

DIEGO GARCIA IN TIMES OF GLOBALISATION

**A Collection of Essays written by LALIT
Published, typeset and printed by Ledikasyon Pu Travayer
October 2002**

Note: This may not be the final version that was printed in October 2002

Konteni

Prefas	9
U.S Hegemony and Unilateralism	17
By Ram Seegobin	
How Diego Garcia was Depopulated & Stolen	25
By lindsey collen &Ragini Kistnasamy	
AGOA – an instrument of the US ruling class	57
By Rajni Lallah	
Losean Indyin Zonn de Pe ubyin Zonn de Ger?	85
Par Ashok Subron	
Lalit dimunn ordiner	109
Par Lindsey Collen ek Rajini Kistnasamy	
Pozisyon Guvernman ek burzwazi	125
Par Alain Ah-Vee	
Sityasyon Chagosyen Zordi	135
Par Rajini Kistnasamy & Lindsey Collen	
What exactly is “Mauritius”?	147
By Lindsey Collen	
Diego Garcia under occupation	155
By Anonymous Contributors	
False Assertions about the “Impossibility” of Getting the Diego Garcia Base Closed	161
By Lindsey Collen & Ragini Kistnasamy	
Manyer ki Pese Britanik lor Diego Garcia ti kasyet	165
By Lindsey Collen & Ragini Kistnasamy	
INFO	171
Par Rada Kistnasamy	
Zizman dan ka kont US, DCDM ek Lezot	171
Sabotaz Protocol Kyoto	172
Krash Bombardye B-1	175
Permisyon US Depi UK	177
The US Damages Case	179
Constitutional and International History	183
by Ragini Kistnasamy & Lindsey Collen	

Brief Chronology	199
By Veena Dholah	
Recent Campaign Document – 1	206
Letter to Tony Blair	
Recent Campaign Document – 2	211
The Rann Nu Diego Committee	
Recent Campaign Document – 3	212
The AGOA and Diego	
Recent Campaign Document – 4	214
Ram Seegobin exposes the dangers of AGOA conditionalities	
Recent Campaign Document – 5	221
The 2002 Resolution on Diego Garcia initiated by the Sahrington Strategy Workshop	
Recent Campaign Document – 6	224
The island of Diego Garcia, B-52's and you and me	
Notes On Contributors	230

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

This collection of essays on Diego Garcia in times of Globalisation is the ninth in our “knowledge for all” series. In order of publication, the series is made up of: Jose Bove a Maurice; Natir Imin by Lindsey Collen; Lefe Globalisasyon lor drwa imin by Ashok Subron; Lalwa Travay depi lesklavaz ziska Globalisasyon by Ram Seegobin; Patriarchy, Political Power, Sexuality and Globalisation by Patricia Mc Fadden; Globalisation, Food security and War by Vandana Shiva; and the world movement against Neoliberal Globalisation and Resistance in South Africa by Trevor Ngwanne.

Then just prior to this book on Diego Garcia, LPT published a large format book Langaz kreol Zordi, the papers from our Colloquium on Language.

This collection of essays on Diego Garcia was put together by Lalit on LPT's request.

LPT has great pleasure in presenting it to you.

PREFAS

Listwar post-kolonyal Republik Moris finn ante par Diego Garcia. Diego Garcia li enn parti inportan nam Moris, li enn parti inportan nam repiblik moris, li enn parti inportan dan konsyens kolektif Morisyen. Pu sa rezon la, nu prezant u sa liv-la. Kumsa nu kapav exteryoriz tu sa la, e petet fer progre.

Baz militer Diego Garcia laba, li kuma enn ple lor Losean Indyen. Enn lorer. Republik Mauritius, pei-la li-mem, res demambre. Enn desirir. E tu sa Morisyen ki form Lepep Chagosyen, zot tuzur exile. Enn vid dan zot leker. Enn dey.

Memwar zot sufrans, memwar zot deplasman forse, memwar sa zenosid, memwar sa kriyote ki Leta Britanik ek Leta Amerikin finn fer Chagosyen sufer, li tuzur inpreyn atmosfer Moris. Li partu. Li dan nu ler, dan nu lamer, dan nu later. Li dan nu lespri.

E li enn but listwar ki tu kalite lotorite ti pe tufe, san-ses. Lotorite ti kasyet sa listwar la. Zot ti gard li enn sekre, pu ki bann diferan lepep – sirtu Amerikin ek Angle – napa kone ki finn pase. E pu ki pa zis laba, me isi dan Moris, tu ti sipoze res flu, san-prev, vag.

Listwar ti tufe dan silans inpoze par *Official Secrets Act* dan Rwayom Ini. Rwayom Ini pei ki finn demambre Moris, ki finn tortir abitan Moris dorizinn Chagos, ki finn koken 65 Lil. Ena de lartik Lindsey Collen ek Ragini Kistnasamy lor la. Enn (paz 165) li lor ki manyer sekre deta opere dan Gran Bretayn, lot la (paz 25) li lor manyer ki Zizman Novam 2000 dan Lakur Siprem Lond finn vinn met divan lizye piblik sa konspirasyon deta terib, enn konspirasyon pu derasinn tu Chagosyen, pu koken Chagos an antye, e pu konverti seki ti sipoze pu vinn enn swa-dizan “stasyon sinyalman” an enn baz militer mazer pu solda, maren, erfors USA.

Listwar ti tufe osi par Leta Zini – pei ki ti komplis dan tusala, pei ki ti azir e tuzur pe azir kuma reseler, pei ki mont so baz militer orib. Leta Amerikin asak fwa finn lav so lame de so responsabilite. Wadire Pons Pilat. Get lartik lor purswit Chagosyen kont Leta Amerikin, ek so Dick Cheney ek so Donald Rumsfeld (paz 179). Sa purswit la expoz lyen malsen ant bann militer, bann Sekreter Deta, bann PDG konpayni prive ki rul baz militer, ek politisyen eli. Get osi lartik Rada Kistnasamy lor mini-zizman prosediral dan ka-la, paz 171. Ena enn lartik byen interesan baze lor rapor depi dimunn ki oblize rest anonim, lor ki manyer li ete zordizur lor Diego Garcia (get paz 155).

Listwar sirtu, finn tufe par politik Leta Moris – so Ramgoolam, so Jugnauth, so Bérenger, so Gayan – zot tu finn servi Chagos ek finn servi sufrans ek lapenn Chagosyen kuma enn vilger levye pu zot apiye detanzantan, pu ki zot tir benefis depi Angle, benefis depi Amerikin, pu profi sekter prive Moris, setadir pu zot bayer de fon politik. Alor leta morisyen finn azir lor kestyon Diego dan enn fason ki direkteman ede pu ogmant profi tablisman, pu fer so disik vann pli buku dan marse Lerop, dan marse Amerikin, ler la Pu profi zonn frans, pu fer triko patron vann pli buku dan marse Amerikin. Get lartik Alain Ah-Vee lor rol malsen Leta Moris, su so diferan politisyen Travayis ek MMM, paz 125.

