

Which way for Africa: freedom or slavery?

by Linda De Hoyos

This speech was given at a forum of the FDR-PAC at New York City's Riverside Church on April 5, in memory of Martin Luther King's last speech before his death 29 years ago, made at the same church.

What I wanted to do today was, to go behind the screen of events, to examine some of the ideas that are causing what is really the most devastating horror-show that the world has ever seen. And, I think that we have to realize that whither Africa goes, so go the rest of us. I hope that no one has any illusions about that.

This is why Lyndon LaRouche has said that Africa is the moral compass of the world, and therefore, I'd like to examine the situation from the standpoint of one of the twentieth century's greatest moral navigators: Martin Luther King. And to contrast the worldview of Martin Luther King with that of Ugandan President Yoweri Museveni, who has been put forward as the new leader of the "new Africa," and who will receive an award from the Corporate Council on Africa of the United States, in a couple of weeks, for opening up Uganda to the rest of the world; and whose reputation as the man of the "future Africa" is being built up.

First, let's start with Martin Luther King and some basics.

In one of his writings called "The Ethical Demands for Integration," King says: "The Judeo-Christian tradition refers to this inherent dignity of man in the Biblical term 'the image of God.' This innate worth referred to in the phrase of 'the image of God' is universally shared in equal portions by all men. There is no greater scale of essential worth. There is no divine right of one race, which differs from the divine right of another. Every human being has etched in his personality the indelible stamp of the Creator. This idea of the dignity and worth of human personality is expressed eloquently and unequivocally in the Declaration of Independence. 'All men,' it says, 'are created equal. They are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among these, are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' Never has a socio-political document proclaimed more profoundly and eloquently the sacredness of human personality. . . . Segregation stands diametrically opposed to the principle of the sacredness of human personality; it debases personality. The tragedy of seg-

regation is that it treats men as means, rather than ends, and thereby reduces them to things, rather than persons. . . . But man is not a thing. He must be dealt with, not as an animated tool, but as a person, sacred in himself."

Now, Museveni's worldview can be summed up in the following quote, which, I want you to know, he does *not* deny, but boasts of having said; and it goes like this: "I have never blamed the whites for colonizing Africa. I have never blamed the whites for taking slaves. If you are stupid, you should be taken a slave." [As quoted in *Atlantic Monthly*, September 1994.]

Now, obviously, with only the barest of changes, that statement could be put in the mouth of any slavemaster who has ever existed. To understand how Museveni could say this, you have to understand that, first of all, he is not a very well-educated person, having gone to school at Dar Es Salaam University; which did not provide him the intellectual capabilities to overcome his second problem, which is that he is a member of the Bahima tribe, of southwestern Uganda. The Bahimas, which are a section of the Tutsi group, ruled that area in the most stratified form possible. It was a virtual feudal society, within the state that we now know as Uganda. It was a caste system in which Bahimas were at the top, and intermarriage among the castes was not permitted.

In that situation, the word "Hutu," which describes the group of most of the people of this area of southern Uganda, Rwanda, and Burundi, and so forth—the word "Hutu" means "serf." It's not a tribal designation, it's a caste designation.

So we can imagine that Museveni's internal logic goes something like this: Hutu means serf; therefore, Hutus must be stupid; therefore, Hutus *deserve* what they get. And now, they *are* getting it, in eastern Zaire, in Rwanda, and Burundi, as we have documented, and the horror of what has been done to them will increasingly become conscious to the world.

Britain's 'danse macabre' in Africa

Now, it should be obvious that such a worldview as Museveni's is a very convenient tool for the British oligarchy, and they have given Museveni full rein to carry out his dream of a Hima, or Tutsi Empire, in central-eastern Africa. So, they permitted him, in 1990, to hive off a section of the Ugandan



Martin Luther King (left), whose public denunciation of the Vietnam War at New York's Riverside Church on April 5, 1967, was based on the principle that all men stand equal as being created in the image of God, had a fundamentally opposite worldview from Uganda's marcherlord Yoweri Museveni (center), whose morality is reduced to the boast: "If you are stupid, you should be taken a slave." Black nationalist Stokeley Carmichael (right), who shares Museveni's ideology, was deployed to destroy the civil rights movement of Dr. King.

