

Phil Taylor: Welcome to the Taylor Report CIUT 89.5 FM, I am Phil Taylor.

P.T: Today we are going to have 2 guests and I guess you could say it is a semi-annual thing to do with Central Africa. For our regular listeners this is familiar territory. One of our guests is Keith Harmon Snow who is a genocide investigator and he has worked for some important organizations Genocide Watch, and Survivors' Rights International. And he has recently been in the Congo. We are going to talk to him about what he has learned by being on the scene. And later in the program we are going to talk to Robin Philpot who has one of the few really solid books on the 1994 Rwanda massacres and war that is available in English. We often talk about this - the cultural solitudes French/ English.

People ask me where they can get a good book in English and the answer is there are not many. So it's on our website www.taylor-report.com. The book is titled "Colonialism Dies Hard" Robin has also written an article recently for Counterpunch magazine about his interviews. He did two interviews with Boutros Boutros-Ghali - the former Secretary General of the United Nations. He was the Secretary General in April of 1994 when all the things went ugly. He knows probably almost as much about the United Nations as our own General Dallaire who is professionally on television and has just been named a Liberal Senator which is close as you are going to get to heaven, I think. It's a nice sinecure - you don't have to run for office, they just anoint you. But we will be starting off with Keith Harmon Snow. I think we are very close to having him on the line.

Keith Harman Snow: Hi Phil, I am here, Thank you.

P.T: Hey, great. Really glad we could have you on. I would like to tell out listeners right away that Keith has a website "allthingspass.com" and you should turn to it if you really want to know what is unfolding in Central Africa and what can be done and is being done by conscientious people like Keith Harmon Snow to try to prevent wars and genocide. Keith, we interviewed you not so long ago and it was really a lot of fun because you were sitting on top of a building in Kinshasa which all our listeners got a kick out of.

K.H.S: Did that, yep.

P.T: I am always surprised you go on these trips and you come back relatively healthy and hearty. This is our first chance to talk to you since you have been back. First of all, I am going to work off the expression which we see a lot in the media, that we have humanitarian crises, and there is one that we hear about the in Sudan and it's always labeled "the worst" - the one having to do with the area called Darfur. But, you are a hands-on direct observer, you get in the field and do the work and you were in the Congo. Now, there are those who say the Congo situation, in fact, is worse then that in Sudan. Could you tell us about that and what your thoughts are?

K.H.S: Well, I am one of those who says often that the Congo situation is much worse then Darfur, Sudan or Sudan as a whole of course. In fact, The International Rescue Committee, the IRC, along with its two big partner organizations: Refugees International & CARE, they all sent a letter on March 23 to the Security Council, the UN Security Council, to say that they want to support the UN Observers Mission in the Congo, MONUC, the UN so-called peacekeeping forces in the Congo.

And in the beginning of their letter, the first thing they point out is “We are writing in regards to the ongoing crisis in the Democratic Republic of Congo which according to the UN Emergency Relief Coordinator is the world’s most neglected emergency.”

P.T: Hm

K.H.S: So here’s three big humanitarian organizations that are pointing out themselves that it’s one of the world’s most neglected emergencies, and of course they all have very powerful interests, these three organizations have very powerful interests in Sudan as well. They in fact have very powerful interests in Rwanda, and they in fact have very powerful sway over the New York Times, because you see the International Rescue Committee cited often in this article, in the New York Times article about the Congo for example, and we could get into that, but the point you were making was that the Congo situation is actually much worse and Darfur is receiving a lot of attention even though, ... it’s pretty horrendous when you have to compare body counts but,

P.T: Yes

K.H.S: ...to compare the absolute numbers that Darfur versus Congo then you have to ask the question why is Darfur receiving so much attention in the media and Congo is receiving so little.

P.T: And tell us about that crisis - to what extent is it what we call “a man-made crisis” and what are its dimensions? How has this unfolded in East Congo?

K.H.S: You are talking about the crisis in Congo?

P.T: Yes. I mean...has it always...I suppose one of the unfortunate things is there is a kind of callus in the brain of Westerners, they tend to think, well it’s always a crisis right? After all, the leadership of Congo for, say, the past 20 years or so is always painted as evil, a kleptocracy, so people presume that there is a humanitarian crisis going with it. But actually this is a crisis, is it not, that emerged from the war in Rwanda that then went, extended into Congo with measurable consequences, is that right?

K.H.S: Absolutely, if we painted the US Government as what they are, which is a nasty brutal dictatorship perpetrating violence all over the planet, and we had that in the media over and over and over then people would actually believe it. And what you got in the Congo of course is that the media inculcation of the idea that it’s just tribal, hopeless tribal massacres, you know, pointless slaughtering, it’s even in the New York Times regularly you know...including this article I was just talking about.