Get lartik Ashok Subron (paz 85) lor sabotaz sa proze extra-ordiner “Losean Indyen Zonn de Pe”. Sa sabotaz-la ti fer par sa bann mem politisyen tret, *Lalit* akiz zot de “tret” parski, tandi ki sekter prive ek PMSD ti tultan pro-kapitalis, pro-inperyalis, pro-dominasyon, Travayis, li, dan so listwar li ti *kont*, li ti ansam ar lepep oprime, ar klas travayer. Me, li finn vande. Samem nu dir li “tret”: Me, listwar retenir ki kan Ramgoolam ti vande ar Angle, an 1965, Moris ti tuzur koloni, alor so Premye Minis pa ti relman ena puvwar “vande” anver so “met”. Li ti ankor reelman su zug kolonyal. Par kont, MMM, kan li pu vinn vande, li pena okenn de pretext. MMM, li osi, avan lane 1981 par la, li ti kont kapitalis, li ti kont kolonizasyon ek li ti opoz bann espes reyn inperyal. Lerla li finn vande. E, latet dan vande, se so Bérenger limem. Moman exak, kan li vande piblikman lor zafer Diego, se kan li gayn so nominasyon kuma enn espes “anbasader partu-partu” an 1990 dan Guvernman koalisyon ar Jugnauth.

E, kan zot vande, natirelman tu sa bann parti politik o-puvwar refiz vinn chalenj Guvernman Angle ek Amerikin, ni dan Nasyon Zini avek enn rezolisyon kare-kare, ni dan Lakur Lazistis Internasyonal. Zot prefer marsand lavantaz isi-laba pu Misye-la. Zot prefer res trankil lor baz militer, lor kestyon re-inifikasyon Moris, lor sufrans Chagosyen.

Me, Guvernman li pa lepep. Sa sekre ki Guvernman finn sey garde, li finn suvan kase kan dimunn ordiner Chagosyen ek dimunn ordiner Moris finn reysi lev enn muvman politik tapaze, fer manifestasyon lari a ot vwa, vinn akter dan nu prop listwar. Get lartik Ragini Kistnasamy ek Lindsey Collen (paz 109) lor prezizeman sa lalit nob ki dimunn ordiner, sirtu fam, finn amene dan nu pei kan zot finn defye lotorite.

E tudernyeman lavwal sekre pe tire net.

Alor, nu liv lor Diego Garcia tom byen.

Li enn moman dan listwar kot Georges W. Bush, Prezidan Leta Zini, anperer oto-deklare, pre pu vinn Moris. Dan premye lartik dan liv, Ram Seegobin sitye sa moman la, e linportans Diego Garcia ladan. (Get paz 17). Get lartik Rada Kistnasamy lor politik Bush ki fer buku ditor, ki li lanvironman avek so refi siyn Trete Kyoto (paz 172) ki li so finansman par sekter prive kuma Enron ek Andersen, enn konpayni ki okip rekritman pu travay baz Diego (paz 173), ki li lyen so kabine avek sekter prive (paz 175).

Rezon pu vizit Bush se ki lalwa Amerikin *African Growth and Opportunity Act* (AGOA) exize ki li fer enn reynion enn fwa sak 2 an avek Sef Deta Afrikin, dan kad enn Biznes Forum. E Bush finn dekret Moris pei ki pu resevwar Forum la: Zanvye 2003. Get lartik Rajni Lallah lor AGOA e lor lyen sa lalwa extra-teritoryal lor lalit otur Diego Garcia, paz 57. Get osi paz 212 kot Ram Seegobin (an 2000) dan enn konferans internasyonal dan San Francisco, ti liye sa 2 lalit-la (enn kontrandi so diskur laba).

Nu kapav dir ki *Lalit* finn tuzur gard laflam lalit Diego Garcia alime. Se *Lalit* ki finn gard sa trwa eleman politik santral ansam: lalit pu re-inifikasyon Moris, lalit pu drwa-retur ek drwa reparasyon, lalit pu tir sa vilen baz-la depi sa arsipel sitan zoli. E ladan – dan fidelite a tuletrwa lalit ansam – ki ena lakle laviktwar. Kuma Mme Talate dir: “Pu rann nu Chagos, Diego ki lakle.”

Nu, lepep Moris ansam ek lepep Afrikin ek lepep Amerikin ek lepep Angle, pu fer ferm sa baz-la, pena zes.

Dan sa kontex-la, nu pe bibliye kuma enn “recent campaigns document” platform Rann Nu Diego (get paz 211). Lindsey Collen lor nom Lalit, ti ekrir enn “Let Uver a Sitwayen Britanik ek Amerikin” (get paz 224). Ena enn akisasyon presante divanenn tribinal internasyonal kont lalwa AGOA (inklir so lefe lor kestyon kuma Diego) ki Ram Seegobin ti prezante dan Los Angeles (get paz 214). U kapav lir enn deklarasyon depi enn Strategy Workshop Sahrington (kot nu ena mamb aktif) ki pe fer sinye o-nivo lafrik aktyelman, paz 221. E get lartik par Ragini Kistnasamy ek Lindsey Collen lor “*Base Closures*” (paz 161) ki montre komye baz militer lamas dimunn reysi fors Leta Amerikin anfet ferme. Dan dernye 15 an, li 30% so bann baz andeor Leta Zini ki finn ferme. Sa vedit, nu ena, atraver nu muvman mondyal ek isi, pu fer Lamerik ek Gran Bretayn pey enn pri politik byen for.

Alor, seki bann Leta Britanik, Amerikin ek Morisyen finn konplote pu gard sekre, pe expoze asterla.

Ondire listwar pe tir so vanzans kont sa konspirasyon pu perpetre enn krim kont limanite an sekre. Chagosyen, tu sa bann Morisyen exile depi zot lil dorizinn, finn ranport laviktwar dan zot ka dan Lakur Siprem dan Gran Bretayn: zot gayn drwa return Chagos.

Get lartik par Lindsey Collen ek Ragini Kistnasamy lor tu sa evennman kasyet ki finn sorti dan sa Ka-la, paz 25. Me, laviktwar ankor lwen, parski ena tu sort kalite problem pu zot al Chagos, sirtu Diego Garcia. (Get lartik paz 135 lor sityasyon Chagosyen zordi). E pli grav, dan listwar Leta Moris finn servi Chagosyen kuma levye pu gayn profi pu Misye-la; sa finn kree kondisyon kot zordi, sirtu apre Zizman-la, si nu reysi fer nu Guvernman azir kont Guvernman Britanik ek Amerikin, zot pu sezi tu lokazyon pu rod negosye separeman avek Chagosyen. Gran Bretayn ek USA, zot plan se pu fer swa Chagos antye, swa Diego Garcia kuma enn “Mayotte”, setadir enn but demambre, avek enn stati ki res a-definir.

E, bann B-52 tuzur pe dekole depi laba pu al bombard lezot pei: Irak, lerla Afganistan, Sudan, lerla Afganistan ankor, sirman Yemen, e lerla petet Irak ankor. Alor, popilasyon sivil pe mor, pe blese, pe tromatize, ar bom ki large depi avyon ki sorti nu later, depi port avyon ki kaze dan nu labe, dan enn parti nu pei: Diego Garcia. (Finn mem ena enn aksidan enn B-1, enn avyon ki ekipe pu sarye zarm nikleer, get “info” Rada Kistnasamy paz 175. Sa expoz ankor enn danze pu nu rezyon).

