an idea, but the facts are there: There is a desire to leave the Africans to their sorry fate.

Trying crimes against humanity

I now come to the international tribunal. One of the Canadian lawyers defending a Rwandan who has been indicted, said that, compared to the Hague Court for trying crimes committed in ex-Yugoslavia, they are acting like racists. First, the defense lawyers do not have the same facilities as those in the Hague. There is not enough money, motivation, or logistics, to have an experienced, knowledgeable lawyer. So there really is no tribunal worthy of the name. We want everyone who was a party to the massacres and genocide to be punished. For us, it is out of the question to have killers involved in running the country.

But, we do need a tribunal worthy of the name. And it must go straight to the crux of the matter, which is, the crime of assassinating the two Presidents. There were witnesses to these assassinations, people who were at the airport, at Dar Es Salaam, when the plane took off. These people are starting to disappear, and, despite motions filed with the international court to follow up investigations, the case was not opened. We also filed suit against the RPF for committing crimes. We named the names of RPF individuals involved in crimes. But the tribunal chose not to open the file on those RPF members who, today, are in the government, and who took part in the genocide and massacres.

So, we are in a situation in which, whatever we do, even if we had the best possible program for ruling, we are blocked by the same attitude of the international community, which does not want to seek a solution to the crisis.

I can give you a brief summary of the form of government we defend. We need a Constitution guaranteeing the freedom of each and every citizen. We need a regionalized economy, in which people can be heard, and the state protects the weak and the fragile. In terms of democracy, we need an absolute democracy, not African-style, but one that corresponds to the new generations of today. I do not think we can take the society of our grandfathers as reference. We have new aspirations for government.

We can talk about justice and reconciliation among the three countries, but we are boxed in by the fact that certain

powers want to force leaders on us whom we do not want. They want to forget about the crimes that were committed by those leaders, namely Museveni, Kagame, Kabila, and, we could add, the head of Burundi, Pierre Buyoya. With these four people, we have created a situation in Africa that will continue to remain explosive.

I would hope that Mr. LaRouche, the Schiller Institute, and the organizers of this seminar will be able to make the international community aware of this. The solution belongs, of course, to the Africans, if we are allowed to find an African-style solution. But there are so many interests in that region today, that we can do nothing until we change the attitude of the international community. If that does not change, then we are condemning people to die of hunger, and opening a period of unending war.

Linda de Hoyos

Can we stop the chain reaction of catastrophe?

Mrs. de Hoyos, who spoke on April 26, is the Africa desk editor for EIR. Some of the maps used in her presentation are not included here; the information conveyed in those maps is discussed in the text.

The presentations we have just heard have given us once again the picture that we have seen unfolding in Rwanda and eastern Zaire over the last three years, and while most of the international community has been silent about this, for those of us who *are* concerned, the levels of human suffering that we have seen are absolutely incomprehensible and have never been witnessed in the history of humanity. I do not know that any population that I have ever heard about or read about has been forced to undergo the kind of constant death marches that the Rwandan refugees have been forced to undergo in eastern Zaire in these last six months.

The question confronting the people who have come here is, "How can we reverse this catastrophe? How can we create a victory out of this terrible crisis?" The question is even if this is a possible task for us at all? I think that the answer is that it is possible, but that this can be accomplished only if we adhere to certain principles at all costs, and at all costs no matter how chaotic or violent the seas around us might become.

The first advantage that we have in this fight, is that we

do have a good picture of who the enemy is. As far as I can see, the British and their allies, who have conspired and carried out what we have seen happening in eastern Africa in the last three years, have overextended themselves, have overplayed their hand. They are no longer in the background. They are very much up front. Their companies are very much up front. While it is true that there have not been protests against what has been happening, the story is coming out more and more, particularly in Europe—of *who is making money out of all this blood*. This is coming more to the fore.

We also know, since *EIR* did an investigation that confirmed allegations that were coming from people in Uganda and Rwanda, that President Museveni was completely involved in what was happening in Rwanda. We confirmed that this was done on orders, and in complete cooperation with the British Privy Council, through Baroness Lynda Chalker, who is deployed directly by the Privy Council. She is a member of the Privy Council; the Privy Council relies upon her to carry out policy. The Privy Council is the deliberating arm of the British monarch; it has nothing to do with the British people; it has nothing to do with the British government per se.

We know that in 1990, approximately one-fifth of the Ugandan army invaded Rwanda. We know that in October 1993, after the election in Burundi, there was an attempted coup, and that the elected President of Burundi was brutally murdered. We know that there was a conspiracy that was carried out successfully to kill the President of Rwanda in April 1994. These *two* events—not one of them—but both of these events, are what triggered the terrible bloodletting that occurred in Rwanda in 1994. It would be completely ridiculous, as the press does, to ignore the Burundi situation as not being a major factor in what happened in Rwanda. However, in the United States, there was only one small article in the U.S. press in October 1993 on the attempted coup in Burundi. This event was completely buried from consciousness by the Western press.

We also know that the murderers of these Presidents walk free in Kampala today. We have their names. You can go find them; anyone can go find them.

Now we see the next round of this onslaught, which is October 1996, the war against eastern Zaire. We know that Kabila was not even involved in the opening of this war, until a month afterwards, when he was flown in to be placed as the titular head of this operation in November.

EIR has documented that the driving force for this operation is Barrick Gold, Anglo American Corp., which is the "grandmother" of all these mining companies which are moving in. The British geopolitical goal here is the annihilation of nation-states in Africa, and the total monopoly control of Africa's vast mineral and agricultural wealth.

However, were it not for British *methods* of cultural warfare and social control, this goal would not be so close within their reach. It is the power of British methods of cultural warfare that has to be addressed. I would further like to pro-