

Rwandan puppet provokes fracas at Washington think-tank seminar

by Linda de Hoyos

A seminar at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Washington, D.C., turned into a near brawl on Oct. 25. The occasion was the presence of Dr. Emile Ilunga, president of the Rally for Congolese Democracy (RCD), the so-called rebel force in eastern Congo which is militarily backed and supplied by the Rwandan regime of Paul Kagame.

The atmosphere for confrontation was first set by the Center itself, when event chairman Tony Smith announced to the audience of 100 people that this time, questions must be written down and submitted to the CSIS staff. This elicited a sharp protest from Ambassador Hank Cohen, a former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, who queried: "Why doesn't Dr. Ilunga want any dialogue with the audience? I've been to CSIS events for 15 years, and we've never had this procedure before." Chairman Smith, in defiance of the recollections of most present, claimed that question-writing was the usual CSIS custom. The CSIS maintained its strong-arm defense Dr. Ilunga, and of the London-scripted policy of the Clinton administration to back him, throughout.

The next ingredients for confrontation were supplied by Dr. Ilunga himself, who was flanked by two assistants, one of whom translated from the French for the heavy-set chairman. Ilunga began by unfolding a map of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (D.R.C.), showing the current military divisions of the country. Northeastern Congo is controlled by the Bemba rebel group, backed by Ugandan forces; the northwest is controlled by Ugandan forces directly; and the central and eastern section is controlled by the RCD, he said. This signalled Ilunga's disingenuousness right off the bat, as he failed to mention that the RCD is backed up by the Rwandan Patriotic Army, whose genocidal record in eastern Congo is now common knowledge.

Despite this, Ilunga called the war in the Congo a "civil war." The RCD chairman said that he had come to the United States with a "peace message": Without the aid of the international community, especially the United States, Ilunga said, there cannot be implementation of the Lusaka accords. The Lusaka accords will be very difficult to implement anyway, Ilunga noted, because all the interests of the parties involved differed. Some, he said, were just after gold and diamonds.

The Lusaka accords, as *EIR* has exposed, do not provide

for peace in the Congo, but call for a Joint Military Commission to disarm by force all "non-state actors" in the area. This includes those Congolese forces in the region who oppose the Ugandan-Rwandan invasion of their land, as well as Rwandan rebel groups who oppose the murderous Kagame regime. Ilunga lamented that only the Zambian government had given any support to the Joint Military Commission which is to carry out the "disarming." The Commission is composed of all the forces currently in the Congo—the D.R.C., Uganda, Rwanda, Zimbabwe, Namibia, and Angola.

The many questions directed at Ilunga were then edited and filtered through the chair. The first question centered on how the RCD proposed to maintain the Congo's unity. Ilunga claimed that the RCD wants the unity of the Congo; however, he made no attempt to say how this might be brought about, and his map instead pointed to the Congo's permanent balkanization. Further, Ilunga noted smugly that the D.R.C. government of President Laurent Kabila would never be able to retake the territory that it had lost.

Support for RCD is 'weak'

On whether or not the RCD has any support from the Congolese people, Ilunga answered that it was "*faible*," which was translated as "not as much as we had hoped for." At this point, Ambassador Cohen, who is an official lobbyist for President Kabila in Washington, denounced the translator from the floor, noting that *faible* means "weak," with a shouting match among Cohen, the chair, the translator, and members of the audience ensuing for several minutes on this point.

At any rate, Ilunga said, "winning support is a process." He was then followed by his financial "minister," Alexis Thwambe, who was more direct: "The Congolese people wanted a change from the Kabila system, but they did not want war. Since we have taken up arms, that has given us the possibility of changing the system. Without taking up arms . . . we would not have the Lusaka accords which brings in the international community and will put an end to the Kabila dictatorship," he said.

Questions continued. Did Dr. Ilunga consider the invasion of the Congo by Rwanda and Uganda to be illegal? To this the RCD chairman answered that it was Kabila who calls it

an invasion. The Lusaka accords, he said, make no reference to any invasion by Uganda and Rwanda. This absurd answer—given that his map designated a third of the country under the control of Ugandan troops—prompted the first protest from a Congolese in the audience, who pointed out that the United Nations had said that there was an invasion of the Congo! To this, Dr. Ilunga gave further provocation by saying that if the allies of Kabila were removed from the Congo—Zimbabwe, Namibia, and Angola—then the RCD would soon be in Kinshasa, the Congo's capital.