Pu fasilite konpreansyon bann lekter lor listwar Diego Garcia, nu pe piblie enn kronoloji prepare par Veena Dholah ek enn grup kamarad.

Nu devwar se pu fors nu Guvernman aret so politik kriminel lor kestasyon Chagos. Si ena Depite ubyen Minis ki anvi reprezant lintere sekirite Amerikin, li bizin demisyone dan Parlman isi, al poz so kandidatir Lamerik. Si ena Preme ubyen Vis Preme Minis ki anvi reprezant lintere sekter prive, li bizin aret pretann ki li reprezant enn sirkonskripsyon kelkonk ek rant dan Mauritius Employers’ Federation.

Diego Garcia li enpe kuma enn mikrokosm ki montre nu tu bann danze lepok globalizasyon. Li osi montre lyen ant globalizasyon kapitalist aktyel, dan tu so vyolans destriktif, ek sa kolonizasyon kriyel ek inimin avan li.

US Hegemony and Unilateralism

By Ram Seegobin

Over the past 20 years the world has moved from a bipolar state, with the United States and the Soviet Block forming the two poles and a large number of countries in a non-aligned movement, to a situation of growing hegemony with the US in total command. This transition happened gradually in the first decade, and then very rapidly after 1989, when the Soviet Block collapsed. During the same period the Peoples' Republic of China moved towards greater integration into the world market. It is rather much of a coincidence that in 1989, it was the military retreat from Afghanistan that heralded the collapse of the Soviet Union and announced the coming US hegemony, while in 2001 it is the military invasion of Afghanistan again, by the US and its lackeys, that confirmed the same US hegemony.

But then it has been common knowledge for a very long time now that Afghanistan holds the key to the immense oil and gas reserves in the central Asian republics east of the Caspian Sea. As in a game of chess, the barren mountains of Afghanistan represent the strategically vital square that allows control over vast energy resources. The mujaheddins, the Talibans, the al-Qa'ida, Ben Laden, these are all pawns and pieces that change from black to white and back again.

US Hegemony

The organic growth of US hegemony over the whole world has had several different components: one of the earliest ones was an internal ideological battle within the United States itself, where the political and economic right did battle against the post-Vietnam War "liberal" currents that had become entrenched in the various intellectual institutions, while at the same time economists like Friedman and Hayek were establishing an ultra-liberal economic agenda. Conservative and right-wing "foundations" like the Ford, Carnegie and Heritage Foundations took the relay, and this drive eventually produced the Reagan-Thatcher US-UK axis, which has since become the Bush-Blair axis.

The economic backbone of this hegemony was simply "ultra-liberalism", in other words the disengagement of the state and elimination of democratic control from all spheres of economic activity, with the result that multinational corporations (mainly US-based ones) could now decide on the fate of billions all over the globe, with profit as the only real motivating factor. The ultra-liberal agenda was imposed through the agency of institutions like the *World Bank*, the *International Monetary Fund*, and the *World Trade Organization*, all of which are under heavy American control. Present day capitalist Globalization is driven by a certain ideology, and that ideology corresponds to the interests of large multinationals, most of which are US-based.

To speed things along in the direction of deepening liberalization, the US will not hesitate to use "trade weapons": the *African Growth and Opportunities Act* will facilitate entry into the American market as long as African countries agree to privatize services and public utilities and expose consumers to the greed of investing corporations, as long as exporting countries support US foreign policy, however aggressive and expansionist.

The penetration of ultra-liberal capitalist ideology and the imposition of corporate rule throughout the world have been achieved through "gun-boat diplomacy" and downright military interventions. The "military-industrial complex" that effectively determines both the internal and external policies of the US has been responsible for a number of wars and military interventions over the past years, with different ideological pretexts in different periods. The US crusade to contain the expansion of communism and Soviet influence in the

world produced the Vietnam War, the CIA interventions against democratic governments in Chile and Nicaragua. The “anti-drugs crusade” served as the excuse that led to the armed invasion of Panama and the kidnapping of Noriega, with over 8,000 dead, whereas the real reason was for the US to gain total control over the Panama Canal. After the “anti-drugs crusade” came the “humanitarian intervention” of “Operation Restore Hope” in Somalia with 10,000 dead, and the Kosovo War. Then in the late nineties started the “anti-terrorist crusade”: the bombing and destruction of a pharmaceutical factory producing essential medicines in Sudan in 1998, the bombing of Afghanistan equally in 1998, and the massive bombing and invasion of Afghanistan again in 2001. Today, in addition to the traditional massive military presence in countries like Saudi Arabia and Turkey, and on military bases like the one on Diego Garcia, the USA has established a strong military presence in the Philippines, Indonesia, Djibouti, and Ivory Coast. They have in addition established a list of other countries that could receive military attention in the near future, all in the name of “anti-terrorism”, as if launching a military attack on the civilian population of a country could possibly prevent future acts of terrorism in the world.

But behind all these wars and military interventions of the USA, the naked interests and greed of the “military-industrial complex” are plain for all to see, whatever the pretext that is being used during any given period. The military budget and the profits of big corporations producing armaments soar around each war, the control of US corporations tightens over the supply of oil and gas after each military intervention in the Middle East. The new strategy of the “military-industrial complex” and the US oil corporations is to establish control over the immense oil fields off the West African coast.

The spying activities of the various US agencies is no longer taken up with the cold war: the targets are now the so-called “terrorist organizations”, the various movements that are challenging the US-led capitalist globalization process, or just about anybody who does not accept US hegemony. Today, with the “Echelon” electronic surveillance system, the CIA and military intelligence of the USA can listen in on any private telephone conversation, and pinpoint the location of any portable telephone.

US Unilateralism

By definition, hegemony implies unilateralism. The role of the *United Nations Organisation* has steadily been whittled down, as the more democratic General Assembly has been made subservient to the Security Council where the US has a veto, and where the non-permanent members can be pressurized or blackmailed into voting with the US, even when it is clear that it is the US national interest that is predominating. The US has, in the past vetoed a UN Resolution calling on all member countries to respect international law: the US clearly sees itself as being “above international law”. The same unilateralism has manifested itself over the Kyoto agreement to decrease the emission of hot-house gases: the present Bush administration, with its heavy links to the oil and energy industries, withdrew from the agreement. The UN Conference on Racism that took place in Durban in 2001 was quite thoroughly sabotaged because the US did not agree to the question of reparations for slavery being discussed. The UN Resolutions on the limitation of the use of land-mines has also not been ratified by the US, presumably because the US military wants to continue using “cluster bombs” in their dirty wars, and cluster bombs have very much the same effect as land mines that continue to kill and maim civilian populations, especially children, for years after. At present the US is waging and preparing to wage wars against a number of countries, all in the name of the “war against terror”, following the September 11 attacks in New York and Washington. But what is perhaps not very well known is that the US is the only country in the world that has been tried and convicted for “State terrorism” by an international tribunal, for its terrorist actions against a democratically elected government in Nicaragua. It is perhaps not surprising that the US has not only refused to recognize the newly set up *International Criminal Court* for hearing cases of “war crimes” and “crimes against humanity”, but it has even gone so far as to force a small number of docile countries to sign bilateral agreements which would exclude the handing over for trial of US military personnel accused of these crimes.