But, in fact there is very clear reasons behind the conflicts, and very powerful interests involved, including the International Rescue Committee, who I will take a second to point out - if you look at their Board of Directors, it includes Henry Kissinger. Now what is Henry Kissinger doing with the humanitarian organization, the International Rescue

Committee? Do you just show up for these meetings and say nothing at all? That's not really the case at all. So you've got to ask, who are these powerful people behind these organizations? And what we are looking at is total information warfare, total empire warfare, multi-national warfare where all of these factions are using every tool in the book, including humanitarian agencies, to further their interest in the particular zones that are either in warfare or in imminent warfare, or so-called peacekeeping situations.

P.T: By the way there are horrible, really large numbers. We always... almost every one of these articles we see talking about these two places always has a paragraph that says "70 thousand died of hunger, 100 thousand are homeless" etc... I mean, these are big figures. What sort of numbers do you credit and who are these people? Are they all Congolese? Are there other Nationalities? And, what has happened to them?

K.S: The people that have died you mean?

P.T: Yes, or might today be sort of on the margin of existence with very few prospects.

K.S: Yeah, the situation is pretty bleak for the people in the Congo. Having been there on the ground, all over the country, not all over but you know, in many of the places in the country where I have been its extraordinary bleak and no matter what you read, no matter which book you read, you can't ever understand the Congo until you arrive and that was true for me. It's a numbers game you know.

It reminds me of George Orwell all the time in his writings about propaganda and how they would steer, the media would steer your attention to one area when really the war was going on in a completely different place. And it's the same with the numbers. I look at the numbers from some organizations that are out of Kinshasa, the capital of the Congo, and they are saying there's 50 thousand new displaced people in this area. Then you look at another group's numbers and they dispute that saying "No, there is only 5 thousand". Which is real and which isn't, is hard to figure out sometimes. Ultimately it comes down to the interests that are involved on the ground of course. So for example, The IRC is repeatedly citing that there has been... I'm looking at the New York Times Sunday March 20, 2005: "Beyond the Bullet and Blade. There is an estimated 3.5 Million lives since 1998 making it the most deadly conflict since World War Two." This is their number of dead cited on Congo. But why since 1998? Why 3.8 Million lives? If you do a proper accounting, you know - this is the number that is thrown out as being an example of how horrible it is in Congo, and it's absolutely true that it's horrible there - but it's closer to 6 or 7 million. And it didn't begin in 1998, it began in 1990 when, ... it began even before that.

The powers that be supported Museveni's shooting to power and then the invasion of Rwanda in 1990 which led to the Rwandan cataclysm in 1994 and the Rwandan and Ugandan launch of war against the Congo in 1996. You should begin in 1996 if you want to be a little bit more appropriate and it's got to be 6 or 7 million that have died at this point. Who are they? Generally they are, and the IRC is absolutely right, most of them are non-combatants that have never picked up a weapon and they are just caught in the crossfire and because of the military situation, because of the warfare, they are forced into a marginal survival situation where they don't have any food. They don't have any

way to get food. They don't have any safe shelter. They are dealing with all kinds of diseases from malaria to cholera, to, in some cases yellow fever. Other river diseases that exist there: general diarrhea, hepatitis and then as I said the starvation factor and then there is the brutalization by the militias themselves and then there is all the killing which has to do with armed combatants.

What is it about? It's not about tribes any more than Bosnia or any other conflict in the world is about tribes. It's about powerful factions that are shipping in these weapons and as it is with Darfur, you've got powerful western, meaning European and American, military factions being supported from the United States and completely off the agenda as far as the media... instead we get this stuff about Arabs on horses that need to be neutralized according to the current Western thrust, or peace and justice thrust, for stopping the humanitarian crisis in Darfur.

P.T: Here are countries, and, as you mentioned, one individual most of the world is fairly familiar with - Mr. Kissinger, who isn't really known for his warm heart or enthusiasm about rescuing anybody. And they've got this big neon sign called "Humanitarian Intervention" but there's some things out there they seem to be interested in. Could you tell us, I mean what is at stake in East Congo? Could a person make a living if he had a lot of money and was investing? What could he find there?

K.S: Sure, there's a lot of people with some big mansions over in that area of the world; South Africans, and Rwandans in Eastern Congo who have some big mansions down there near Bukavu, for example. Coltan, which is columbo-tantalite, which is mined in the Kivus. Actually on one of your former radio shows I made a mistake and said that it was coming out of near Kisangani but its coming out of the Kivus.

P.T: Well let's make sure we get that right.

K.S: Yeah, well it's important from my point of view.

P.T: And coltan, we can't have mobile phones without coltan Right?

K.S: Right, you wouldn't be talking to me if we didn't have coltan. It's also used for Sony Play Stations. When the New York Times, for example, talks about the coltan problem, they don't ever talk about the relationship between the Sony Corporation and some of the powerful people in the Clinton Administration who then or now work for Sony and that kind of connection that doesn't ever come out.

