

killed in Rwanda and the thousands more forced to flee their homes, and the millions more living in total terror for their lives, under siege and without food and water, are the victims of a plot to destroy their country—originating *outside of Rwanda*. Despite Africa Watch's fulminations against Habyarimana, since 1973 the President had given Rwanda some stability and some progress in its economy and infrastructure. As in the case of Somalia, the plug was pulled on Habyarimana without any viable institution on hand to replace him.

The trouble began in 1990, when the Rwandan Patriotic Front invaded Rwanda from Uganda. The RPF, led by Paul Kagame, represented Tutsi refugees who had fled to Uganda. Kagame, who was trained in the United States, was a leading officer in the Uganda Armed Forces, and it is believed that the Tutsi refugees were an early element of Uganda President Musaveni's National Resistance Army in the early 1980s, through which Musaveni took power in Uganda in 1985.

The RPF invasion became the pretext to "internationalize" the situation in Rwanda. Habyarimana responded to the invasion by calling in French troops. For its ability to procure weapons to fight the RPF, Rwanda had to depend upon French credits. Foreign aid donors began to place pressure on Habyarimana to come to terms with the RPF and the growing "democracy movement"—aided and abetted by outfits such as Africa Watch—inside Rwanda.

In August, Habyarimana was forced into a settlement with both the RPF and the democracy movement. In September, U.N. Secretary General Boutros-Ghali initiated plans to send in a "peacekeeping force" to monitor the progress toward the transitional government. The force was comprised of French and Belgian troops, with some troops from Bangladesh and Ghana thrown in to cover for the striking presence of former colonial powers on the premises.

At the same time, Habyarimana was forced to sign a new deal with the International Monetary Fund, enforcing harsher austerity on the population to pay Rwanda's debt, which is nearly half its Gross National Product.

The April murder of the Rwandan President has now become the pretext for the international forces to leave Rwanda to its own devices. RPF forces are driving toward Kigali from the north. Armed Hutu military and gangs are meanwhile rampaging to kill any "fifth-column" Tutsi they can find—including women and children. On April 21, the U.N. Security Council agreed to reduce the U.N. "peacekeeping force" from 2,400 to 270. With the pullout, Rwanda can be expected to descend to the same type of chaos that engulfed Somalia after rebels took Mogadishu in 1990. Once the country has been reduced to such ruin, then likely Boutros-Ghali will demand that the U.N. "Blue Helmets" come back in.

As the *New York Times* illuminated the final goal in all this: "The United States and its allies have decided it would be difficult to maintain it [peace in Rwanda], without transforming the country into a United Nations trusteeship or a colonial-style administration."

Are Nigeria, Sudan threats to IMF model?

by Lydia Cherry

Recent Anglo-American attempts to brand Nigeria as a pariah regime, and a stepped-up campaign to dismember Sudan, no doubt have a lot to do with how threatened the world of Anglo-American finance is over the fact that both nations have said "No" to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) economic model.

The destabilization operation against Nigeria took a big step forward on April 4 with the announcement, given front-page play by British and Eastern establishment media in the United States, that the U.S. State Department and President Clinton have labelled Nigeria a top drug-trafficking country and placed it on a State Department list of nations failing to cooperate in international drug-control efforts, along with Burma, Iran, and Syria. The action immediately brings a halt to U.S. aid.

In a memorandum, President Clinton also singled out Afghanistan, Bolivia, Laos, Panama, Peru, and Lebanon as countries that do not cooperate sufficiently with American anti-drug efforts, but waived economic sanctions against these nations because of unspecified "vital national interests." Even if a Nigerian government role had been established, which it has not, one would have assumed that the Nigerian role as a big oil supplier to the United States would have exempted Nigeria from sanctions from the standpoint of vital U.S. national interests.

But not so.

The two nations, both former British colonies—Nigeria, the most populous country of Africa, and Sudan, the largest country in Africa that is also located in one of the world's top 10 "natural" breakbasket regions—are both openly seeking alternatives to the IMF model. Nigerian head of state Gen. Sani Abacha in mid-April appealed to the international community to understand why Nigeria has pulled back from the market reforms since early January and to acknowledge what destruction this model has wrought. "It is no longer enough to insist on reforms whose patterns of effect have now been catalogued country after country . . . and yet for the international community not to appreciate what are the likely outcomes of changes that it advocates," he said.

