

## EIR Feature

# The war against the British Empire can be won

by Muriel Mirak Weissbach

With its proxy invasion of Sudan, the British Empire, or, as it is politely known today, the British Commonwealth, has launched an aggressive war against a sovereign nation, as part of its broader operation aimed at destroying sub-Saharan Africa as a whole. By so doing, the British Empire has defined itself as the enemy of humanity, and has drawn a river of blood between it and mankind. This is the evaluation of Lyndon LaRouche, who is leading a political drive in the United States, to stop the British game plan at all costs, and to hold its operatives, both in the war arena and among the politicians of the United States, accountable to the statutes of Nuremberg, as perpetrators of crimes against humanity.

There is no doubt that the British Empire is behind the rampage in Africa, as we documented in our last issue (*EIR*, Jan. 24, "British Oligarchy Launches New War Against Sudan"). Nor is there any doubt that the British are fully aware of the fact, that what they are attempting to accomplish, in redrawing the map of a depopulated Africa, constitutes a repetition of the nineteenth-century "scramble for Africa," which they, the British, at that time spearheaded. In an article in the Jan. 17 London *Times*, the Foreign Office, for which it speaks, openly bragged of its role.

The article, entitled "Africa's Ex-Rebels Go Back to War Against New Foes," is worth quoting at some length. Its author, Sam Kiley, is a man who predicted, in December 1995, that in 1996 there would be a war against Sudan with the secret backing of the United Kingdom and the United States. Kiley, speaking of the hostilities against Zaire, out of Uganda and Rwanda, and, now, against Sudan, out of Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Uganda, writes, "The leaders of four African countries have launched a cross-border military purge of their enemies. The coordinated effort could undermine French influence in East and Central Africa and confirm fears in Paris of an 'anglophone conspiracy' in the region."

Kiley explains, "President [Yoweri] Museveni of Uganda, who arrived in London for a private conference last night, is at the center of the initiative, which is



*A cartoon, entitled "The Rhodes Colossus," from approximately 1895, depicting Cecil Rhodes's desire to dominate the continent of Africa. Today, the new British Empire, known as the British Commonwealth, is trying to reassert colonial control.*

based on friendships between African guerrillas-turned-politicians, forged in conflict and in student digs in the 1970s." The others are Paul Kagame, the Rwandan vice-president, minister of defense, and former military intelligence chief for Museveni; Eritrean President Isaias Afwerki; and Ethiopian President Meles Zenawi, who all "brought down dictatorships . . . in the 1980s and 1990s." Now, "with the enthusiastic backing of the United States and the quiet approval of Britain, they are . . . retaliating against neighboring states which have been harboring rebel groups opposed to them—taking their

cue from Washington's frequent demand that 'Africans find solutions to Africa's problems.' They are doing so by, in turn, assisting rebels against the governments of those countries."

Kiley belabors the point, that these four are driving events in the Great Lakes region and Sudan: "This week the Sudanese People's Liberation Army (SPLA) led by John Garang, a longtime colleague of Mr. Museveni and Major-General Kagame, has won remarkable victories against Khartoum's army on the borders with Eritrea and Ethiopia. Both countries have denied any involvement with the SPLA, *but Eritrean*

and Ethiopian officers have been seen commanding SPLA soldiers.” Kiley quotes an unidentified “African diplomat” to the effect that “there is no way that the SPLA are not being supported by the Eritreans and the Ethiopians. Their help could turn around the civil war in Sudan” and lead to the overthrow of the Khartoum regime. Kiley points out, also, that although Uganda and Rwanda deny involvement in the “uprising by rebels in eastern Zaire,” the opposite is true: “On the front line, however, *soldiers freely admit that they were trained in Rwanda and served in the Rwandan army. Some even spoke only Ugandan languages, such as Acholi*” (emphases added). Kiley comments, “This complex web of overlapping civil wars has resulted in a spread of the English language in Zaire, traditionally an area of French influence,” and concludes with the historical point: “Since French soldiers were forced to surrender Fashoda to the British under Lord Kitchener in 1898, the army and hard-line elements in the Elysee Palace have been obsessed with the spread of Anglo-Saxon influence in Central Africa. Recent events have reinforced their conspiracy theories.”