It's the same with Howard French, the New York Times writer who is making a lot of money on his current book "Africa, Continent for the Taking" Sure, he talks about the raw materials, but he doesn't go into the issues, the deep issues behind it and that's because... if he doesn't work for the CIA, he might as well. But, the point you asked about was, what's available? What are they after? What are the multi-national corporations and the powerful individuals behind them after in Eastern... or Congo generally? Coltan, for the cell phones and Sony Play Stations, and lap top computers. Copper, cobalt - cobalt is the big one.

We have talked about this before. It's essential for aerospace industries, all of them. It's more important than coltan by far. Oil under the Lake Albert, Lake Mobutu region is a big, big reason for the conflict in Ituri today and that's of course associated with some of those mercenary companies and Canadian oil companies, and they are all the same people in many cases.

And then there's the timber that is being shipped out through Uganda and through Rwanda and through the Port of Kinshasha to the United States and Europe and that's a big, big deal for corporations like Weyerhaeuser who you can find connected ... in fact, there is a board member from CARE International which is one of these partners to the IRC I just mentioned, and one of the board members is also with Weyerhaeuser and curiously enough let me just read this off - some of the other Board members for CARE International include big directors of Bristol Myers Squibb, which is a big pharmaceutical company who also has a director sitting on the New York Times. Credit Swiss First Boston, a big banking institution which is also affiliated with Refugees International, the other partner that I mentioned. And then of course you have got Lockheed Martin - bingo... surprise, surprise. Then, in the CARE Board UK, United Kingdom, there's connections to JP Morgan and Unilever Corporation which is a huge, huge corporation with powerful interests in Africa, that in some cases revolve around weapons... you know...

P.T: Humanitarians all!

K.S: Yeah Well... Propaganda is a wonderful tool, if I didn't say it already, we are dealing with total information warfare here, you know, and people have to respect that that's what is going on.

P.T: Well your work, by the way, - again I'll tell our listeners we are speaking to Keith Harmon Snow and he has a website: allthingspass.com. He is one of the few people who actually goes out there and takes a look for himself. Takes the risks and you have actually seen all these folks up close. Some of the UN people you've seen the suffering etc. You have taken an interest in what happened in Rwanda, and in the wars that Rwanda has waged. What are they doing now? There is a debate about it: are they present in East Congo or are they operating through surrogates?

K.S: I can't confirm that absolutely, but when I was in Congo in this latest December of 2004, the Rwandans were still in there, they were still being sighted. People, militias wearing Rwandan military uniforms giving orders for example. Same with the Ugandans a little bit more north. But they're definitely arming and training powerful militias in the area, pumping in a lot of weapons. So, yeah, they're still very much present and provoking warfare within the Congo. As well, the United Nations Observer Mission is just another armed faction at this point. You may have, you or I may have beliefs on whether that's efficacious or not, and better for the Congo or not, and we could talk about that, but in any case they are still another armed faction that has gotten involved in the war and they have been accused by Congolese up in Bunia, the Turi region, of being... using excessive force and violence in the past month, for example, when some woman and children were killed by UN troops. But that of course has not been reported anywhere. The amount of troops also tend to, ... in the past they have been perceived to

be siding with certain militias and letting them get away with murder for the most part. And then taking action against other militias. There are some questions - if the IRC, which has these powerful people behind it, supports the United Nations mission, then you have to ask...well, what role is the United Nations mission actually playing and who's interests are they serving? Are they bringing peace to a zone which is being controlled currently by individuals associated with Rwanda or Uganda or certain multi-national corporations? And it's pretty difficult to figure out.

P.T: Well, if they are taking coltan and diamonds out of Eastern Congo and it's going through Kigali, and it's going through Uganda, some of it, and I gather those two seem to be a little like thieves who are sometimes fighting with each other over who gets this stuff. What do you make of the fact that they would have soldiers present, they'd be arming factions, they'd be hauling things out of Congo that don't belong to them? And yet they also supply a core part of the UN operation in Darfur.

K.S: Peace keepers all!..I would say...they do put on quite a dog and pony show...That Paul Kagame, the president of Rwanda, of course, is the best actor in this big thing and his close associates include the propaganda flak producers in the United States. You said something about diamonds. For example, here is a very interesting chain of connections. What is the name of that fellow...Paul Rusesabagina, the man who the movie Hotel Rwanda is modeled after. Of course he was taken up to Darfur, and you know about that, and he was shuffled around by some powerful military types. He was giving an award by Chaplains of America, and the award was handed to him by Bob Dole in 2000. And you know, there is a very conservative right wing fellow from the American Government.

P.T: His passion for Africans is really unmatched by anybody

K.S: It is, and the same with the same fellow there, Paul Rusesabagina, he was given the recipient of the Immortal Chaplains Prize for Humanity and also you can make a connection from that Immortal Chaplains to this group - The National Democratic Institute, who gave an award to Kofi Annan and to some people working in Rwanda. And it turns out that on the board of The National Democratic Institute is Maurice Templespan and Madeleine Albright and Jay Brian Atworth who is a USAID Administrator of the past. But the key one there that I think is most interesting is Maurice Templespan who is very close to the Clinton's and he is one of the world's premier diamond kingpins. And wherever they are coming out of, whether they're coming out of Kinshasa or Kigali or both, I think it's probably true. They are definitely making their way to the Templespan contingent.