The more recent examples of US unilateralism can be seen in the way that Afghan prisoners have simply been transported to the Guantanamo US military base on the island of Cuba, where they have neither the status of “prisoners of war” under the Geneva Convention, nor are they in the least protected by Courts of Law of the US. After the New York and Washington attacks, many hundreds of non-US citizens were arrested throughout that country: the diplomatic missions of the countries from which those detainees came from had no access to them, nor even any information as to where they were being detained.

The recent Resolution on the resumption of arms inspection in Iraq that the US wanted voted by the *United Nations* Security Council is perhaps the most glaring example of the way in which the US intends to impose its unilateralism on the *UNO*.

The resolution aimed at legitimizing a massive military attack by the US on Iraq, if Bush, in his own judgment, considered that Iraq was not in total compliance with the conditions as laid out in the UN Security Council Resolution.

Hegemony is fragile

Hegemony is very much like an enormous dam: it looks formidable and impregnable, until there is a crack in it, and then it destroys itself by the sheer weight of the contradictions and conflicts that it has accumulated.

The Anti-globalization movement that has brought together trade union movements, ecologists, landless peasant movements, youth and women’s movements, has effectively and successfully challenged the US-led capitalist globalization that is threatening the very existence of millions of poor people in the world. The ideology behind capitalist globalization has been exposed, the role of the US-based corporations and the Bush administration has been exposed and is being challenged. The economic basis for US hegemony and unilateralism is no longer as strong as it was.

As the threat of a US-led war against Iraq and other countries becomes more real, the “Anti-War Movement” is gaining momentum in many countries of the world, but perhaps more significantly, in the USA itself. Soon the American people will no longer accept that their country should wage murderous wars, in the selfish interest of the “military-industrial complex”.

After the attacks against the Twin Towers of New York and the Pentagon Headquarters in Washington, Bush and his “military-industrial complex” tried to consolidate US hegemony by imposing an ultimatum on the world; they said, in effect: “Either you are behind us, or you are with the terrorists, and then we will come after you.” For a few weeks this ultimatum worked, but now the same ultimatum has turned against Bush, and the cracks are now visible in the dam.

The task is now to create an international movement to oppose politically the hegemonic nature of US imperialism, otherwise there will be the danger that the opposition will develop on the terrain of religious fundamentalism and obscurantism. In the short term the struggle will need to be focused on the lackeys of US imperialism in each country, the same lackeys without whom there would be no hegemony.

British Courts, November 2000

How Diego Garcia was Depopulated & Stolen

By Lindsey Collen & Ragini Kistnasamy

The history of the forcible removal of two thousand people from their home islands in part of Mauritius, that is to say on the Chagos Archipelago, to another part, that is to say the main island of Mauritius¹, should be a very well known story. And yet it persists in not being well known.

The authors have for over 20 years been working on getting this true story known – to the people of Mauritius, to the people of the United Kingdom and to the people of the United States of America, that is to say, to the people of the three countries where democratic control over Governments can conceivably put right the wrongs done in the past.

But where there are vested interests in silence, even though the beacon of truth is lit, it is as though it is too weak a light to shine through the opacity of vested interests.

However, there are moments of important exceptions. When the truth gets out. Sometimes it gets out, only to be buried again by the vested interests.

One of these examples, which we want to keep unburied is an important court case.

The Supreme Court judgment in Britain in the Olivier Bancoult case against the British State is one of these exceptions. The Case was for the right of Chagossian people to return to Diego Garcia and Chagos. Bancoult and the members of the Chagos Refugees Group won their case. The Ordinance under which they were exiled was quashed. They have won the right to return. In practice, of course, the administrative barriers are still there and are being fought against.²

Here, in this article, we will treat the social and constitutional history of the “depopulation”, from the viewpoint of the facts that are made clear in the judgment, especially its first part. We do this because there are many people (not necessarily the first readers of this book, but other who you might want to convince) who stand more chance of believing a Law Lord and his colleague judge, Lord Justice Laws and Mr. Justice Gibbs, than two women in Lalit who were arrested and charged with unlawful demonstration, in the struggle to get these facts out. We might be considered biased. The judges could not possibly be biased in the direction of the people we are supporting.

We should point out at the start that this Case was 30 years late in coming to the Courts for a very simple reason that readers might like to bear in mind. The facts were tied up in the 30-year “secrecy” law, in Britain.³ Once the facts were out, and published in the Henri Marimootoo ground-breaking series of articles, The Diego Files, the Court case became possible.

In this article we are not going to debate the issue of whether the case hinders the Mauritian sovereignty claim or not. We are only highlighting the way in which the contents of the judgment help the spreading of the truth about this cruel bit of colonial history.

We shall follow the reader through the contents of the judgment⁴, but only as the judgment affects our understanding of history. This means we will not be referring to all the convoluted arguments, including a lot of royalist and colonial references, relevant as they may be to the strictly “legal” questions.

¹ Some of the people on Chagos were forcibly removed to Seychelles

² See our article in this book, “Sityasyon Chagosyen Zordi”

³ Documents created by Government Departments in Britain are usually closed for thirty years. Most are released on the 1st January 30 years after the date of the last document on the file. Occasionally records may be closed for longer than 30 years, these are known as *extended closures* and are usually released after either 50 or 75 years. (The last New Year's Opening took place on the 1st January 2002 when over 34,000 files from 1971, 1951 and 1926 were released to the public.) See our article in this book, “Secrecy Laws in UK”

⁴ Readers will note that the structure of our article is sometimes quite difficult to follow. We found that, in order to be strictly loyal to the judgement, we have had to follow the structure of the judgement.

The judgment starts by placing in a historical perspective the demand for the right to return to where the Chagossians believe they belong.

History of the islands and its people

The judgment starts by saying accurately that the Chagos Archipelago islands and Mauritius were ceded to Great Britain by France in 1814. From that date until 1965 the Archipelago was governed as part of the British colony of Mauritius. About 1,100 miles separates Chagos from Mauritius main Island. The judgment then goes on to mention the Chagossian inhabitants. “On at least some of the islands, there lived in the 1960s a people called the Ilois⁵. They were an indigenous people: they were born there, as were one or both of their parents, in many cases one or more of their grandparents, in some cases (it is said) one or more of their great-grandparents. Some may perhaps have traced an earlier indigenous ancestry.” So much for the UK and US fiction, over the years, that there were no permanent residents of the islands the US so badly wanted to rent from the UK, in exchange for the UK getting Polaris systems on credit. What this judgment will expose to readers is one of the shadier conspiracies carried out under the cover of the Cold War, between the UK and the USA. And we should bear in mind that today the US military base on Diego Garcia is used regularly, as point of departure for aircraft carriers and aircraft on missions that involve killing civilians. We should also bear in mind that democratic control over what is done there is lost somewhere between the peoples of the UK, the USA and Mauritius. So, it is as though there is a bit of the planet where the military tries to rule as dictator.