### Strategy sessions in London

The accuracy of Kiley’s account was confirmed by developments on the ground in the war zones, as well as in the political and military strategy sessions since the Jan. 12 invasion. Just days later, on Jan. 16, Ugandan dictator Museveni appeared in London for a five-day, “private” visit, during which he met with British Foreign Minister (and former Defense Minister) Malcolm Rifkind, as well as Baroness Lynda Chalker, the Colonial Secretary who is called Overseas Development Minister. Chalker, who is the controller of Museveni for British intelligence, had been in Ethiopia in December, just prior to the invasion. Museveni also attended a conference of the Ditchley Foundation, an organization of the British elite which is closely linked to the Royal Institute for International Affairs. There were unconfirmed reports, as well, that the other three front-line states were represented in London. What is certain, however, is that a meeting took place in the Ethiopian capital, Addis Ababa, during roughly the same time frame, with the defense ministers of Eritrea and Ethiopia, and the Ugandan chief of staff. Both gatherings focussed on the next stage of the operation against Sudan.

(What is also certain is that Museveni was delivered a message that he could not misunderstand, during his sojourn in London. In the *Sunday Telegraph* of Jan. 19, appeared an article, entitled “Churchill Sent RAF Hero to Grab King,” which tells how Churchill’s government dealt with African leaders who had a mind of their own. “King Freddie, known as the Kabaka, had angered [the governor of the protectorate] Sir Andrew [Cohen] by calling for independence for Buganda, one of Uganda’s four ancient kingdoms, and for opposing a federation of East African countries.” A top Royal Air Force pilot was deployed to bag King Freddie, and fly him to Britain, where he was given a life of luxury. He was then

permitted to return to power in 1955, as Kabaka of Buganda, and, in 1962, with independence, to become President, until he was overthrown in 1966, and exiled to London, where he died, penniless, at the age of 45.

If Museveni had any qualms about carrying out the plans against Sudan and Zaire, which the British presented him with in London, he must have thought twice.)

### The situation on the ground

On the ground, the invading forces of Ethiopia had taken the two border towns of Qasam and Kurmuk, on Jan. 12. The attack against the two positions, guarded by garrisons of 200 Sudanese soldiers, had been preceded by massive artillery barrages, from inside Ethiopia. According to the document presented by Sudan’s Minister of External Relations, Ali Osman Mohamed Taha, one day later, there was heavy shelling with 120 and 130 mm artillery and 122 mm artillery ballistic missiles, for six hours, which destroyed the town of Kurmuk, which is the capital of Kurmuk province in the Blue Nile State. The towns of Gizan, Yarada, and Menza were also shelled. Then, an infantry division, with 22 Ethiopian tanks and 6,000 Ethiopian troops, invaded and occupied the towns. With the Ethiopians, who were mainly members of the Tigrean People’s Liberation Front, the formation which constitutes Zenawi’s military base, were a handful of SPLA soldiers. The amount and type of weaponry, as well as the tactics used by the invading force, prove that it could not have been the SPLA, which has been reduced to a tiny number of troops. Further material proof of the identity of the invaders came with the destruction of an Ethiopian tank, by the Sudanese, and the capture of Ethiopian and Eritrean prisoners. The Sudanese ambassador to London, told a press conference there on Jan. 20, that some of the invaders were “white,” and probably not even Africans.

In order to camouflage the attack as an SPLA initiative, the Ethiopians immediately set to the task of flying in SPLA soldiers, from their bases in Uganda and Ethiopia, to take up positions in the two captured towns. This cosmetic operation was carried out, while the United Nations Security Council refused to hear the case presented by Sudan, claiming it were an internal affair, and the international press filed reports—none of them from the actual site of the conflict—claiming the “SPLA rebels” were advancing at a brisk clip, toward the strategic city of Damazin, which supplies the Sudanese capital Khartoum with 80% of its water and electricity. Although Reuters et al. carefully noted in their wires, that there was “no independent confirmation” of the claims of the so-called “rebels,” yet the stories continued to flood the media.