The Templespan contingent, of course, is very close with Madeline Albright and Samantha Powers, a woman who helped found the Carr Center for Human Rights at Harvard. She has, of course, become a force in her own right on the genocide in Rwanda and producing the flak that is really clouding people's minds about what really happened there and what's happening in Congo. And you see her published everywhere. The New York Review of Books just carried something, the Atlantic Monthly. So; it kind of goes on that way.

The diamonds and the coltan and the copper and the cobalt and the Clinton faction which is working in the south to get out the cobalt and the copper; and the Bush faction which is working in the north to get out the gold near the Turi region. They are all very much involved and it's very difficult to see through the clouds to figure out what is going on.

P.T: Thank goodness we are talking to you about it. This is Keith Harman Snow.

K.S: I'm not making anything any better.

P.T: Well you know the old saying... was it Sartre said - first you have to understand, then you can do something, so you are helping us there. People should go to allthingspass.com, by the way, to read more about all of this. Keith, you looked into the film Hotel Rwanda a little bit, I recall, I saw it in a note from you. Have you interviewed anybody about that film?

K.S: Yeah, I interviewed a couple people who were actually in the hotel at the time, and what they have done for me is help me see just how little the word "Genocide" applied to what happened in Rwanda versus just outright warfare...you know...the guy confirmed that the film was a total farce. One of the things that I found when I started looking into the film was that it was produced by United Artists, who is a subsidiary of MGM, who has on their Board of Directors former Secretary of State, former General Alexander Haig. I mean, it's not an accident that they produced this film which is clouding the situation on Rwanda

P.T: And sent the actor up to Sudan

K.S: Yeah, sent the actor up to Sudan and he is winning these awards for the right wing or the left wing or whoever and the whole story, the whole film...there's two facts that are basically true, and that's what makes it such a powerful film and such a devastating film, in the sense of people understanding the truth, is that if you watch the film, you come away with the fact that a lot of Africans died, and it's horrendous, and it makes you feel for those Africans in the film. And it's definitely true. And the other fact is that the white people abandoned the black people. Beyond that it's all complete fiction, and I am saying that not in the sense you can say most Hollywood films are fiction, but in the sense that this is black propaganda, black propaganda is intentionally malicious, destructive, violent disinformation, meant to persuade people to see something a certain way when really the truth is quite different.

P.T: Give me an example, you have talked to some people who had been at this hotel - what sort of things did they tell you that struck you?

K.S: Well, for example the UN, MONUC - in the film, you've got this UN guy that is all the time helping to save lives. According to the people that were in the hotel, there were no UN troops there other than a few that passed through now and then. That's one fact. Another one, is the fact that it was protected by gendarmes of the Rwandan Army at the time, the current Government Rwandan Army (1994, the FAR - what's known now as the ex-FAR, but the FAR at the time - the Force Armee Rwandaise) they were guarding... the gendarmes were guarding the hotel, which means that according to the mythology or the

right and proper thing, as Robin Philpot would say, that the genocidiere themselves were protecting the people in the hotel. Paul had nothing to do with it, this fellow Paul portrayed in the film, that actor there...whatever his name is, who supposedly saved these people. He did not have any power at all according to the people who were in the hotel who said what was going on.

There were powerful Hutus and powerful Tutsis in the hotel. Some of the most powerful Interahamwe had some family members in the hotel. If the Interahamwe is this nasty genocidiere force that we have come to believe it is, why were some of the members of the Interahamwe in the hotel at the same time as some very, very powerful Tutsi's having a wedding, eating fine food, not at all like they portrayed it in the film. These are just a few things off the top that I can remember. I am trying to write it up but I haven't had the time to do that.

P.T: Well, we are glad you have given us time but we want you to please sit down and do that. Now I want to get to this...you also have been observing something, an interesting phenomenon which is to some degree related, of how things are unfolding in Sudan. You had an encounter, I think, at the University of Massachusetts or Smith College with students who are looking for even more humanitarian intervention to help benighted Africans. And it involves a plane, something called a predator aircraft, what's that all about?

K.S: Yeah, you mentioned that it's important for people to understand what's going on before they take action. This is a perfect example of misdirected actions. A group of about, I don't know, must have been 10 or 15 young Smith woman who were organizing against the genocide in Darfur are having a big campaign to get students to sign letters and send them to US officials, including Senator Kennedy and George Bush, and some UN officials but mostly to US Officials. And one of the things this letter is asking for, is to give the President of the United States authority to use these predator, unmanned aerospace vehicles. They are UAV's - it's called UAV's. It's a billion, couple billion dollar business...10, 15, 20, 30, I don't know, 50 billion dollar business now.