Army, and to march into Rwanda, under the cover of the Rwandan Patriotic Front; and, as one Ugandan recently said, when asked about this, "Everybody notices when a fifth of the army disappears across the border."

This was done again, in 1994, when the Rwandan Patriotic Front, which already occupied part of Rwanda, blitzkrieged its way across Rwanda as soon as the Rwandan President Habyarimana had been murdered at Kigali Airport. This resulted in a massive bloodletting, which was not simply a genocide of Tutsis, by any means; and resulted in pushing millions of people out of Rwanda—when there were only 7 million people in Rwanda to begin with. Millions were pushed into Tanzania, and millions more into eastern Zaire.

Up until the point of the invasion of eastern Zaire, from Rwanda and Uganda, in October of 1996, we had calculated that this British plan for the recolonization of Africa had already resulted in the deaths of 1.6 million people. And, I would say that, out of the 1.2, or 1.4, or 1.5 million people that were pushed into eastern Zaire—the UN High Commission on Refugees says that there are only about 75,000 left out of at least 600,000 people who remained in eastern Zaire. That's how many refugees there are; and, if you look at the *New York Times*, you can see what state they're in, and what a terrible "threat" they are to everyone. We do not know what has become of the 600,000 or so who returned to Rwanda, but I can assure you that they are *not* safe.

So, the Rwandan Hutu refugees have been virtually exterminated. This has been done, not on behalf of Museveni himself (although he seems to think so), but on behalf of Sir George Bush's Barrick Gold, Anglo American, Lonrho, other British-Canadian companies: the companies which constitute the financial wealth and basis of the British monarchy, the Privy Council, and its related oligarchies.

What this means for East and Central Africa—and for the rest of Africa, because this is just the beginning—is the enslavement of a continent, and the death of millions, millions of people.

The driving force, on the ground, for this recolonization and for the case of the Tutsi Empire, is segregation—it is apartheid.

To demonstrate this to you, I want to take you to another front in Uganda's war against its neighbors, which is its war against the nation-state of Sudan. There are two divisions of Ugandan soldiers in eastern Zaire—we have confirmed this from various places; and, there's certainly one division inside Sudan, and there are more divisions, about four divisions—40,000 troops—in northern Uganda, waiting to go into southern Sudan.

The compass lost: Francis Deng

Let's take the case of Francis Deng, who is the theoretician of the separatist movement in Sudan, which Museveni is com-

ing to aid—the SPLA, the Sudanese People’s Liberation Army. Now, Francis Deng was formerly at the United Nations High Commission on Refugees (which, I want you to know, has supervised the mass death of refugees in Zaire), and, now, is at the Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C. In 1996, he published a book called, *War of Visions*. In stark contrast to the principles held sacred by Martin Luther King, Deng states in the first lines of his book: “Identity is used in this book to describe the way individuals and groups define themselves, and *are defined by others*, on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, language, and culture. In Africa, as the case of Somalia has so tragically demonstrated, clan, lineage, and family are often vital elements of identity. Territorial region as an element of identification overlaps with one or more of these factors, and is therefore complementary. Whatever the determining factors, identity is a concept that gives a deeply rooted psychological and social meaning to the individual. As groups vie for power, material resources, and other values, these dynamics may involve cooperation, competition, or conflict. The source of conflict lies not so much in the mere fact of differences, as in the degree to which the interacting identities and their overriding goals are mutually accommodating or incompatible” (emphasis added).

This is Francis Deng’s idea of the identity of the human personality.