One reason for the press lies was dictated by the British war strategy: to exert military pressure from three fronts, Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Uganda, to effect a political upheaval in the capital. Knowing that there is no way, militarily, that the SPLA could mount a serious assault on Khartoum—indeed, no way that it could even muster the troops to occupy the

## Waging aggressive war is a 'Nuremberg Crime'

Planning and initiating aggressive war is a "Nuremberg Crime," as was defined by the four-power agreement creating the International Military Tribunal, signed on Aug. 8, 1945 in London. This agreement, signed by the United States, Britain, France, and the Soviet Union, which is sometimes called the "London Charter," included the following provision:

"II. Jurisdiction and General Principles

"Article 6

"The following acts, or any of them, are crimes coming within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal for which there shall be individual responsibility:

"(a) *Crimes against peace*: namely, planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a war of aggression, or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements or assurances, or participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the foregoing; . . .

"(b) *War crimes*: . . .

"(c) *Crimes against humanity*: . . .

"Leaders, organisers, instigators and accomplices participating in the formulation or execution of a common plan or conspiracy to commit any of the foregoing crimes are responsible for all acts performed by any persons in execution of such plans."

The first Nuremberg indictment, in October 1945, for the trials of the major Nazi war criminals, contained four counts: 1) Conspiracy, 2) Crimes against Peace, 3) War Crimes, and 4) Crimes against Humanity.

Count Two read: "All the defendants with divers other persons during a period of years preceding 8 May 1945 participated in planning, preparation, initiation, and waging wars of aggression which were also wars in violation of international treaties, agreements and assurances."

Twelve of the 22 defendants who were tried, were convicted on Count Two, in various combinations with other counts. Seven were sentenced to death by hanging, the other five were given sentences of imprisonment ranging from 10 years to life.

The principles of law recognized in the Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal were incorporated into Control Council Law No. 10 for occupied Germany, and were formally affirmed by the United Nations General Assembly in 1946.

towns which Ethiopia would like to conquer—the British are counting on psychological warfare to tip the balance. Their gamble is that, if the international media project a convincing enough image of an invincible invading force, then people opposed to the government will be encouraged to rise up against it and overthrow it. The British agent who is functioning as the "political opposition leader," Sadiq al-Mahdi, thus issued calls, following the invasion, for the opposition to prepare to launch an uprising in the capital. Speaking to the United Arab Emirates weekly *Al-Shuruq*, on his way to Mecca, al-Mahdi said, "A popular uprising will erupt at a given time to rid Sudan of this regime. The opposition has started to get ready to take part in military action. The armed forces will play an important role." He continued, "If it is possible to get rid of the regime peacefully, so much the better. But I can say that none of Sudan's neighbors is disposed to support it any more." Contradicting earlier claims that he would preserve the unity of the country, al-Mahdi was quoted in other Arabic press, saying that a referendum with "our brothers in the south" would have to be held, because "we cannot take for granted that unity between north and south will continue, as if nothing had happened."

Thus, the military and political organization of the anti-Sudan war is, as the Foreign Office bragged in Kiley's *Times* piece, controlled by the British top-down. The only piece of camouflage in that account, is the inference that the United

States is the "enthusiastic" initiator, and the U.K., a mere follower.

### The fallacies in British strategic thinking

But despite the arrogant bravado, the reality of the situation, even militarily, is not quite as Kiley or his Foreign Office higher-ups would have it. The situation of Egypt epitomizes the fallacies in British strategic thinking in this case. Sudanese Vice President al-Zubeir Mohammed Saleh, met with Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak on Jan. 16, in the course of his tour of Arab and Islamic capitals, to brief governments on the aggression. Following the closed-door session, Minister Saleh was reportedly pleased with the Egyptian response, which, he said, "underlined its support to the unity of Sudan. . . . The picture of what is going on following the Ethiopian invasion and on what is happening in east Sudan was clear to the Egyptians and the viewpoints were identical."

However, two days later, Mubarak himself announced, that he viewed the matter as internal "squabbling" among Sudanese, and categorically declared, "There is no Eritrean or Ethiopian attack or any foreign attack." Mubarak's about-face provoked anger, not only among the Sudanese, but also within Egypt, where an opposition rally, called on Jan. 19 to express solidarity with the Sudanese government's resistance, attracted up to 5,000 people. Jordan, Yemen, Iraq, the U.A.E., Qatar, Syria, numerous Arabic newspapers, and the



*Sudanese citizens in Khartoum celebrate the results of their democratic election in March 1996. It was the first direct election for the President, putting the lie to British propaganda that Sudan is a dictatorship.*

Iranians, all declared their firm support for Sudan, and many of them voiced their disgust with Mubarak. Whatever may have prompted the Egyptian President to talk out of both sides of his mouth at once, he is well aware of the fact, that, were the aggression against Sudan to escalate into a full-fledged foreign takeover, or a break-up of the country which would threaten Egypt directly, he would be forced to intervene in Khartoum's defense, or to pay the price of betrayal, in the form of a military coup. Mubarak knows this, the Sudanese know it, and the British should know it.