Ilunga then was asked if political parties were permitted to operate in RCD-controlled areas. Before the answer came, Ambassador Cohen again interjected that the question had been translated “will be” instead of “is”—causing another uproar from the audience, the chair, and the speakers. Ilunga did manage to answer, however, that since there are “no important political figures” in the eastern Congo—such as the major opposition to Kabila in Kinshasa—there was no political pressure for parties to operate in the eastern Congo! He proclaimed that, whereas, in Kinshasa, there were political arrests every day, in “our area, there are no political prisoners”!

The next question was: Will it be possible for those Hutu rebels or Interhamwe who have been disarmed under the Lusaka accords to then live peacefully in the Congo? Dr. Ilunga answered that those Hutu rebels who are disarmed who are then convicted of genocide (in Rwanda in 1994), will return to their country to face trial. That is, they will be found guilty and then sent to trial and to their deaths in Rwanda.

The Kivu provinces

It was the last question on the unrest in the Kivus that brought the CSIS seminar to a chaotic close—after only an hour and 15 minutes. What about the problem of the Kivus? The Kivu provinces, which Ilunga's RCD controls and the Rwandan military controls, “should not enjoy special treatment,” said Ilunga. “Local problems should be dealt with.”

This caused extreme anger among numbers of the Congolese participants, especially those from the Kivu provinces. This is because the only way in which problems have been dealt with by the RCD in the Kivus is through killing, as the April report of the United Nations Special Rapporteur Roberto Garreton documented. Despite that report, the killing and massacres continue up to this day. The seminar broke down. Amidst the pandemonium, the chair thanked Dr. Ilunga for answering “such provocative questions.” Those in the room who opposed Ilunga and were out of order were confronted angrily by CSIS senior staff; those who were out of order but supported Ilunga, were never reprimanded.

Between the CSIS's attempt to stem confrontation and Ilunga's own lying justifications for invasion and mass murder in eastern Congo, the bankruptcy of the U.S. State Department's warlord policy for Africa was once again amply demonstrated.

Documentation

The RCD's record of massacres

The RCD has been reported by the Missionary News Service of Nairobi (MISNA), noted for its reliable on-the-ground reporting, to have carried out a series of massacres throughout this year against Congolese civilians in the provinces of North and South Kivu. The extent to which Rwandan national forces are responsible for the mass murders is not known. But the RCD has taken up the practice of the all-Tutsi military of Rwanda's neighbor Burundi, by which revenge is taken on the unarmed civilian population for any attacks on the military itself. The massacres in the areas of conflict have all been carried out by the RCD forces, with the one exception of the murder of more than 100 civilians in the Diocese of Bongo in northeastern Congo on July 22, carried out by Congolese soldiers on the eve of the area's takeover by the Ugandan military. Since January, MISNA has reported the following massacres as being carried out by the RCD:

Dec. 30-Jan. 1, Makabola: “Well above 500” people were killed over the holiday by RCD forces in the town of Makabola. The massacre was directed by a Rwandan officer known as Shetani, who came with troops in trucks. He called the people out of hiding and then “the massacre began!” The “killing spree” lasted two days, and the town was thoroughly looted.

January-February: “According to information referred by our MISNA sources (which will remain anonymous), in the first two months of this year, 45 civilians were murdered for no reason; of which only 22 have been identified with last name and place of origin. There is also an elevated number of missing people, always in the territory conquered by the RCD and controlled by the Ugandan or Rwandan troops. During the months of January and February, our MISNA sources reported, numerous civilians were kidnapped in Burhale, Mushinga, Lubona, and Mulamba. People disappeared without a trace. As for all the civilians captured, mainly during night raids, it was done by armed factions of the RCD forces.”

March 5, Kamituga area, South Kivu: More than 100 people were killed in retaliatory massacres “perpetrated by the troops of the RCD” in the Kamituga area, including Mazozo, Lutunda, Kenge, Lulimba, Kabukungu, and two neighborhoods of Kamituga: Tangila and Kele. In addition, more deaths that took place during Feb. 11-13 were revealed. In Lukweti, Rutshuru, and Biholo, 78 people were killed between Feb. 28 and March 1, including seven women and two children.

March 19-21, Kivu: MISNA reported that more than 250 civilians were killed in retaliation for Mayi-Mayi attacks by

the RCD forces. They were carried out in two groups of villages, in Burhinyi about 80 kilometers from Bukavu, and in Ngweshe, about 40 kilometers from the city. “The victims were mainly elderly men, women, and children, killed during alleged anti-Interhamwe mop-up operations, carried out by the troops of the RCD. In the Ngweshe area, many houses were burnt to the ground. While the Reuters agency yesterday [March 23] reported a third massacre in Magunga, involving another 100 victims, carried out by a group of Mayi-Mayi hired by Rwandans.”