Out of this, he spins a web of deceit, which is called the conflict between the Arab, northern Sudanese, and the African, southern Sudanese: “The identities of North and South have evolved in sharply contrasting racial, cultural, and religious self-perceptions. . . . In the North, the sense of pride and dignity the Sudanese Arabs gain from their self-preserved heritage would prevent them from shedding their Arab skin to resume their long-discarded African identity. The Southern Sudanese, too, are proud of their race—which has survived recurrent Arab invasions for slaves—and contemptuous of a race they consider morally depraved, and bent on dominating, subjugating, and humiliating the black race. . . . Partition may indeed allow each side to consolidate its internal front”—precisely, and conveniently, London’s desire.

If this alleged incompatibility is irreversible, then how does Francis Deng then account for the fact that, before the British came—and even up to about the 1920s, during the period of British rule—these two areas were integrated? As cotton production brought large-scale production to Sudan, and as cotton production came south from the north, there began a greater and greater interplay between the Arab north and the so-called African south. The British were very afraid of this, because they were afraid of the Sudanese in the north. The Sudanese had “murdered” Charles Gordon Pasha (who definitely deserved such a death); they had defeated the British in battle; and they were a force, which the British were *terrified* would be able to penetrate into southern Sudan, and into equatorial Africa; and then, it was feared, all the British colonies would be in a complete uproar.

So, the British instituted a policy in 1923 of absolute and total apartheid *within* Sudan itself: They divided the country in half. Up to that point, many people in the south had been in the army of Sudan; they were kicked out, and sent back home to the south. There were people, so-called Arabs, or Arabic-speaking people (they were not Arabs, for that matter; they’re African), Arabic-speakers, who lived in the south: They were kicked out; they were told they had to go to the north. It was as if a barbed wire fence had been strung across the entire country.

The people in the south were left to themselves: They were not allowed to develop; they were not given much education; they were not given any aid, in terms of developing their economies. There was no urbanization permitted—people were told they could not come into the cities, they had to stay outside of the cities; just as African blacks were told that during the apartheid days in South Africa.

This policy was described as follows in *The Secret War in the Sudan, 1955-1972*, by Edgar O’Ballance: “In 1930, the British administrators redefined their southern policy of separating the north from the south. It had, in fact, begun in 1902, and been furthered in ’22, because they feared that the newly emerging, anti-British sentiments in the north, encouraged by Egyptian factions, might spread into the south. On the 25th of January, it was decreed that the object was to: ‘Build up a series of self-contained racial and tribal units, with structure and organization based to whatever extent the equity of good government permit, upon indigenous customs, traditions, usages, and beliefs.’ ”

In other words, what the British did is something that Francis Deng could really subscribe to!

Then the British proceeded to create a separate “identity” for the south. In 1930 Angus Gillan, governor of Kordofan, wrote that the aim of the apartheid policy was “to preserve authentic Nuba civilization and culture against a bastard type of ‘Arabization.’ ” Thus, within 30 years, a southern Sudanese precursor to Francis Deng would write: “The policy of assimilation through the Islamic religion and Arabic language is unequivocally opposed by Africans because this is calculated to destroy their African identity and national dignity.”

Having created this southern Sudanese identity out of whole cloth, and having divided the country in two, at the point that the British left and set the two sides of the country against each other, then they said, “Well, we’re going to give the administration of the entire country to the north.” And, by 1955, even one year before independence, there was war in southern Sudan against the north, which had been provoked and instigated by the British colonialists.

Same games in Uganda

The British played the same exact games in Uganda, where there is no Arabic-speaking population, of note. The southern Sudanese, having been kicked out of the southern

Sudan army, were used by Captain Lugard to conquer Uganda: They were recruited into British armies to come in and conquer Uganda. This formed the core of the Uganda Rifles of 1895. Now, the theory behind this was, that the Nubians constituted the best material for soldiering, according to the theory that there are “martial races.”

According to this British theory, as described in *The Colonial Roots of Internal Conflict* by Samwirir Lwanga-Lunyiigo, “The central African races were seen as possessing military qualities in direct proportion to the amount of influence left by foreign invaders. In the Uganda context, the Nilotic and Sudanic tribes of northern Uganda show signs of the effects of former Asiatic invasions, to which they owe their warlike characteristics.” This is what the British told the northern Ugandans and the southern Sudanese that they were really all about.