### **Historical precedents may haunt the British**

The other crucial fact which must be examined, to understand the vulnerability of the British approach, is historical. The *Times* article quite correctly stresses, that the British are consciously trying to repeat their nineteenth-century adventures. Yet, they may end up repeating parts of it they would rather forget.

The British ruled over Sudan during the last century, first indirectly, through influence over the Ottoman Empire, then directly, beginning in 1882. In 1881, the Egyptian nationalist Col. Ahmad Urabi led a revolt and, in the same year, Dungleawi Muhammad Ahmad b. 'Abdallah, a charismatic religious figure in Sudan, announced that he was the "Mahdi," or expected savior, and united tribal groups into a national force. The British took direct control over Egypt, which it occupied in 1882, and, thus, ruled the Sudan as well, through Cairo. The

British immediately organized two expeditions into Sudan to eliminate the new movement, both of which failed miserably. The two expeditions were those of Col. William Hicks and the hero, Charles "Chinese" Gordon, nicknamed for his success in defeating the Taiping rebellion in China.

Hicks, though equipped with 10,000 men, had no experience in the terrain, and his contingent proved to be an easy target for the Mahdi's forces. Suffering from lack of food and water, and infiltrated by Sudanese agents, Hicks and his troops were harassed, their communications cut, and they were militarily wiped out in November 1883 at Shaykan.

Gordon, who had been governor of the Sudan from 1877 to 1880, was called on by the British government in 1884, to arrange for the evacuation of Egyptian officers and civilians from Sudan. Initially, in March 1884, Gordon tried to corrupt his adversary, by offering the Mahdi the position of sultan of Kordofan, which the religious leader spurned and ridiculed. By April, the Mahdi had decided to organize the siege of Khartoum where Gordon was headquartered, and proceeded throughout the summer, to isolate and encircle the British. In September, Gordon sent the British and French consuls down the Nile on a steamer, in an attempt to run the blockade of the Mahdist forces, and to get news of the situation of besieged Khartoum to the world. The steamer was attacked and all the Europeans were killed. In October, the Mahdi moved with his forces to Omdurman, preparing for the assault on nearby Khartoum. Finally, the British government decided to send a

relief expedition, but by the time the steamers actually reached Khartoum, on Jan. 28, 1885, the British officers saw no Egyptian flag flying, and concluded, correctly, that the city had fallen to the Mahdi. The steamers turned around and fled.

As for Gordon, he was killed on the staircase of his palace, which is today the President's palace. The dead Gordon became an object of hero-worship in Britain, mostly for the purpose of whipping up jingoistic support for an expedition under Kitchener, to destroy the Mahdia state and the Sudan.

The Sudanese state continued to exist as a national institution after the Mahdi's death, under his successor, known as the Khalifa, despite tremendous hardship, epidemics, and famines. British intelligence reports of the period by Sir Reginald Wingate, document the sense of national unity that remained strong among the people. The British decided to send Kitchener in, to destroy the Sudanese state, and take direct control over the Upper Nile. They knew, as they know today, that whoever controls the Upper Nile, controls Sudan and Egypt. In 1890, the British signed a deal with the Germans, establishing a British sphere of influence over Uganda and Kenya, up "to the confines of Egypt" in the north. From 1890 to 1898, the Belgians intervened, and, thanks to the Berlin Conference's recognition of its sovereignty over the Congo, moved in to claim control over the Upper Nile. The Khalifa's forces responded, and defeated the Egyptian proxy there who had made an agreement with the Belgians, to divide up the territory.

The British decision to invade to reconquer Dongola province was communicated in a telegram to Kitchener on March 13, 1896. The date is important, because the French Foreign Ministry, which had decided to send its own expedition to the Upper Nile in November 1895, issued the final draft for it to Capt. Jean-Baptiste Marchand, on Feb. 24, 1896. The news of the final draft must have reached Britain right away, and just two weeks later, Kitchener received his orders.

