

addition, what it does is to pave the way for the partitioning of the D.R.C., which in the end has no effect in ending, if [it has] not exasperated, internal problems in Rwanda, Burundi, and Uganda.

Problem 4: Military supplies. How much sense does it make if the intent of this Accord is to allow the invaders a legal way to re-supply their weaponry for further attacks?

Problem 5: Lack of association of the non-armed opposition to the table. The tendency to reduce all credible politics to armed politics is prevalent to Central Africa. Politics must be de-militarized in the Congo. The non-armed opposition groups make up the largest segment of the population. If indeed lasting peace in the region is the intent of this Accord, it makes no sense to have omitted the most influential segment of the society in the region. The unarmed opposition, especially the democratic sector within it, is the key to de-militarizing Congolese politics, when it is included. As long as the non-armed opposition groups are not part of the accord, the Lusaka Accord is doomed to failure.

Problem 6: Disarmament of the Mai-Mai resistance group. Invaders have been talking much about the disarmament of armed groups, including the Mai-Mai resistance movement. The Mai-Mai resistance was not born in Rwanda. They had been fighting Mobutu for many years. However, if today these militants and Congolese patriots turned their guns against Rwanda, the reason is simple. Rwandan troops have been systematically killing their clan leaders, family members, raping their daughters, taking civilian prisoners into Rwanda, and destroying their cultural and civilian records. They took their land and imposed new settlements of people newly from Rwanda. We Congolese oppose any attempt to disarm these true patriots fighting for themselves and their country.

Implications of the Lusaka Accord

In its current form, the Lusaka Accord has several implications:

1. It guarantees the instability of the region for many years to come because of the mistrust it is creating.
2. It prepares for another genocide, as real causes of the crisis are not addressed. The causes have to be dealt with from inside Rwanda, Burundi, and Uganda, and not from outside their own borders or countries.
3. It either kills or delays the democratization process and development in the region.
4. It legitimizes the culture of violence, militarism, ethnic mutual exclusion or extermination in the region rather than preventing it.
5. It sets the stage for the partition of not only the D.R.C., but also many other African countries in the future.
6. It legitimizes an invasion as long as there is an emotional or sympathetic reason.
7. It legitimizes all human rights abuses and other kinds of abuses associated with the invasion.

Albright stokes fires of war against Sudan

by Linda de Hoyos

“The goal of the visit of Secretary of State Madeleine Albright to East Africa,” stated Sudan Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Bishop Gabriel Roric on the eve of the visit, “is to plot aggression against Sudan.” It is definitely the case that during her visit to Kenya on Oct. 23, Albright used her visit as a forum to attack Sudan and put pressure on African and European allies to isolate Sudan and to back the Sudanese People’s Liberation Army.

Although this time Albright did not directly demand war against Sudan, as she had done when she visited Uganda in December 1997, her actions demonstrated that the U.S. State Department retains its mission to destroy the government in Sudan, no matter the cost to the people of the country, especially those in the south.

Albright took the occasion of her visit to Kenya to hold a highly publicized meeting with John Garang, chairman of the Sudanese People’s Liberation Army who has led a 16-year-long war against the Sudan government which has cost 2 million lives. Garang, with the backing of Washington and London, has been the one hold-out among southern leaders, and has refused to sign the April 1997 peace charter with the Sudan government. Not a secessionist, Garang demands that Sudan become a “new Sudan,” presumably to be led by himself. All this to be achieved by way of the gun.

Albright heaped praise on the warlord: Garang “is a very dynamic leader who has a goal that is difficult to fulfill because he is not recognized in the international system.” She pledged that the United States would extend \$3 million for the construction of “civil society” in southern Sudan, and promised more “food aid” to the south. Although Garang made a show of receiving no military assistance from Washington, it is well known that he is supplied indirectly through Uganda, where, according to reliable sources on the ground, military equipment is now being moved in for a new Garang offensive into southern Sudan.

Pressure on U.S. allies

Albright then proceeded to denounce the Sudan government, which had just declared a cease-fire in the south for humanitarian purposes. She attacked those European countries and Canada, whose private firms are investing in Sudan, asserting that there is no “trickle down” from such investment to the people. Such investing countries, she said, “have to be



Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) greets Madeleine Albright, at the Senate hearing considering her nomination as Secretary of State, Jan. 8, 1997. Today, Albright and Helms are in full agreement on their desire to smash Sudan and China—among a long list of other nations. (Also shown are outgoing Secretary of State Warren Christopher, second from left, and Sen. Joe Biden [D-Del.], on the right.)

persuaded that that money only goes into the pockets of those who want to keep control over the people. We have our sanctions but other countries are engaged in what they're calling a critical dialogue and are looking at ways to help them expand their oil drilling. We're going to have to talk to some of our allies about ways to put pressure on Khartoum. I'm definitely going to discuss this with the Canadians."

Within 48 hours, the Canadian government announced that it may apply sanctions on Sudan if it finds that the oil exports, being carried on with the help of the Canadian energy firm Talisman, are contributing to the war. However, the SPLA has made the oil fields and oil pipeline a military target.

"The problem is that the government in Khartoum has to recognize that its charm offensive is not working and is offensive. They need to understand that the only solution to this is to deal with the huge portions of their population who don't want to live under *Sharia* [orthodox Muslim] law," Albright said, ignoring the fact that under the Peace Charter the southern states are not under *Sharia* law in the federalist system of the constitution.

Albright's 'peace' formula

Albright then put forward the peace process organized around the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development as the only route to go for negotiations between Sudan and its opposition. The IGAD talks leave out the northern opposition to the Sudan government, which is in partnership with Garang under the so-called National Democratic Alliance, which was cobbled together by Baroness Caroline Cox, Deputy Speaker

of the House of Lords in 1995. Furthermore, according to John Prendergast, a special adviser to U.S. Assistant Secretary for African Affairs Susan Rice, who was in the region immediately following Albright, U.S. adherence to IGAD stems from its desire to "pressure Khartoum," not for the purposes of bringing about a peace.

Albright specified that Washington does not "support other processes that some are suggesting, the Egyptians or the Libyans." Both Cairo and Tripoli are trying to put forward an initiative for talks that would include all the opposition; however, Garang has not cooperated with this effort.

During her stops in Tanzania and Kenya, the Secretary of State also met with Ugandan President Yoweri Museveni and with Burundian President Pierre Buyoya, both of whom have deployed troops to invade the Democratic Republic of Congo. The first is the chief warlord that the United States has depended upon for its operations against Sudan, despite the fact that Uganda is not a democracy itself. The Burundian President heads a mono-ethnic Tutsi military which in the last month has carried out the forced resettlement of 300,000 Burundian civilians into what are called by the international press "concentration camps." There is no adequate food, sanitation, or clean water in the camps, and IRIN news agency reports that killings are a regular occurrence. Nevertheless, the credibility of Buyoya, who came to power in a military coup in 1996, was boosted by Albright's taking time to meet with him personally. In short, the message Albright delivered to East Africa could not be missed: The United States may talk peace, but its war policy remains in place.