Then, these people were used against southern Uganda. Meanwhile, in Buganda and other tribal kingdoms, the British, as they left, set these kingdoms up, particularly Buganda in the south, as a sovereign country, almost within Uganda itself, that is, giving it special treatment, and gave it its own bloc in the parliament. Meanwhile, economy: While using the people in the north as their armies, they developed the south to some extent. They permitted cotton production: This is where most of the agriculture production of the country was taking place; this is where the wealth of Uganda was coming from. They would have laborers come in from the north to work on the farms in the south, in the plantations in the south. When some dopey British administrator in the north tried to set up some cotton production up there, he was told, “Don’t do this! This is a *non*-productive zone, in the north. And these things are only permitted to take place in the south.”

So, the north was left underdeveloped, relatively speaking; the south was built up; and, as the British left, they created all these divisions, which meant that it was extremely difficult for Uganda to come together as a nation.

Museveni’s march against Sudan

Today, Museveni believes that he speaks for the people of the south; and he has, since he’s been in power in 1986, turned the army into a southern-based army, and most of the officers are from his own, particular Bahima group. This army has been used, constantly, to back up the southern Sudanese and Francis Deng in their fight for a separate Sudan; to destroy the potential of Sudan to develop as a nation-state, which would be a model for every single nation in that region, as to how they can independently develop. Idi Amin was put in power, because *he agreed* to march on Sudan. Milton Obote, the person he couped, would not.

Museveni was given backing, in the bush in 1983, when he fought against Mobote again (he didn’t like the election results, so he decided to go to war); and, in the bush, he had very little until *after* a new Sudan war broke out in 1983, and

then Museveni was able to meet with Lord Peter Carrington in London; he got money; he got backing; and then he came to power in 1986 in *order to ensure* the British march on Sudan from Uganda.

That war, that continuous war, which is now in its 14th year in southern Sudan, has resulted in the uprooting of millions of people there. We can recall the terrible famine and hunger that existed there in 1985, due to this war: This has resulted in the deaths of far more than a million people.

And this is done in the name of an “African identity.”

Museveni himself is a believer in this British-hatched concept of an African identity, which has nothing to do with being a human being. I had the occasion to speak to a representative of the Sudanese People’s Liberation Army at a conference in Washington, with a member of the Ugandan Embassy, who is a Museveni toady. This person from the SPLA is a little bit high-strung and he sputtered to me, “The problem is, they want us to become Muslims!”

And I said, “Come on, this just simply is not the case. There is freedom of religion in Sudan, and you know that.”

And he said, “No, no, no! They want us to become Muslims, and we’re *Africans!*”

And I said, “What do you mean, you’re Africans?”

And he says, “Well, we’re *Africans!*”

And I said, “You mean, you can’t be Muslim and be an African?”

And he said, “That’s right!”

This is demographically absurd, since probably one-third of sub-Saharan Africa, not counting Sudan, is Muslim. But, this fantasy is inculcated in the brain of these Garang-backers in southern Sudan, and this is backed 100% by Museveni, and he has given speeches on this point at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, and miraculously, wasn’t laughed off the stage.

Nyerere’s Kindergarten

In the post-colonial era, the center for this “African identity” is the Dar Es Salaam University of Tanzania. The SPLA’s Garang, Museveni, Eritrea’s Isaias Afwerki, and many other guerrillas come out of the Dar Es Salaam University—or, “Nyerere’s Kindergarten,” in reference to former Tanzanian President Julius Nyerere, who is a sly perpetrator of genocide—not carrying it out openly, but, nevertheless, very effectively.

Museveni, who had some trouble in elementary school, according to his autobiography, decided to go to Dar Es Salaam as opposed to Makerere University in Kampala, one of the finest universities in all of Africa, because he didn’t find studying civilization “relevant.” In Dar Es Salaam there was no such danger; students were fed a steady diet of Marx, Franz Fanon, and Lenin.

