

of the party and a fraction of its army, means that Burundi is *terrified*. It has minor outbreaks of killings and cross-killings in the area where the refugees are, but it is doing its best to damp this down. But you can see why I say that the whole thing in Burundi is on a knife's edge. The Hutu and Tutsi leadership in Burundi *want* peace. They almost, but not quite, trust each other. But there are real animosities between these two communities.

In Burundi, you never had planned genocide. Half of the killing in Burundi was what I would call a "forward defense" policy. If you were a village, you were afraid that the army would attack you, so you killed the soldiers. The army then came and killed you. So an army post that was largely Tutsi in a totally Hutu area was afraid it was going to be attacked, so it attacked first. In other words, you didn't have the planned genocide.

If that syndrome starts again, there is no way that the Burundi government, its army, can stop it. Therefore, the Burundi government needs to be approached, and asked, "What can we do?" including getting these refugees out of Burundi, almost anywhere, as long as it is not Burundi.

The problem is that it is not clear to me what the RPF means when it talks about trying those directly involved in genocide, which I suggest is a quarter of the adult population. This, however morally desirable it may or may not be, is hardly practical. I am sure the RPF would like most of the refugees to come home and would be perfectly willing to have them live quiet lives with them. Certainly, the international community will look at them askance when they have only half of the population of the country in the country, if only because of the cost of trying to keep them alive outside the country. You can't run Rwanda with half of its population missing.

But I must say that a lot of the people have good reason, in terms of their conscience, to wonder whether it is safe to come back. And given the high-profile murder of the archbishop and bishop, even people who are personally quite innocent might very well be worried. [The RPF on July 1 murdered Bishop Thaddee Nsengiyumva; Vincent Nsengiyumva, Archbishop of Kigali; and Bishop Joseph Ruzindana in Kabgaye, where they had sheltered 30,000 Tutsi refugees.]

The claim that there was really no difference between Hutu and Tutsi because there was some intermarriage, which there was; that there were no real communal hostilities toward each other, is simply not true. The Belgians ruled entirely through the Tutsi, locking in what was originally a minority invader kingdom with tall pastoralist warriors ruling short, crop-tilling helots. The claim that the thing is entirely artificial is not true. That certain people have chosen to *inflame* it is true, but they weren't operating on nothing.

And, of course, in 1960, the Hutu overthrew the Tutsi government in a bloodbath. But a lot of Tutsi stayed in the country and, on average, they were richer, better educated,

and had better positions. The Habyarimana government and its predecessor thought that the 15% Tutsi minority, as long as it wasn't supported externally, was safe enough and that affirmative action-type methods would keep some kind of balance.

Q: The British generally have most to do with government aid. Did the British pay for the demobilization?

A: It might have been them. Remember, Museveni is the only African President who can say, "There will not be multi-party elections until I am dead," and get his foreign aid quota over-fulfilled. You had these non-party rigged elections, and now you have this rigged non-party constituent assembly.

Q: Who do you think shot down the plane?

A: Uganda. I can't prove it, but it would have been easier for Uganda to do it than for the RPF itself. The RPF did have a contingent in Uganda, I mean in Kigali, on the hilltop; on the basis that that would be safe for them, but that meant that they were perfectly easy to be watched. So I don't believe for a moment that they could have got people with a shoulder-held missile close enough to the airport to shoot it down. The U.N., of course, supposedly had the airport secured. But I think it is nonsense to say that anybody who could easily get a shoulder-held missile and is good at cross-country walking, couldn't have got within a mile or so of the airport—I don't know what distance is required to shoot the plane down. In other words, it doesn't have to be Uganda, but on the basis of who benefits. . . .

British Foreign Office: 'Where's Rwanda?'

EIR interviewed the relevant official at the British Foreign Office East Africa Desk on Aug. 8.

EIR: On the situation in Uganda, there has been some discussion that the RPF was actually trained and armed in Uganda.

A: I can't comment on that, I have no idea. Ask the Ugandans. We wouldn't know about that. I don't know if there is anyone here who could give you a definitive answer on that. Speculation is speculation, about Zaire and the RPF; speculation about Uganda and the RPF. There is no doubt that, because of traditional historical background, Museveni has been closely connected with the RPF. But, as I am sure you well know, he has denied any kind of involvement to the extent you have mentioned. Sorry I can't be more helpful.