Sept. 13, Mwenga, South Kivu: Several dozen civilians were massacred in the Mwenga area by the RCD. Another massacre was carried out not far from Kasika; the death toll was not confirmed. The RCD attacked, in retaliation for a Mayi-Mayi assault, “all the residential areas situated along the road that takes from Vilalombili (6 kilometers from Mwenga) to Kakulu (about 20 kilometers from Mwenga). In the area of the massacre—concluded our MISNA sources—a contingent of around 1,000 Congolese soldiers enrolled by the RCD was deployed, a part of which just returned from Butare (Rwanda) where they were trained to form death squads.”

Oct. 8, Kalambi, South Kivu: “Several dozens of defenseless civilians were massacred in the Kalambi village, midway between Kasika and Mwenga (Urega, South Kivu).” The massacre was carried out in retaliation for an attack by

“Congolese nationalist partisans who control vast areas in the territory” against a “contingent of 300 RCD soldiers.”

Oct. 21, Kashambi, South Kivu: “A massacre of defenseless civilians in August 1999 in Kashambi, land of the Bavira, was only discovered today. Our MISNA sources reported that 61 people, who have been identified, were killed and buried in mass graves, later unearthed by the same sources. The victims, young and elderly men of over 80, women and children, it seems were killed and thrown in mass graves” by soldiers who were identified as being from the RCD.

Independent Congolese denounce Lusaka Accord

The following are excerpts of testimony presented by Mwabilu L. Ngoyi, president of the Congolese International Union (CIU), assisted by Dr. Kanyand Matand, CIU vice-president, and supported by Kibwit Ntet, CIU delegation to Canada, to the Africa Subcommittee of the U.S. House International Relations Committee on Sept. 28. The remarks have been slightly edited:

We are here today before you as representatives of the Congolese International Union. This union was born through the democratic process of free elections held by more than 30 groups—political parties, non-governmental organizations, and other interest groups—that gathered in Newark, New Jersey, on Sept. 18-19, 1999, in response to a conference organized by the Reformed National Convention and sponsored by Rutgers University’s Center for Global Change and Governance. The union represents a broad spectrum of political views, among which some support, and others are against, the current government. In the best interest of the Congolese people, the conference participants agreed to form a union according to the Pact of Newark. This union symbolizes the Congolese aspirations for national unity, territorial integrity, peace and stability, democracy, and development. The union is mandated to promote, support, and defend the legitimate interests of Congolese people around the world. This union is an independent body, which operates independently from the Congolese government. Therefore, we, here, assert the independence of our testimony regardless of the possibility of some commonality with the government’s view or position.

Before we proceed further with the Lusaka Accord, we would like to talk about the D.R.C.’s [Democratic Republic of the Congo] invaders.

Who are the people from Rwanda, Uganda, and Burundi? What do the invaders stand for? They stand for militarism or military politics, violence, ethnic self-serving interest, and ethnic mutual exclusion or extermination. We Congolese people believe in peace and stability for democracy. We have

The Way Out of The Crisis

A 90-minute video of highlights from *EIR*'s April 21, 1999 seminar in Bonn, Germany.

Lyndon LaRouche was the keynote speaker, in a dialogue with distinguished international panelists: **Wilhelm Hankel**, professor of economics and a former banker from Germany; **Stanislav Menshikov**, a Russian economist and journalist; Schiller Institute founder **Helga Zepp-LaRouche** from Germany; **Devendra Kaushik**, professor of Central Asian Studies from India; **Qian Jing**, international affairs analyst from China; **Natalya Vitrenko**, economist and parliamentarian from Ukraine.



Order number EIE-99-010.
\$30 postpaid.
EIR News Service
 P.O. Box 17390
 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390
 To order, call
1-888-EIR-3258 (toll-free).
 We accept Visa and MasterCard.

been fighting for it for many years. We saw that dream at our door. We were hopeful, until Rwanda interfered, to topple the former regime that shattered the Congolese dream for democracy. We . . . Congolese were trying to figure out how to revive the dream for democracy. Unfortunately, for the second time in a row, Rwanda shattered the same dream the same way. We can understand why this is happening. Governments in Rwanda, Burundi, and Uganda took power by force, and have since dragged their feet in the process of implementing democratic reforms. Therefore, it is not in the best interest of those countries to see democracy take place in Congo, because they don't want the U.S.A. to put pressure on them for democratization of their respective countries.