Crucial US military base

The judgment then describes how crucial the US base is. This is important because we have heard US spokespersons referring to Diego Garcia as a rather insignificant base⁶. The judgment says: “In the 1960s by agreement between the governments of the United Kingdom and the United States of America it was resolved that there be established a major American military base upon the chief island of the Archipelago, Diego Garcia. There is no doubt but that the defense facility which the base provides is of the highest importance. In a letter of 21 June 2000 from the US Department of State it is described as “an all but indispensable platform” for the fulfillment of defense and security responsibilities in the Arabian Gulf, the Middle East, South Asia and East Africa.”

Cutting Mauritius up

The judgment is clear on the point that Chagos was in fact “divided from Mauritius”, and that this was done in order to make way for the base. This second point too, is important, especially as successive Mauritian Governments fail to see, or refuse to see, that it is the Diego Garcia base that they must continue to call to be closed down, instead of being obsequious about sovereignty. “In order to facilitate the establishment of the base, the Archipelago was first divided from Mauritius and constituted (together with certain other islands)⁷ as a separate colony to be known as the “British Indian Ocean Territory” (“BIOT”). That was done by the British Indian Ocean Territory Order 1965 (“the BIOT Order”).”

Depopulation by force

The judgment also makes it clear that people were forcibly removed to make way for the base. This is, of course, generally accepted in Mauritius, but it is often hard to make ordinary British or American people believe such an atrocity was committed in their names.

The judgment reads: “Then in 1971 the whole of the Ilois population of BIOT (and other civilians living there) were compulsorily removed to Mauritius. Their removal was effected under a measure called the Immigration Ordinance 1971 (“the Ordinance”). The Ordinance was made by the Commissioner for BIOT (“the Commissioner”).”⁸ He was an official created by Section 4 of the BIOT Order. The judgment describes the legal

⁵ This term has been replaced by “Chagossien” as the term “Ilois” developed perjorative connotations

⁶ The US Ambassador in 1994, for example, in a press interview said: “If Mauritius asks the Americans to evacuate Diego Garcia, this won’t cause us illness. Diego Garcia won’t be a major irritant in our bilateral relations. Our survival does not depend on Diego Garcia. If we have got to go, we will go.” (*L’Express*, 29 May, 1994)

⁷ The BIOT was set up with islands severed from Mauritius, on the one hand, and Seychelles on the other hand. Seychelles has challenged Britain on this severing of its national boundaries and has successfully retrieved all its islands out of BIOT.

⁸ The Commissioner was, in fact the second respondent representing the British State in the Bancoult case, the first respondent being the Secretary of State for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office

set-up behind the forcible removals: [The Commissioner] “made, or purportedly made, the Ordinance under powers conferred by section 11 of the BIOT Order. As a matter of fact he made it ... upon the orders of the Queen's Ministers in London.”...

“The principal issue in the case is whether there was any lawful power to remove the Ilois from BIOT, in the manner in which that was done.”

Queen’s Prerogative used for BIOT Order to remove Chagossians

The judgment says that the BIOT Order made on 8 November 1965 by "Her Majesty, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in that behalf by the Colonial Boundaries Act 1895, or otherwise in Her Majesty vested" ... “is an Order in Council made under the powers of the Royal Prerogative. This gives an idea of the immense powers still vested in the monarchy, and helps explain why so many British people are against the Monarchy. This is what the Order says:

“3. As from the date of this Order -

“ ‘a) the Chagos Archipelago, being islands which immediately before the date of this Order were included in the Dependencies of Mauritius, and

“ ‘b) the Farquhar Islands, the Aldabra Group and the Island of Desroches, being islands which immediately before the date of this Order were part of the Colony of Seychelles, shall together form a separate colony which shall be known as the British Indian Ocean Territory.

“ ‘4. There shall be a Commissioner for the Territory who shall be appointed by Her Majesty by Commission under Her Majesty's Sign Manual and Signet and shall hold office during Her Majesty's pleasure.

“ ‘5. The Commissioner shall have such powers and duties as are conferred or imposed upon him by or under this Order or any other law and such other functions as Her Majesty may from time to time be pleased to assign to him, and, subject to the provisions of this Order and any other law by which any such powers or duties are conferred or imposed, shall do and execute all things that belong to his office according to such instructions, if any, as Her Majesty may from time to time see fit to give him.’ ”

The judgment then looks at Section 11 of the BIOT Order because of its critical importance to the central arguments in the case:

“(1) The Commissioner may make laws for the peace, order and good government of the Territory, and such laws shall be published in such manner as the Commissioner may direct.

“...And Section 19 of the BIOT Order provides:

“ ‘There is reserved to Her Majesty full power to make laws from time to time for the peace, order and good government of the British Indian Ocean Territory (including, without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing, laws amending or revoking this Order).’

“ Section 4 also excludes any person who does not have a permit from being there. It reads:

“ ‘(1) No person shall enter the Territory or, being in the Territory, shall be present or remain in the Territory, unless he is in possession of a permit or his name is endorsed on a permit in accordance with the provisions of section 5 and section 7 of this Ordinance respectively.’ (Our underlining)

“Section 10 says the Commissioner can decree any person’s presence “unlawful” and he “shall be removed from and remain out of the Territory, either indefinitely or for a period to be specified in the order.”

The Background Facts, according to the judgment

The judgment says the numbers of people living there were “significant”. Whether they were in the hundreds or the thousands, the judgment says, is not material. According to one report quoted in the judgment by a British official⁹ from 1971, that is after people had already been suffering forced removals, there were 829. About half were on Diego Garcia, and the others on Peros Banhos and Salomon. About half were dual nationality British and Mauritian, half Seychellois and some were Mauritian citizens only. In fact, there was about three times this number before the removals started.

Economic activity

The judgment says (but this is only true if one excludes the growing of vegetables, animal husbandry, the harvesting of fish, other sea food, turtle and bird eggs): “Before these upheavals the principal, effectively the only, economic activity on the islands had been the production of copra from coconut plantations.”

Land ownership

The judgment reads: “As a matter of private law, title to the islands had been vested in the plantation company, Chagos Agalega Ltd; but the Crown purchased the company's rights in 1967.”

⁹ It is not unlikely that this figure is a gross underestimate, bearing in mind the plot to pretend the Islands were uninhabited

What this means is that the British State was already going ahead with the severing of Mauritius, and the depopulation, was already being implemented. Then, the islands “were managed by the company under lease.”¹⁰

The judgment goes on to say that “Both before and after the company's acquisition by the Crown, the inhabitants, including the Ilois, were all contract workers on the plantations, or family members of such workers. None of them enjoyed property rights in any of the land. This is of some importance, since from time to time before the making of the Ordinance, the documents show that the British authorities (I mean the term neutrally as between Her Majesty's government in the United Kingdom and the, or any, distinct government of BIOT) have had it in mind to rely on the inhabitants' lack of such rights, and their status as contract workers wholly dependent on the plantations, as being in some way inconsistent with their possession of any public law rights to remain in the territory as citizens of it.”