In 2003 Donald Rumsfeld reauthorized the defense budget to include an extra 3 or 4 or 5 billion dollars for UAV's alone. The Predator UAV was produced by General Atomics. It's an unmanned aerospace vehicle, which means it's a killing robot. It's huge - they can carry missiles, they can detonate nuclear devices, they can carry weather warfare technologies which can modify the local environment. They have sensors, they have communications intelligence. They are unaccountable. And they have film cameras, and they are guided by some guy with a little film camera off in some other place, some US base up in the Darfur region, for example. They are planning to launch these UAV's against, according to the Smith students - they should be used against these Janjaweed militias on horses.

P.T: The men on horses, the devils on horses.

K.S: Exactly, what the letters are saying...these Smith students are advocating people to sign these letters that say is that the US President should give the authority to use these UAV's - the Predator, to neutralize these forces. Now, if you send a robot out into the

desert, it's not going to be able to distinguish very well - or they are not going to care in any case - between combatants, and woman and children on camels. It's not that sophisticated, even though it's incredibly sophisticated.

P.T: Also, it's kind of like asking a highly armed man to go into a building to help you out. You don't really know what's on his mind, he can do what he damn well feels like, right?

K.S: Yeah, and the guy controlling these UAV's will be some guy in the back whose agenda is not going to be...these Smith students have absolutely no idea

P.T: Yeah, he's not going to call Smith College and say "Do you have anybody in particular you want me to take out?"

K.S: These Smith College girls don't know nothing about predator UAV's. They've never asked any questions about who produced them? Where are they coming from? How did they come into the world market suddenly and all at once? There were no UAV's in the media about 5 or 6 years ago, for the most part, but suddenly they're everywhere and all at the same time. They've come out and they're being used by the US military all over the world right now, and they're off the coast of New England, for example. I read about a homeland security project that was going on that included UAV's being used off the coast of New England, you know. Why do people allow them? How can these Smith students ask people to send a letter which suggests that they should use these UAV's, when they don't know anything about them? It's something you've seen in Star Wars, you know, a little robotic thing.

P.T: Isn't the striking think that you have... obviously the students start off and they want to be helpful, and they don't like to see suffering and they read the headlines and they think "Well, we must do something". And how quickly people go from that thought to saying "use the most sophisticated robot aircraft to kill people in the name of a humanitarian cause", and then I guess additionally...everybody seems to have forgotten there is actually negotiations, there are actually meetings, there is in fact a ceasefire - it may have some violations but it remains an actual ceasefire. So how could people find themselves with blood lust, practically, which would bypass all the reality of the talks and a plan for a peaceful resolution of it?

K.S: Its insanity, Phil, you know, these girls, they truly want to do the right thing. They said to me, you know, we are just doing the best we can. I said, "That's fine, it's not the right approach, you need to look at this and this and this", and they got very hostile. They've received a lot of information from US Government sources, with include Professor Eric Reeves at Smith College, an English teacher who has become an authority on the war in Sudan, but never, ever talks about the Central Intelligence Agency interests there, or operations there. He never mentions covert operations coming in from Herso, Ethiopia, where there is a huge base of covert operations. He never mentions the fact that there is US funding and militias support coming in from Chad where Exxon has a huge pipeline. And Darfur is all about oil. Its huge, I've got an oil map that just shows the whole area beyond the Darfur boundaries in fact is one big oil field that they are trying to get control of.

These Smith students want to do the right thing, but they are moving forward because someone is giving them... because there is so much propaganda that serves the interests, and tells them to do it a certain way. That is, there is nothing coming out about the Chinese, the US-Chinese conflicts in Darfur, the relationship between the Chinese and the Lundeen Petroleum Company which is from Canada, In fact Adolph Lundeen has very close connections to Canadian businesses.

P.T: Oh good, our own villain!

K.S: Yeah, and Lundeen is a Swede or a Swiss, and he is very close with the Bush gang. But we don't know, without going over there myself, for example, I don't know what the Chinese National Petroleum company, where they're falling on this or where Exxon is falling on this and who is funding which militias. But, it's clear that some of those Janjaweed themselves are actually being supported by the United States to stir up trouble, which then gets left-wing people in the United States concerned about these refugees. The numbers are inflated to begin with, but you have got, you know, whatever -250 thousand refugees now, or two million, that people are concerned about. Therefore "George Bush needs to do something to stop this humanitarian crisis". It's just completely irrational, information-warfare-based thinking. Its insanity

P.T: Well thank goodness you, of course, have been in Sudan, you have been in the Congo, and we have your site: allthingspass.com. You are doing great work

K.S: Oh, by the way, let me mention if you want to learn about these UAV's, I've written a report on my site, that I really invested a lot of energy into, and its called "Out of the Blue: Black Programs, Space Drones and the Unveiling of US Military Offences" - that are really coming out of the black arena, the black program arena, which means completely hidden. And there is a big report and there is a small article. People should look at the big report in the UAV section, it begins about page 35.