The French, fully aware of British intentions in the Upper Nile, wanted to shore up the Mahdia state until they could secure their position in the Upper Nile through Marchand's expedition. The French, in fact, were willing to offer the Khalifa a protectorate, for his collaboration, which he refused.

Kitchener's invasion was planned, so as to avoid the pitfalls of the previous fiascos. A railroad line from the Red Sea to Abu Hamed was built, as a supply line for his army, and a British-Egyptian force was equipped with vastly superior military means.

Knowing that the attack was coming, the Khalifa had concentrated his forces in Omdurman, and had begun to build defenses around the city. In September 1898, as the French Marchand was secure in Fashoda, the British marched hurriedly on Omdurman with 25,800 men. Kitchener had 44 guns and 20 machine-guns on land, plus 36 guns and 24 machine-guns on the gunboats. The British had the Martini-Henry .450, fast-firing Maxim Nordenfeldts, and Krupp cannon. Despite their obvious, hopeless inferiority as far as weaponry was

concerned, the Mahdist forces' strategy was to attack, and, in some cases, as under the leadership of Osman Digna, they succeeded in routing the British.

The final battle, on Sept. 2, 1898 at Omdurman, was between a vastly superior British forces with gunboats and machine-guns, and a Sudanese force which, though outranked, resisted to the end. About 11,000 Sudanese were killed and 16,000 wounded in a few hours of British assault.

The British defeat of the Sudanese was part and parcel of the British confrontation with the French at Fashoda, where the latter capitulated, and in March 1899, renounced their claims there. That was the beginning of the Entente Cordiale. In January 1899, Kitchener's forces signed the Condominium Agreement with Butros Ghali, grandfather of the former UN secretary general. Yet, revolts in both Sudan and Egypt followed, and the British realized that they must find and kill the Khalifa, who had eluded them at Omdurman. This they did, after months of tracking him, and, in typical British fashion, shot him and his followers in the back, while they were at prayer.

### **Friction within the Entente Cordiale**

What the British would like to repeat today, as stated in so many words in the *Times* piece, is the elimination of Sudan as a nation, and the capitulation of the French to total British hegemony. This is not only the case vis-à-vis Sudan, with whom the French have established good trade relations recently, but also regarding Zaire, formerly francophone, which London wants to reorganize as an anglophone possession. Up until the British unleashed the assault against Zaire, Paris had been acquiescing to the junior partner status London had accorded it in the new Entente Cordiale. But, because Britain has infringed so flagrantly on its sphere of influence in Zaire, the French have begun to fight back, if not militarily, at least through a kind of intelligence warfare, exposing the sordid reality of British manipulation (see p. 42). France was not in agreement with the British, that the UN Security Council should ignore the Sudanese demand for a debate and action. Given the existence of frictions with the British elsewhere, including on the European stage, as well as in Iraq and in the Middle East, a repetition of Fashoda *tout court* is not to be taken for granted.

As for the destruction of Sudan, and its break-up into several ethnically defined "micro-states," according to the designs of Baroness Cox's Christian Solidarity International (CSI), the British believe, almost superstitiously, that it can be easily secured. With their keen sense of history, they have arranged to recruit as their agent, the grandson of the very man, the Mahdi, who killed Lord Gordon. Sadiq al-Mahdi has been their man, actually since the early days of the Umma party, founded with British help. And with their fine sense of historical symmetry, they have arranged to schedule their attempted reconquest of Sudan, almost exactly 100 years later. Instead of the pedophiles Gordon, Hicks, and Kitchener,

this time they have preferred to deploy the Ladies, Cox and Chalker, perhaps in deference to modern women's rights movements.

### The situation is not the same

Yet, the situation is not, cannot be, the same. The Sadiq al-Mahdi they own today, does not have the charisma of his ancestor, nor, apparently, the religious zeal or integrity, although he is reputed to be someone who expects to be treated like a deity, with a kiss of the hand and all. In point of fact, even the merger arranged by the British and executed by the Eritreans, between Mahdi's political opposition, such as it is, and the military wing of the rebels, under John Garang, is falling apart. Mahdi's calls for insurrection have fallen on deaf ears in Khartoum, for several reasons. First, since he left his country, to take up quarters with a government which is supporting an invasion of the Sudan, he has lost whatever credibility he claimed, as a national figure. Second, and more to the point, the fact of the foreign invasion has rallied the Sudanese population to defense of the nation, quite contrary to the British hopes for exacerbated internal conflict. According to reports from inside the country, the "uprising" Sadiq al-Mahdi has been repeatedly urging, has not materialized; in its place, there has been a mobilization of Sudanese, both political and military, in defense of the state, against foreign aggression.