The position of the British State had been made clear in Court when their lawyers said: “... in 1968 all the Ilois living on the islands were employed as labourers by the plantation owners (or were members of the families of such labourers) and none pursued a livelihood independent of the plantations. The Ilois accepted that they could be moved by their employers from one island to another and even from the islands as a whole if, for example, they were guilty of misconduct. None of them owned any land or had the right to permanent use of the land.”

Conspiracy of British Officials and Ministers: 1964-1972

The judgment fixes the first formal discussion around the setting up of a base as early 1964. In fact, there were informal negotiations perhaps from earlier than this. The judgment says: “Discussions between the governments of the United Kingdom and the United States concerning the establishment of defense facilities in the Indian Ocean were held in February 1964.”¹¹

The judgment then goes on to expose the elements of the conspiracy, as they were played out: “It is clear that by 11 May 1964, the date of a secret memorandum headed “DEFENCE INTERESTS IN THE INDIAN OCEAN”, prospective initiatives relating to the arrangements which would need to be made were well advanced. The document states:

“ ‘In his telegram No 977 Sir P[atrick] Dean draws attention to the difficulties we are likely to have to face in the United Nations if these proposals became known at the present time. In connexion with our proposal for placing the various territories concerned under direct UK administration, he draws attention to paragraph 6 of Resolution No 1514 (of December 14, 1960)¹² which reads:-

“ ‘Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.’

“He also suggests that we might face demands for separate transmission of information about these territories under Article 73 of the Charter which requires members ‘to transmit regularly to the Secretary General... statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social and educational conditions in the territories for which they are responsible.’”

So all the illegality and all the immorality of the planned take-over of Diego Garcia were made absolutely clear to the Cabinet.

The judgment adds that “A revised memorandum of May 1964 refers in terms to “the repatriation or resettlement of persons currently living on the islands selected¹³”. In paragraph 9 of the same document:

“ ‘The line taken with regard to those persons now living and working in the dependencies would relate to their exact status. If, in fact, they are only contract laborers rather than permanent residents, they would be evacuated with appropriate compensation and re-employment. If, on the other hand some of the persons now living and working on the islands could be considered permanent residents, i.e., their families have lived there for a number of generations, then political effects of their removal might be reduced if some element of choice could be introduced in their resettlement and compensation.’”

The judgment then goes on to say that “No element of choice was in the event provided.” In other words, people were just treated as if they were not permanent residents when they were.

Keeping the Mauritian State out of the way

The judgment then quotes a document that shows the way that the British and American authorities were scheming to do away with any risk of “control” by Mauritius. “In another 1964 document it is made clear that “[it] would be unacceptable to both the British and the American defense authorities if

¹⁰ Then, the company was re-constituted and renamed Moulinie and Co Ltd.

¹¹ The agreement ultimately arrived at is contained in a 1966 Exchange of Notes (1/173), which is before us.

¹² For quotes and references, see our article in this book, “Constitutional History of Chagos”, esp. the footnotes.

¹³ Note the use of the word “selected”, showing how the UK was looking for islands to give USA for military use.

facilities of the kind proposed were in any way to be subject to the political control of a newly emergent independent state (Mauritius is expected to become independent some time after 1966¹⁴)... it is hoped that the Mauritius Government may agree to the islands being detached and directly administered by Britain." In January 1965 the Americans were making plain their view that "detachment proceedings should include the entire Chagos archipelago, primarily in the interest of security, but also to have other sites in this archipelago available for future contingencies¹⁵." Then in July 1965 the Foreign Office in London was saying:

“The islands will be administered direct by Her Majesty's Government with the object of making them available in the long term for the construction of such defense facilities as may be required. The islands in question are the Chagos Archipelago...”

Then on 28 July there is a Foreign Office memorandum which states:

“Our understanding is that the great majority of [those people at present on the islands] are there as contract labourers on the copra plantations on a number of the islands; a small number of people were born there and, in some cases, their parents were born there too. The intention is, however, that none of them should be regarded as being permanent inhabitants of the islands. Islands will be evacuated as and when defense interests require this. Those who remain, whether as workers on those copra plantations which continue to function or as labourers on the construction of defense installations, will be regarded as being there on a temporary basis and will continue to look either to Mauritius or to Seychelles as their home territory...

“In the absence of permanent inhabitants the obligations of Chapter XI of the United Nations Charter will not apply to the territory and we shall not transmit information on it to the Secretary-General (cf. The British Antarctic Territory).”[Underlining by authors of article]

Harold Wilson, British Prime Minister, in the plot

The judgment shows how quickly things then move. Three days from the brief to the Prime Minister, Harold Wilson, to the BIOT Order in Council: “On 5 November 1965 the Prime Minister was briefed by the Colonial Secretary. The Prime Minister was told that the proposal was to put the islands "under direct British administration", with arrangements to be made for compensation, and to seek the making of an appropriate Order in Council (which would create the new colony) on 8 November 1965; and as I have said, that was the date of the BIOT Order.”

The judgment now makes even more clear what happened. We quote again from the judgment: “There follow in the papers a series of notes and memoranda, which we examined in the course of argument, showing the concern of the British authorities to present to the outside world a scenario in which there were no permanent inhabitants on the Archipelago. I found the flavour of these documents a little odd; it is as if some of the officials felt that if they willed it hard enough, they might bring about the desired result, and there would be no such permanent population.”

So, the people living on Chagos had to be spirited away, if they could not be willed away.

As the judgment puts it: “There was, plainly, an awareness of a real difficulty in the way of the smooth transformation of the territory into its intended role as a defense establishment with no settled civilians. A note of 12 November 1965 reads:

““I agree that there is an awkward problem here which the Secretary of State should know about. The present idea is that the inhabitants (1,500 altogether) would not be removed from any of the Islands until they are required for defense purposes. This is going to make it very difficult to avoid having to report on the new territory under Article 73(e) of the Charter.”

“Then on 15 November 1965, in the words of another official:

““... the territory is a non-self-governing territory and there is a civilian population even though it is small. In practice, however, I would advise a policy of 'quiet disregard' - in other words, let's forget about this one until the United Nations challenge us on it.””

It is clear that the judges in the Bancourt case just could not believe what they were hearing. It is clearly a conspiracy that was only ever to have been clearly exposed during the course of the judgment.

The judgment says: “It seems to have been in early 1966 that first thoughts were given as to the form which an Immigration Ordinance relating to BIOT might take. A manuscript note dated to February 1966 reads in part:

“In this particular case it occurs to me that we do not really want anything as elaborate as the Seychelles Immigration Ordinance but something pretty rudimentary which merely allows for entry under permit and grants as few rights with as little formality as possible.”

¹⁴ Mauritius became independent on 12th March, 1968

¹⁵ This may be a reference to economic resources, the possible rich polymetallic nodules that there may be in the oceans.

At about the same time, on 25 February 1966, a confidential missive from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the Commissioner of BIOT in the Seychelles shows a recognition at a very high level in government of the tensions between British policy interests and the interests of the islanders:

“3. Our primary objective in dealing with the people who are at present in the Territory must be to deal with them in the way which will best meet our future administrative and military needs and will at the same time ensure that they are given fair and just treatment...