Part of the British "Great Game" for Africa has been to keep these two countries apart, as it has been to convince

other African countries that they must battle at all costs to prevent Nigeria from becoming hegemonic in the region. Indeed, Nigeria is one of the 13 countries whose population growth is considered to constitute a national security threat to the United States, as reported in National Security Study Memorandum 200, issued by National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger in 1974.

Nigeria government cleared of charges

Underscoring the political nature of the charges, a recent U.S. State Department report cleared the Nigerian government of accusations that it is one of four countries "not cooperating" with the United States in containing the menace of drug abuse and trafficking. Responding to the U.S. charges, Nigerian High Commissioner to the United Kingdom Alhaji Abubakar Alhaji pointed out in a letter to the April 15 London *Financial Times* how "surprising" it is "that the same U.S. [State] Department that has commended Nigeria for arresting and turning over to American law enforcement authorities suspected drug traffickers wanted in the U.S. should now, *for political reasons*, turn around to make unsubstantiated allegations against the government." The Nigerian high commissioner quoted from a U.S. State Department report (No. 432) submitted to the U.S. Congress: "The [Nigerian] government does not as a matter of policy facilitate the production or distribution of drugs or encourage money laundering."

Nigerian head of state General Abacha suggested that western governments "look inward" at their own societies, rather than attempting to cast the blame elsewhere. "Nigeria does not produce any hard drugs. Nigerians are not a drug-consuming people. The few criminal elements who engage in drug trafficking are victims lured by the money offered by the European and American drug syndicates who control the production, trafficking, and street-level distribution of the drugs," he said.

Naming the names

Although Sudan has the agricultural capacity to potentially feed both the Middle East and Africa, this potential has been systematically undermined by foreign powers.

Sudanese Foreign Minister Husayn Abu-Salih, in an interview in the Paris-based publication *Al-Muharrir* on April 11, discussed the memorandum he recently presented to the Arab League Council "on the plot concocted by some western countries aimed at dividing Sudan and separating parts of it." Pushed to identify which western countries, he replied: "America and Britain are not far from what is happening."

An example of this propaganda campaign appeared in the April 7 issue of the *Washington Post*. Lacking any semblance of journalistic objectivity, the *Post* insisted that the only "model" Sudan offers "is the epitome of government at its worst."

"Sudan points with pride to its isolation from internation-

al credit markets and the fact that it is one of the few countries in the world without any foreign reserves. The World Bank won't do business with the Sudanese, and the International Monetary Fund is poised to put them out the door," the *Post* said. The Sudanese economy "is in a free-fall brought on by horrendous mismanagement and a ruinous 10-year-old civil war," it claimed. "Yet the Sudanese government offers an astonishingly positive assessment of its performance. Authorities in Khartoum believe Sudan offers a model of a successful Islamic revolution that other nations will want to emulate. . . . The suffering and misery of the Sudanese people speak otherwise."

British role is key

The Beirut-based daily *Al-Safir* in late February reported on "a meeting of the Sudanese opposition parties in the British House of Lords sponsored by Baroness Caroline Cox which had called on the international community to establish 'safe havens' in southern Sudan and to impose an air, economic, military, and oil embargo on Khartoum that would weaken [Sudan President] al-Bashir's government enough to allow the opposition to enter the capital and remove the regime." As an *EIR* investigative team detailed in our Sept. 3, 1993 issue, London is playing the key role, once again, in organizing the opposition forces to bring down a government deemed intransigent by Whitehall.

The London meeting included the leadership of the entire opposition stable that includes the Democratic Unionist Party, the al-Ummah party, the Communist Party, and the Sudanese Human Rights Organization. The only opposition party that boycotted the London meeting was the National Organization for the Independent Sudanese Forces, which clearly had misgivings about the Anglo-American interest in southern Sudan. The statement released in London by that organization noted the following points:

1) "Although tragic, the situation in southern Sudan does not differ from more tragic situations in numerous regions in Africa and other parts of the world that have not received similar attention."

2) "This concern coincides with the proposed western political plans regarding the problem of the south and with a call for international intervention to set up so-called safe havens in some parts of Sudan. This smacks of a plan to partition Sudan and separate the South."

Sudan's Minister of Culture Abd al-Sabdarat, in a recent interview in *Al-Muharrir*, discussed Sudan's problems with the West, and in particular the United States, from an Islamic perspective. "The United States is against religions because its real religion is materialism. So it does not want Islam to be an alternative to the economic collapse, which will eventually afflict the western camp as it afflicted the socialist camp." He added that Britain is more hostile to the possibility of Sudan providing an alternative model, in a period of overall collapse, than is the United States.