The point which the British have not grasped from the historical precedent is precisely this: There are social processes which defy the laws of political manipulation.

One final point on the historical issue pertains to the United States. If one reaches back into the last century, as the British oligarchy seems to be encouraging, one is faced with the incontrovertible fact that the role of the United States, then, was not that of cheerleader or bankroller for British imperial escapades. As recently as the Presidency of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the line was drawn between Washington and London, precisely around FDR's refusal to accept such British imperial methods. Today, it is not only or primarily the French whom the British wish to cast as junior partner in their reestablishment of the Empire, but the United States itself. In the case of Africa policy, emphatically, policy toward Sudan, they have succeeded in recruiting a pack of willing scoundrels, lined up in Cox's CSI, and deployed through the Congress to wage psychological warfare. They have used their control over mass media, to propagate the slanders against their target, Sudan, much in the way that their intelligence chief Wingate did 100 years ago. But they have not established total control over the internal political process of the country, and have not squelched political debate.

To the extent that the truth about the British strategy, policy, and activity in Africa emerges, as it has particularly through *EIR*, a serious offensive against it can be mounted within the United States, and internationally. With this issue of *EIR*, we wish to initiate the war against the British Empire.

### Map Key

The Inter-Governmental Authority on Drought and Development (IGADD) has been organized by the U.S. State Department and the British House of Lords to function against Sudan. "Friends of IGADD" are the enforcers for this policy, and are: the United States, Britain, the Netherlands, Italy, and Canada, with Germany and Sweden as observers.

- ① Oct. 1, 1990: The Ugandan Army, operating under the political title of the Rwandan Patriotic Front, invades Rwanda. The invasion is stalled by Zairean, French, and Rwandan troops, but the RPF continues to occupy a northern section of the country.
- ② October 1993: An attempted military coup in Burundi by the Tutsi military results in the murder of the Burundian elected President Melchior Ndayaye, and results in the slaughter of nearly 100,000 people in Burundi.
- ③ April 6, 1994: In the immediate hours after the plane carrying Rwandan President Juvenal Habyarimana was shot down, the Ugandan-Rwandan RPF conducted a blitzkrieg through Rwanda—an invasion that resulted in the mass slaughter of 1 million in Rwanda, of which both Tutsis and Hutus were the victims.
- ④ October 1995: Ugandan troops operating under the political cover of John Garang's Sudanese People's Liberation Army invade southern Sudan, with the goal of taking the southern city of Juba. The operation fails, with the reported loss of many Ugandan troops. Garang is once again pushed back to the Ugandan-Sudan border.
- ⑤ October 1995: Ugandan troops maraud Kenya, at the point that Kenyan President Daniel arap Moi is in a public brawl with Baroness Lynda Chalker.
- ⑥ Dec. 17, 1995: Eritrean forces invade and seize the strategic Hanish Islands in the Red Sea, which were territory of Yemen.
- ⑦ July 1996: Coup by Tutsi military in Burundi consolidates Burundi as marcher-lord state for venture in Zaire to follow.
- ⑧ August 1996: Ethiopian troops invade southwestern Somalia, seizing the towns of Dolo and Mandara, in operations against the Somali Ittihad group. Ethiopia also bombs Kenyan towns in the area.
- ⑨ Oct. 21, 1996: Rwandan, Burundian, and Ugandan troops operating under the political cover of the Zairean Alliance of Democratic Forces of mercenary Laurent Kabila, invade Zaire. The invasion has multiple purposes: 1) The invaders attack the Rwandan and Burundian Hutu refugee camps in Goma, Uvira, Butembo, and Magungu, forcing hundreds of thousands of refugees back to Rwanda and Burundi against their will. Fighting-age men and boys are screened out of the return process, with many reported killed or "disappeared." 2) It succeeds in hiving off a significant section of eastern Zaire, placing it under military forces deployed by the British Commonwealth and Privy Council, with Baroness Lynda Chalker's oversight of Ugandan President Yoweri Museveni the critical link. Uganda had been training Kabila et al.