“4. With these objectives in view we propose to avoid any reference to 'permanent inhabitants', instead, to refer to the people in the islands as Mauritians and Seychellois... We are... taking steps to acquire ownership of the land on the islands and consider that it would be desirable... for the inhabitants to be given some form of temporary residence permit. We could then more effectively take the line in discussion that these people are Mauritians and Seychellois; that they are temporarily resident in BIOT for the purpose of making a living on the basis of contract or day to day employment with the companies engaged in exploiting the islands; and that when the new use of the islands makes it impossible for these operations to continue on the old scale the people concerned will be resettled in Mauritius or Seychelles.

“5. We understand from a recent discussion with Mr. Robert Newton [who had visited the islands] that, in his opinion, the people on the islands cannot be regarded as permanent inhabitants but are in fact in the category of contract labour employed by the estate owners or commercial concerns...

“6. Against this background we assume that there would be unlikely to be any undue difficulty with the inhabitants of BIOT themselves in moving over to a position in which they all held temporary residence permits on the basis of which their presence in the Territory would be allowed...

“7. Whatever arrangements are made to establish the status of the people in the BIOT as belongers of either Mauritius or Seychelles, there will in any case be a need for the enactment of appropriate immigration legislation for the Territory itself...”

Avoiding United Nations scrutiny

The judgment continues: “And the Commissioner's views were sought as to the proposal relating to temporary residence permits and other matters. A minute of June 1966 confronts the nub of the problem with considerable candor:

“ ‘They [the Colonial Office] wish to avoid using the phrase 'permanent inhabitants' in relation to any of the islands in the territory because to recognize that there are permanent inhabitants will imply that there is a population whose democratic rights will have to be safeguarded and which will therefore be deemed by the UN Committee of Twenty-four¹⁶ to come within its purview...

“ ‘It is... of particular importance that the decision taken by the Colonial Office should be that there are no permanent inhabitants in the BIOT. First and foremost it is necessary to establish beyond doubt what inhabitants there are at present in the islands, how long they have been resident there and whether any were born on the islands. Subsequently it may be necessary to issue them with documents making it clear that they are 'belongers' of Mauritius or Seychelles and only temporarily resident in the BIOT. This device, though rather transparent, would at least give us a defensible position to take up in the Committee of Twenty-four...

“ ‘It would be highly embarrassing to us if, after giving the Americans to understand that the islands in BIOT would be available to them for defense purposes, we then had to tell them that they fell within the preview [sic] of the UN Committee of Twenty-four.’”

So, the British State is working out how to avoid its United Nations obligations by “taking a decision” that there are no permanent inhabitants.

Colonialism and racism

But the judgment is even braver, in quoting the most colonialist and racist notes, that expose the mindset of the actors in the conspiracy. It is presumably this extreme racism that allows the officers of the State to conduct such a terrible secret plot against other human beings.

The judgment says: “There is a manuscript note by another official which comments on this minute; it refers to "a certain old fashioned reluctance to tell a whopping fib, or even a little fib, depending on the number of permanent inhabitants". A note dated 24 August 1966 quotes a minute from the Permanent Under-Secretary (I assume at the Colonial Office). The Permanent Under-Secretary unburdened himself thus:

““We must surely be very tough about this. The object of the exercise was to get some rocks which will remain ours; there will be no indigenous population except seagulls who have not yet got a Committee (the Status of Women Committee does not cover the rights of Birds¹⁷).”

¹⁶ Called Committee of Twentyfour, because set up under Article 24.

¹⁷ We have to draw attention to the race and sex prejudice in this quotation, which the judges have clearly included in order that it be noted. It continues in the next quote.

“ ‘This attracted a comment from another official, a Mr. Greenhill, who spoke the same language:
“‘‘Unfortunately along with the Birds go some few Tarzans or Men Fridays whose origins are obscure, and who are being hopefully wished on to Mauritius etc. When that has been done I agree we must be very tough and a submission is being done accordingly.”

Why the British wanted Diego Garcia and Chagos

The judgment quotes from a document which bears no date, but whose context shows it was written after 12 August 1966, and which has a section headed "OBJECTIVES". It shows how the British State wanted to avoid any political agitation when it would need to forcibly remove inhabitants:

"10. The primary objective in acquiring these islands from Mauritius and the Seychelles to form the new 'British Indian Ocean Territory' was to ensure that Her Majesty's Government had full title to, and control over, these islands so that they could be used for the construction of defense facilities without hindrance or political agitation and so that when a particular island would be needed for the construction of British or United States defense facilities Britain or the United States should be able to clear it of its current population. The Americans in particular attached great importance to this freedom of maneuver, divorced from the normal considerations applying to a populated dependent territory. These islands were therefore chosen not only for their strategic location but also because they had, for all practical purposes, no permanent population.

“ ‘11. It was implied in this objective, and recognized at the time, that we could not accept the principles governing our otherwise universal behaviour in our dependent territories, e.g. we could not accept that the interests of the inhabitants were paramount and that we should develop self-government there. We therefore consider that the best way in which we can satisfy these objectives, when our action comes under scrutiny in the United Nations, would be to assert from the start, if the need arose, that this territory did not fall within the scope of Chapter XI of the United Nations Charter.” (emphasis added in judgment)

These last two quotations from the section “Objectives” are truly horrific proof of the UK-US conspiracy. And Bush and Blair blithely call other States an “axis of evil”.

Plans to move Chagos inhabitants to Mauritius

The judgment continues: “On 2 March 1967 the Commissioner submitted a draft Ordinance to the Secretary of State under cover of a minute which set out the results of his own researches into the makeup of the Chagos population. His figures (for which, however, he did not claim "a high degree of accuracy") showed 563 Ilois spread over Diego Garcia, Salomon and Peros Banhos, of whom no less than 327 were children.” The minute implies that Chagossians could be moved to Mauritius, because they "belonged" to Mauritius:

“‘‘I think it is arguable that they can, for although they have been on Chagos for a long time, they have lived there only on sufferance of the owners of the islands and could at any time have been sent back to Mauritius if no longer wanted in connection with the estate. They have never in the past had any right to reside permanently in Chagos.”

“The Officer Administering the Government of Mauritius saw the potential flaw in this approach: in a missive to the Secretary of State (by now for Commonwealth Affairs, rather than the Colonies) of 29 September 1967 he stated:

“ ‘I am not sure myself about the validity of the argument that the Ilois have lived in Chagos 'only on sufferance of the owners', since the point at issue is 'belonging' in the national sense rather than rights of residence on private property.’

“By a detailed minute of 25 July 1968 the Prime Minister was briefed by the Foreign Secretary as to the overall position relating to the defense facility plans for the Chagos. An annex was attached headed "Position of Inhabitants", which in effect repeated the argument that the Ilois lived in the Archipelago only on sufferance of the private law owners: "In this sense it can be contended that no one has any right to reside permanently on the islands..." But there was growing anxiety among senior officials who were, so to speak, living close to the problem. On 4 September 1968 a Mr. J H Lambert stated:

‘We advised the Foreign Secretary that the latter argument might be difficult to sustain in view of the recent discovery that the numbers of second generation 'Ilois' were much greater than originally anticipated...’

