

## Rwanda a test case for U.N. dictatorship

by Linda de Hoyos

Led by United Nations Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the United Nations is now attempting to use the slaughter of more than 200,000 men, women, and children in Rwanda to set a precedent for the dissolution of the principle of national sovereignty and to drastically enhance the one-world rule of the oligarchy through the U.N. bureaucracy.

In a statement reminiscent in tone of the shoe-pounding antics of Soviet General Secretary Nikita Khrushchov in the 1960s, Boutros-Ghali on May 25 called a press conference in New York to angrily denounce the world's nations, including the African nations, for what he termed the "genocide" in Rwanda. Boutros-Ghali claimed that the murdering rampage of Rwandan death squads represented a "failure not only for the United Nations; it is a failure for the international community. And all of us are responsible for this failure. Not only the great powers, but the African powers, the non-governmental organizations, all the international community. It is a genocide which has been committed. More than 200,000 people have been killed and the international community is still discussing what ought to be done."

The Egyptian diplomat also took the occasion to announce that contrary to his earlier pledge, he would seek another six-year term as U.N. secretary general.

Boutros-Ghali's rage centers on the refusal of the world's countries to accede to his demand for a 5,500-man U.N. Blue Helmet squad to seize and secure the Kigali Airport in Rwanda's capital for the U.N., right at the point that the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), in its siege of Kigali, was on the verge of taking the airport. Although on May 13, the Security Council had authorized the use of U.N. troops in Rwanda, their deployment was postponed primarily due to intervention from the United States. On May 16, officials of the U.S. State Department and Pentagon—acting under guidance from Presidential Directive 25, which puts strict

conditions on U.S. participation in U.N. peacekeeping ventures—went to U.N. headquarters to argue that the Security Council mandate had no clear time limit and no clear mission. The United States also pointed out that neither side in the Rwandan war—neither the government forces nor the RPF—had agreed to the U.N. presence, thus placing U.N. troops in danger of getting caught in the crossfire, as the RPF had in fact promised they would be.

On May 17, the Security Council approved a mission for 5,500 Blue Helmets into Rwanda, rejecting Boutros-Ghali's plan that the U.N. take the airport, and limited to protecting civilian pockets in Kigali and refugee enclaves along the borders. Even with a reduced mission, Boutros-Ghali has received agreement only from Ghana, Ethiopia, and Senegal to send troops, all of them poorly equipped. Boutros-Ghali is still trying to get manpower from Egypt, Nigeria, and Zimbabwe. The United States has declined to send troops, saying that Rwanda is not a point of national interest. South Africa has also declined.

### U.N. tries to cash in

Boutros-Ghali's demand that U.N. troops intrude directly into the fighting in Rwanda is not the only precedent being sought by the United Nations for gaining powers overriding national sovereignty.

James Gustave Speth, administrator of the U.N. Development Program, gave a speech to the State Department-linked African-American Institute on May 24, demanding that the U.N. place political conditionalities on the African countries. "The madness" of Rwanda must brought to an end, said Speth, and "therefore, I propose a phasing out of all arms trade and military assistance to Africa, over the next three years. This call might form the basis of U.N.-supported talks as to how this phasing might be achieved. We should

start with a focus on those countries that risk being on the verge of conflict, for example: Burundi, Zaire, Cameroon, Nigeria, and Algeria. Reversely, those that promote peace, security, and development within their borders [according to whose criteria?] should be rewarded by the international community with substantially higher levels of assistance.”

Speth also demanded that Organization of African Unity—operating under the U.N.—must receive monies to enable it to “effectively mount preemptive responses to potential conflicts. It is not enough to scramble when a conflict is in full swing, as we have found in the case of Rwanda. We should act preventively.”

Speth’s motivations are not humanitarian. As an official of the State Department in the 1970s, he led the study group for the Carter administration’s *Global 2000 Report*, which demanded the reduction of the world’s population to 2 billion—that is, the elimination of over 3 billion human beings!

Other plans are afoot. The U.N. Human Rights Commission moved on May 25 to pursue Nuremberg-style prosecutions of the perpetrators of mass murder in Rwanda. The draft passed by the commission bemoans the fact that so far “the primary responsibility for bringing perpetrators to justice rests with *national* judicial systems” (emphasis added).