When [Congo] President [Laurent] Kabila took power, Rwandese, Burundian, and Ugandan troops took charge of security in the Congo, including the protection of their borders with the Congo. They failed to protect those borders. If so, why then today are Rwanda, Uganda, and Burundi manipulating the U.S.A. and the international community, telling them that they are in the Congo to secure their borders?

We are convinced that external forces, which have invaded Congo for their own interests, critically threaten Congolese interests, and we think that the American people and government have been given distorted views about the Congolese crisis. This might explain why the U.S. government has yet to forcefully respond to the suffering of Congolese people, who have always been allies to the American people.

It is with broken hearts that we remind this noble assembly that Rwanda, Uganda, and Burundi have repeatedly lied to the international community, including the American people, about the presence of their armies on Congolese territory. When they acknowledged their invasion, occupation, and administration of Congo as a colony, plundering Congolese resources, the international community commended their act in the name of peace and could not hold them accountable for their lies. When the armies of Rwanda and Uganda turned on each other in Kisangani [in September] and fought for control of Congolese resources and destroyed vaccine for Congolese children and killed innocent Congolese, the international community turned a blind eye and never condemned in no uncertain terms such criminal acts. The international community never strongly condemned the violation of international norms of human rights, international conventions, in particular the charters of the UN and OAU [Organization of African Unity] by Rwanda, Uganda, and Burundi. It is as though the international community had a short memory of Rwandese, Ugandan, and Burundian lies. It is also plausible to argue that the failure of the international community to prevent the Rwandese genocide of 1994 has generated a sense of guilt that compelled the international community to turn a blind eye not only to their lies but also to their counter-genocide of Hutu in 1996-97, enormous abuses of human rights, invasion, plundering of Congolese riches, killings of Congolese intellectuals and opponents in the Kivu province, attempts to partition Congo, and other crimes.

Your Honorable Assembly, we have the sad impression that peace in the Congo has become a hostage of disagreement between the Congolese government and the international community. We want to remind you that men die, while institutions or countries don't usually perish. It would be a grave mistake if the international community uses its dislike of, or disagreement with, against the current Congolese government or Mr. Kabila, the one who was once hailed a new breed of leader, to jeopardize the peace process, to turn a blind eye to the profound suffering of the Congolese people and the true causes of the Congolese crisis.

Problems with the Lusaka Accord

We are here to ask the American government to review with us the Lusaka Accord, which we consider a recipe for humanitarian disaster of epic proportion, and even renewed genocide that the international community would not want to face again in Central Africa. This Accord is also a recipe for, an attractive setting for groups with aims that could directly threaten U.S. interests. We, the Congolese people, are convinced that democracy is the only way to go. We fully understand that ethnic-manipulated actions are worse than any sort of dictatorship, especially in the Congo where we have 450 ethnic groups. That is the reason why, despite the lack of democracy and human rights violations in the Congo, the popularity of President Kabila has not been affected.

Problem 1: No obvious condemnation of Rwanda, Uganda, and Burundi for having invaded the D.R.C. The Lusaka Accord offers no hope to the Congolese people because it fails to consider the critical element of the current crisis, which is the illegitimate invasion of the D.R.C. by its neighbors.

Problem 2: No immediate withdrawal of invading troops. The Lusaka Accord made another critical mistake by legitimizing the invaders' stay in the D.R.C. Since Rwandese, Burundian, and Ugandan troops invaded the D.R.C., they have been abusing the Congolese people in the occupied territories. They kill innocent Congolese civilians, they rape women, they destroy economic infrastructure of the country, they destroy civilian and cultural records of the Congolese citizens, and they impose new settlements and exploit illegally the Congolese national resources. Their presence is a major hindrance to Congolese democracy. Their criminal presence denies the rights to Congolese people for self-determination, self-governance, and the pursuit of happiness and development of their own potentials as they see fit. These troops are aggressors and ought to leave the D.R.C. immediately.

Problem 3: Holding onto positions. There is no need for special training or scientific knowledge to figure out the destructive nature of the Lusaka Accord. Common sense alone is enough to realize such facts. It makes no sense that troops, which are illegally on foreign soil for their internal affairs based on their culture, should be allowed to keep their positions for several months. This is nothing else but the legitimization and rewarding of terrorist behavior. In

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