At Dar Es Salaam, Museveni and his friends founded something called the “University Students African Revolutionary Front.” This front included John Garang, of the Suda-

nese People's Liberation Army, and Museveni writes in his autobiography: "We also invited other revolutionaries from other parts of the world—people like Stokely Carmichael, now Kwame Torre, whom we invited specifically from the United States"—the conjurer of "Black Power" who was deployed to destroy the civil rights movement of Martin Luther King.

This meeting of Stokely Carmichael and Yoweri Museveni makes perfect sense—because they both represent precisely this type of mentality, an identity based on your *particular* differences. You can imagine these people getting differences down to an identity based on all those people who have a mole on their left chin; or have a particular identity. How narrow an identity can you get; how far can one dissect oneself, and say, "This is where I stand; *this* is my identity"?

Well, it can go into infinity: in reality, into a bad infinity; because, once you have rejected a *human* identity, as in the image of God, and rejected the idea that identity rests in every other person in the world, by virtue of being a person, by virtue of being a human being; if you have rejected that idea, then you have created the basis for war, you have created the basis for exterminations, you have created the basis for Nazism; you have created the basis for any horror you can think of.

And that is what has unfolded in only the 11 years that Yoweri Museveni has been in power, *but* with the backing of people who say, "*We* have the right to rule the world. We are the British oligarchy. And it is *our* right to dictate how things will go. The rest of the world is serfs to us, including Americans; including citizens of our own country; including everybody in Europe, everybody in Asia—those are our serfs." Or, as one British oligarch referred to humanity: "the great unwashed."

It is precisely lawful, therefore, that we find the descendants—the ideological clones, so to speak—of Stokely Carmichael *backing* Laurent Kabila today, from the United States; and who say, "This is the Great Liberator from the tyrant Mobutu."

The crisis today

This clash of worldviews has reached an absolute, final showdown in Africa. What the British are saying, now, is that, out of the failed states of Africa—states which were designed, as they were given independence, *to* fail, and were given *no help* whatsoever—that we have to reconstitute these failed states in the image of Museveni's and London's Uganda. What do we have there? We have a mercenary army; the Ugandan, the Rwandan, and the Burundian armies, are nothing but mercenary armies. They have nothing to do with the national interests of the countries whose insignia they wear. We have a breakdown of all social services—there are no social services in Uganda. Uganda has the fastest-declining life-expectancy of any country in Africa, which is unbeliev-

able, because, in the early 1960s, Milton Obote gave Uganda the finest medical services of any country in Africa, next to South Africa. And the life-expectancy leaped upward, right after independence.

We have a looters' paradise, where there are tax holidays, full foreign ownership, full repatriation of profits—so everything goes *out* of the country. This is the new state, the new model of what Africa is supposed to look like.

As the poet of freedom Friedrich Schiller said, "There is a limit to a tyrant's power," and we hear this even from Uganda, today, as more and more people there cannot understand why their sons should die in wars of extermination against their neighbors.

As we look to build an African civil rights movement, we have only to look to the Declaration of Independence and the purpose of government to secure the rights which Martin Luther King discussed; and, also to the Preamble of the Constitution, which says that, "We the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union." A more perfect union, of greater perfection, of the greater development of each individual, as opposed to debating whether or not the exclusive identities of tribes, ethnic designations and religions, will clash or accommodate. This is the question that has now been called, and it has not only been called in Africa, it has been called for us.

EIR Audio Report

Your weekly antidote
for New World Order 'news'

Exclusive news reports and interviews
Audio statements by Lyndon LaRouche

Updates on:

- The Real Economy
- Science and Technology
- The Fight for Constitutional Law
- The Right to Life
- Food and Agriculture
- The Arts
- The Living History of the American Republic
- Essential Reports from around the Globe

\$500 for 50 Issues

An hour-long audio cassette sent by first-class mail each week. Includes cover letter with contents.

Make checks payable to:

EIR News Service

P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

Phone: (703) 777-9451

Fax: (703) 771-9492