P.T: Terrific, and the title of that by the way is "Out of the Blue" right?

K.S: Yeah, just like this Darfur crisis.

P.T: Well Keith, thank you very, very much for being with us.

K.S: I hope it was helpful.

P.T: Yes, it was very, very helpful and we look forward to talking to you again soon.

K.S: Thanks so much.

P.T: Okay, bye bye. Keith Harman Snow, allthingspass.com.

You are listening to the Taylor Report, you can go to our website taylor-report.com, or you can write to us at: taylor@ciut.fm. We are going to take a very brief break and come back and talk to Phil a bit and then we are going to talk to Robin Philpot.

.....

I believe Robin Philpot has joined us on the line. Robin is the author of “Colonialism Dies Hard”, and it’s in English, and you can go to taylor-report.com and read it. I recommend you do...and...are you there Robin?

Robin Philpot: Yes, I am, how are you?

P.T: We were just speaking to Keith Harmon Snow about his observations in East Congo and took up this issue of the presence there of the Rwandan military and the fact that, in fact, we may have...its horrible to be talking this way...there is this category called “the worst humanitarian crisis”, and people always speak of Sudan. But in fact it is, he says, it is clearly shown that the situation in Eastern Congo is worse. And this relates to some matters, which nobody here seems to want to talk to, you took up in your book, that is - the invasion of Congo, twice, which has had ugly consequences.

R.P: Well, in fact they’re up to the fourth invasion, and it’s almost, I would say, it’s more like an occupation. And to understand, and this is one of the problems that people have when they say how bad it is in Congo, Is that they refuse to go back and see where it came from, and where this all came from, and how it was part of an overall remodeling effort in Central Africa. The first invasion, people will remember, was November 1996, and it was an invasion coordinated largely by the American administration with their support, it was the invasion by the Rwandan Army to attack refugee camps in Eastern Zaire, as you will remember. And it was something where there were, for weeks prior to that first invasion, there were large Hercules airplanes arriving in Kigali bringing in materials for the invasion. When the UN at that time set up, what happened is that the UN set up a force which was supposed to go in there and protect the refugees from the attack, - they once again called them rebels, but it was clearly the Rwandan Army with US advisors who shot at those camps, those refugee camps to force people to go back to Rwanda.

P.T: Those are, by the way, United Nations established camps.

R.P: Exactly. And they were there since 1994. After the massive war that went on between 1990 and 1994.

P.T: Well there are people like Philip Gourevich who advocated attacking them. By the way, Gourevich is always regarded as a highly humanitarian type. His language was, “well, they are harboring interahamwe, therefore you have to do something”. It justified attacking refugees on those grounds.

R.P: Exactly, and they have justified it and there was an orchestra of people supporting that kind of attack. Now, that is against all International law. It is a forced return of refugees, it’s fundamentally violating International law. Now they did this, and the UN, we have to go back to this, the UN set up this force and it’s Canadian-led at the behest of the Americans. I address this in chapter 14 and 15 of my book which is now on your site. I address how they brought this about, how the Canadians said they were leading the way

but it was through the Americans that asked if Canada can do it to keep France out. Because France and South Africa wanted to set up an International force, and the way to prevent them from doing it was to use Canada to lead one that never was deployed in fact. Because the head of the board, which is Maurice Baril, went through there, led by RPF people, he was taken by RPF. There was no more refugees left in Zaire, so we don't have to deploy the force. And the force was sitting there in Kampala at the time in Uganda. Now, you know it's very important, that invasion began then. And it follows a pattern every time, it plays again in 1998, well 1996-1997 was when they overthrew Muboutu. Then it was again in 1998, and then it was in 2002, I think.

P.T: They decided, yes, they overthrew the man they had installed. They installed Kabila, and then he talked back to them, so they over threw him.

R.P: Exactly, and see the thing is, that people, we have a lot of people here in Montreal and Quebec talk about the situation. But the hard thing is going back and saying, now where does this come from? And I had the chance on two occasions to interview the former Secretary-General of the UN, Boutros-Ghali. I interviewed him in 2002, in preparation for the book, and I interviewed him again in November, just last November, a few months ago. In those interviews, he of course is in a situation, he was the Secretary-General, he dealt with the Security Counsel in that time. And he goes back and points out that this business of saying some vague international community refused to answer the call for help in Rwanda - he points out: no, no, it wasn't the international community, it was two countries. It was the United States and Great Britain who prevented any form of intervention which could have led to talks and a ceasefire right in the period of 1994, which has made a certain man we know, by the name of Dallaire, into somebody famous. He points out that it wasn't some vague international community, it was the United States and the British, basically because they wanted the RPF, led by Kagame, to take power decisively. And then I asked him, I said, you know ... and he said, well if that army, the RPF, had not invaded in 1990 and pursued this action, there would never have been this horrible, these horrible massacres and killings in Rwanda, and than again in the Congo. And the interesting thing is he reminded us of an event called Foshoda. People that know a bit about African history and Colonial history...