Amnesty International, a subsidiary of British intelligence, has chimed in demanding that the U.N. create a “permanent international criminal court” to try people for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and other serious human-rights violations. There has been no mention of the bureaucrats of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) as being among the “perpetrators.”

### **The reality behind the crocodile tears**

If Boutros-Ghali, whose grandfather signed over Egypt to the British Empire in 1899, were honest, he would lay the blame for the Rwanda debacle at the doors of such U.N. agencies as the IMF and the World Bank, and the two powers on the U.N. Security Council involved in the Rwanda situation from the get-go: Britain and France.

First, the IMF and the donor countries, in the course of 1993, reduced Rwanda to penury. As early as March 1993, the Food and Agriculture Organization was warning that drought would cause the starvation of up to 800,000 Rwandas—10% of the population. Nothing was done. Instead the donor countries placed pressure on Rwandan President Juvenal Habyarimana, to agree to a “national unity” government to include the President and his forces; liberal Hutu dissenters organized and sponsored by such U.S.-based organizations as Human Rights Watch Africa; and representatives of the Rwandan Patriotic Front, which is based in Uganda and believed to have covert British backing. To this end, the donor countries placed a funds embargo on Rwanda. Thus, at the point that Habyarimana was killed when unknown assailants downed his plane near Kigali Airport in early April, the Rwandan population was in a state of economic desperation.

As one visitor to Rwanda quoted by the *Baltimore Sun*

on May 8 described it: “Many persons in Rwanda were in a state of near famine. The dry season was very prolonged. The war cost a vast amount. The economic situation in Kigali was the most desperate I’ve ever seen. There were tons of beggars in the street.” In addition, the ratchet downward in the economy had produced a surplus of unemployed youth, who were scooped up by fanatical followers of Habyarimana into the Interahamwe civil militia, which became the killer-corps of the Tutsi minority and Hutu dissenters that has ravaged Rwanda in the last six weeks.

In short, Rwanda had been turned into a powderkeg by the political and economic manipulation of the IMF and the western powers.

Secondly, there is growing evidence that the Rwandan conflict was the final result of a manipulated proxy war between France and Britain on the African continent. In 1990, when the Rwandan Patriotic Front first launched its invasion of Rwanda from Uganda, French forces came into Rwanda, ostensibly to protect French civilians. In the next three years, France was Habyarimana’s major political backer, including using credits from the Crédit Lyonnais bank to enable Habyarimana to obtain arms. Evidence is accumulating that Habyarimana had armed and trained his killer Interahamwe militia over the last year, as his government was working with French advisers and with French troops in the country. Habyarimana’s widow has even gone so far, according to an interview she gave to *Jeune Afrique*, May 3, to accuse Belgian forces under U.N. auspices with gunning down the plane, causing the murder of her husband and the Hutu President of Burundi. The airport from which the plane was shot down with a SAM-7 missile, was under U.N. protection.

On the other side, the Belgians and British have been giving tacit support to the Rwandan Patriotic Front, based in Uganda. A Reuters wire on May 25 indicates the foreign power line-up. The RPF, “fighting the rump government in Rwanda, indicated it had withdrawn objections to a 5,500 U.N. force to protect civilians.” The wire happily noted, however, that RPF spokesman Patrick Mazimhaka told the press that French participation in the force “would not be welcome. We have a stormy relationship with France during this conflict.” Zairean President Mobutu, propped in place by France, has also sought to interfere in the negotiating process, and on May 26 called for the “demilitarization” of Kigali, now largely taken by the RPF, and the U.N. takeover of the capital.

Throughout central Africa, the inter-imperialist rivalries between France and Britain are a constant source of instability, ready to flare up into murderous violence as it did in Liberia and now in Rwanda, or even into full-blown war, as could be instigated between Cameroon and Nigeria, for example. At each such point, the U.N., led by Boutros Boutros-Ghali, will be on hand to demand the U.N. military deployment into the country, in what could be called a plot for the final dissolution of the African nation-state and the “final solution” of its people.