P.T: It's a very important story, please tell us.

R.P: Fashoda was a fort in the upper Nile, in other words what is now Southern Sudan. And it was a fort that the British wanted, because the British wanted to control Africa from the Cape to Cairo, they used to say. You know, Cape Town up to Cairo. And the French were trying to control Africa East-West. From Dakar to Djibouti. And the French led a force up through Chad and to what is now Sudan, and at Fashoda they met the British troops. And the French had to back down, and it was a tremendous loss for the French, a psychological loss for their imperial power, and the British saw it as their mastery of Africa was what happened in Fashoda - this is 1898 that this took place. And when I spoke to Boutros-Ghali he said "you know what is going on now is a repeat of Fashoda" that we are having another thing where basically Anglo-Americans, Anglo-Saxon domination of Africa...began with Uganda, went into Rwanda and now has basically occupied the Eastern Congo. And he said that this is exactly the way they bumped the French out of there and took control of that area. It sounds very, very

convincing in my point. And I'm sorry that in England, ...well hopefully with my book and other people talking about it, we will be able to make people look at this question more profoundly and realize what's going on.

P.T: It's very interesting that particularly, we have a community of people who not that long ago were comfortable with using the word imperialism, the word colonialism and there is the expression "new colonialism". Now we have so-called humanitarian crises and no one mentions that there could possibly be any imperial interests. Except on the part of Mr. Kissinger and others to see if they can help the Africans, advance towards democracy. That's all they care about.

R.P: You know, the title of the book is on your site: Rwanda 1994, Colonialism Dies Hard. One of the things that happens is the colonial mind-set dies very hard. In the 1880's the British talked about their empire as being something that they gained in a bit of inadvertence, that the empire was something that just fell into their hands. That they weren't interested in Africa, they were going there for humanitarian reasons. They were going there to put an end to slavery; they were going there to free these people, a mission of civilizing. What they are doing now, when they are talking about humanitarian intervention, it is an exact repeat of Fashoda. People have lost their bearings if they can't see that it's the same discourse. The way people talk about Africa - that we're not interested in this, we are just going there for help. The refusal to see the will to control the area, the will to exploit the area, that's all hidden under this story. And I think one of the reasons is this deep-seated prejudice towards Africa. One of the things in my book is, in the second part of the book I go through some of these books that are written about Africa, and particularly about Rwanda, and point out that the way they talk about Africa and Africans is a repeat of the way that people did in the 1880's -1890's. Ever since Europeans came into contact with Africa.

P.T: Yes, we seem to have only one narrative - the "Heart of Darkness" - where every reporter who goes over there feels he has to call it the "Heart of Darkness". Instead of thinking that perhaps he just left the "Heart of Darkness".

R.P: Exactly, and if they actually knew, and took the time to read, what Africans, and people like Edward Said, have said about Conrad and the Heart of Darkness and the whole way of looking at Africa which has been defined by Conrad and the Heart of Darkness, they might come back and say, maybe I'm on the wrong side. I'm serious, People, if they should give thought to what people like Chinua Achebe, an African writer, has to say about that, or they should hear what Edward Said has to say about The Heart of Darkness, and then they should say well that's one guy I will not refer to that because he comes from a racist tradition. I'm sick of it because they don't give those people the time of day

P.T: Yes, and indeed you interviewed Boutros Boutros-Ghali, former Secretary-General of the United Nations, and in fact, in the English-speaking world we would have to say, at this point, that they do not give him the time of day. Right?

R.P: Not at all, not at all.

P.T: I mean, he told you some rather shocking things. Incidentally, it's in an article you published... when was that published in Counterpunch?

R.P: It was published on February 26, 27 on Counterpunch.org.

R.P: He is very shocked at the fact that nobody seems to want to go to the heart of who shot down the airplane which triggered the massacre. Who shot down the airplane that killed two African heads of state? It's something that... he says, there have been four official reports, including one by the UN, and not one of them has even dared to address the question. And he says, "Who is strong enough? Who is powerful enough, to make people refuse to dig?"

Then I asked him, well what do you think of this report of a French judge, the anti-terrorist judge, even the French judge who made a seven year investigation has concluded that the current President of Rwanda, Paul Kagame, was responsible for that assassination. And when I said that to him, he said, "And that's not all. The judge told me personally that the CIA was behind that". Now, that is the first time I have heard this said. People have suspected that the CIA might have been involved, but from somebody who actually was in the know or who has a certain... was very close to events, saying this, I think it's extremely frightening. Because, if we think for a minute that the CIA were involved, let's presume that the CIA might have been involved. Think of what they would have had to do, to cover their tracks. And I think that probably explains more than anything, why there is all these official stories about what went on. It's made into - the only thing that could have happened was that all these awful Hutus got up one morning and decided to kill all off these Tutsis. That's how they've covered their tracks. If word came out that the CIA were involved in that, I think people are going to start saying well, look what happened, look what the effects of that was.

P.T: Well, actually, we could look around the world and notice that that organization, with a budget that has not declined but has actually quadrupled, is never mentioned anywhere. I mean, we have endless episodes in South America and in Africa and Asia and now Central Europe even, which everybody wonders if somebody's intelligence operation may be there, and no one utters those three letters CIA. They're never uttered any longer.

R.P: Well, I think one of the reasons is that a lot of these NGOs know that if they start saying anything that they are going to be cut off financially. I would say that one of the problems in Africa right now is, there's too many of these so-called humanitarian and non-governmental organizations, they should be called government organizations.

P.T: Government, sure, they take government money

R.P: Yeah, and they developed the story, they helped write the story about what is going on in Africa. They have a material interest in not telling the truth. Because if they start saying this they know that the next day they are not going to be getting any more subsidies. No, I mean it's as simple as that, it's the sad simple truth.

P.T: They will go from non-governmental to non-organization.

R.P: Exactly

P.T: Now, there is some exciting news... by the way, we have to say that our solitudes is a great subject for this. We are living in Canada, we have this English and French issue. We don't benefit at all because of the struggle for Anglophone domination. We don't know what the Francophone world is saying about so many things. My understanding is, a very important historical figure in the events in Rwanda is Mr. Booh-Booh, who was actually in charge of the situation for the UN, as a special representative to the Secretary-General in 1994, more powerful then our world-famous in Canada General. He is going to have a book is he not?

R.P: Yeah.

P.T.: I wonder if Canadians are going to read about that, the day after it's launched.

R.P: Well, Quebecers will, probably, because there has been... we do run the dispatches coming from French media here in Quebec. But yeah, Booh-Booh is launching his book tomorrow. He has kept silent for 10 years. He was the chief of the UN mission in 1994. Dallaire reported to him. Dallaire had only the military components of the mission, and the person in charge was Jacques-Roger Booh-Booh. People in Canada who have been trying to build up Mr. Dallaire, have just, either they've attacked Booh-Booh, without even talking to the man, or they pretend he didn't even exist. I mean, I bet that most of our listeners today, and I don't blame them for it, might think that Dallaire was in charge over there. Because he wanted to be in charge. And so this book that he (Booh-Booh) is launching tomorrow is a searing attack on - I have read the introduction - and it's a searing attack on Dallaire. He says that Dallaire was very much part of the problem, he was siding with the RPF throughout the time. He was... and one of the very damning accusations is, that Dallaire could never accept the fact that he was working for an African. But he points out a lot of things...

P.T: Which is rather an interesting observation, because Dallaire likes to play that card himself, a lot. Talking about, "oh, nobody cared about the Africans", but he forgets that he was under two Africans: Boutros-Ghali and Mr. Booh-Booh, and he said in his book that he ignored Booh-Booh.

R.P: Sure, he went around him. He said in his book that he purposely did things, he went around his leader. Now if there's one way of destroying a mission it's insubordination, going around and not following commands. He doesn't even hide the fact, in other words it's almost like he boasts, by attacking Booh-Booh in his book for being this, that, and the other thing. In which, I think, it boils down to a kind of racist criticism of Booh-Booh. He just ignores the role that this man was supposed to play. The damning, when he accuses Dallaire didn't want to work for an African... And he points out something that people should say and should look at it when they read Dallaire's book. Dallaire did not know where Rwanda was on the map. Now, I ask this when I do a radio program here in Quebec, I say can you imagine sending an African military man to Montreal to settle the problems between English Canada and Quebec? And taking control of that. People could not even...

P.T: And he says “Where is Quebec?”

R.P: Yeah, and he says “where is Quebec”, and then he comes here, and he tells the world what happened, and everybody in the world believes it? I mean, it’s the most insulting thing...

P.T: What you described is science fiction except it happened.

R.P: Exactly, it happened, and Canada now made him into a Senator, and we should realize that he is only an international hero in Canada. Because, like I just said, Europe has very little respect for him, and I don’t think the United States sees him as much more than a lackey.

P.T: Well, on that I think what we have to say is, we hope Mr. Booh-Booh, since he is involved with our famous General, will get the attention he deserves when he makes his comments. We’ll see if our English-speaking friends, writers and editors, will even mention his existence.

R.P: Well let’s try and hope that maybe the Taylor Report can interview him.

P.T: That’s what I am going to work for. And with that, Robin, I am afraid we have to go. Thanks for giving us the time, and it’s a great book and we want our listeners to read: Colonialism Dies Hard, Robin Philpot, taylor-report.com. Thanks again Robin.

R.P: Okay, thanks Phil, talk to you soon.