“It may be helpful to set out the situation as I understand it:

“a) all the inhabitants of BIOT (totaling under 1,500) are citizens of the U.K. and Colonies and they are all entitled to a U.K. passport with the colonial endorsement;

“b) [deals with the Seychellois living in BIOT, who were "unlikely to exceed 1,000"]

“c) some 500 others (including the 434 second generation 'Ilois') have dual nationality. If they applied for a U.K. passport, presumably the colonial endorsement could only reveal that they belonged to BIOT since there was no other British colony to which they could belong.” (my emphasis)

“There is an interesting reflection upon the position in international law in a minute of 23 October 1968, written by a legal adviser, Mr. Aust:

“There is nothing wrong in law or in principle to enacting an immigration law which enables the Commissioner to deport inhabitants of BIOT. Even in international law there is no established rule that a citizen has a right to enter or remain in his country of origin/birth/nationality etc. A provision to this effect is contained in Protocol No. 4 to the European Convention on Human Rights but that has not been ratified by us [NB: as the judgment understands it, it still has not] and thus we do not regard the U.K. as bound by such a rule. In this respect we are able to make up the rules as we go along and treat the inhabitants of BIOT as not 'belonging' to it in any sense.” (emphasis added in judgment)

“On 21 April 1969 the Foreign Secretary submitted a further detailed minute to the Prime Minister, with copies to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Secretary of State for Defense, the Minister of Power and the Cabinet Secretary. Its occasion was the decision of the new US government to proceed with the military project on the Chagos subject to Congressional approval. Its importance is that it demonstrates the direct involvement of the United Kingdom government at the very highest level in the process of deciding how the Ilois should be dealt with in light of that project. The minute includes these passages:

“ ‘The problem of the future of these people exists independently of American plans, but the decision to proceed with a communications facility on Diego Garcia, which will necessitate evacuating that atoll, has brought it to a head...

“ ‘There is no ideal solution... I agree with the conclusion reached in the paper that on balance the best plan will be to try to arrange for these people, all of whom are citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies or of Mauritius or both, to return to the Seychelles¹⁸ or Mauritius. The people with whom we are concerned are working in the Chagos under contract and own no property or other fixed assets there. However, some of them have established roots in Chagos and I should naturally have wished to consult at least these in advance of any decisions about their future, if this had been possible. Officials have examined closely the possibility of giving them some element of choice, but have advised that this would seem wholly impracticable...

“ ‘In short I ask my colleagues to agree that... we should aim at the return of the inhabitants of the whole Chagos Archipelago to the Seychelles and Mauritius and should enter into negotiations with the Mauritian Government to that end...’

“There was a reply from 10 Downing Street on 26 April indicating the Prime Minister's agreement.” This means that between the 21st and 26th April, the Mauritian Government of Dr. Seewoosagur Ramgoolam, was forced into its “agreement” with the plans.

Drawing up the Ordinance under which people would be deported

The judgment proceeds: “On 16 January 1970 a Foreign Office legal adviser, Mr. Aust, gave written advice upon the question whether the then extant draft Immigration Ordinance should be enacted. His advice starts with this paragraph:

“ Purpose of Immigration Ordinance

“ ‘a) To provide legal power to deport people who will not leave voluntarily;

“ ‘b) to prevent people entering;

“ ‘c) to maintain the fiction that the inhabitants of Chagos are not a permanent or semi-permanent population.

“ ‘I will consider these separately.’

“He addresses (c) above by a paragraph headed ‘Maintaining the fiction’:

‘As long as only part of BIOT is evacuated the British Government will have to continue to argue that the local people are only a floating population. This may be easier in the case of the non-Chagos part of BIOT... where most of the people are Seychellois labourers and their families. However, the longer that such a population remains, and perhaps increases, the greater the risk of our being accused of setting up a mini-colony about which we would have to report to the United Nations under Article 73 of the Charter. Therefore strict immigration legislation giving such labourers and their families very restricted rights of residence would bolster our arguments that the territory has no indigenous population.’

Keeping it all secret

“It was at length decided, at the turn of the year 1970/71, to enact the Ordinance in the form in which it was in fact made. This was preceded by an exchange of minutes which demonstrates the earnest desire of the British government to ensure that its making should be attended by as little publicity as possible. A minute of January 1971, I think from BIOT to the Foreign Office, stated:

¹⁸ Seychelles was still a British colony at the time, thus this reference to British nationals being sent to the Seychelles

“ ‘The ordinance would be published in the BIOT Gazette, which has only very limited circulation both here and overseas, after signature by the Commissioner. Publicity will therefore be minimal.’”
This brings us to the end of PART I of the judgement.

Displacement

The second part of the judgment is perhaps the most important review of the historical facts around the cruel, illegal and immoral displacement of the people of Chagos, who were displaced, as is so abundantly clear, so as to make way for the military base, the military base carefully placed outside of any democratic political control by the people of any known country, the very same military base recently used for bombing civilians in Afghanistan, and being prepared for use for bombing civilian populations once again in Iraq.

Magna Carta

The strange thing about the judgment is that it also shows up something else. It shows that the class struggles of the past when they lead to the codification of human rights, can make the code last over time and apply over immense spaces of the planet. So the nobles who rose up against the King of England in 1215, when they succeeded in getting the Magna Carta signed by the King, left a heritage that applied in the year 2000, to people living in the middle of the Indian Ocean.

The judgement puts it this way, referring to the grounds for Bancoult challenging the BIOT Ordinance: “it is to the effect that section 4 of the Ordinance constitutes an affront to the rights and liberties enshrined in Cap. 29 of Magna Carta (I cite the modernized text given in Halsbury's Statutes):

“ ‘No freeman shall be taken or imprisoned, or be disseised of his freehold, or liberties, or free customs, or be outlawed, or exiled, or any other wise destroyed; nor will we pass upon him, nor condemn him, but by lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land. We will sell to no man, we will not deny or defer to any man either justice or right.’”

The judge even said: “I confess to having been dismayed to hear the government submit ... that the Magna Carta belonged to some unspecified category of subordinate law.”

And the judgment goes on: “It is clear that the Magna Carta is not applied to any colony by express words; it may only be so, therefore, by "necessary intendment". There was much argument at the Bar as to the extent to which the Magna Carta "followed the flag". That expression appeared in a judgment in the Canadian Supreme Court ...¹⁹ [where] it was said that Magna Carta "had always been considered to be law throughout the Empire. It was a law which followed the flag as England assumed jurisdiction over newly discovered or acquired lands or territories."

The judgment continues: “The Magna Carta is in truth the first general declaration (I do not think it was done by King Alfred in the ninth century), in the long run of our constitutional jurisprudence, of the principle of the rule of law. I will only cite Pollock and Maitland, *The History of English Law* (2nd edn 1923), vol. I. p.173:

“‘... this document becomes and rightly becomes a sacred text, the nearest approach to an irrepealable 'fundamental statute' that England has ever had. In age after age a confirmation of it will be demanded and granted as a remedy for those oppressions from which the realm is suffering, and this when some of its clauses, at least in their original meaning, have become hopelessly antiquated. For in brief it means this, that the king is and shall be below the law.’

“This describes the enduring significance of the Magna Carta today. So far as it is a proclamation of the rule of law, it may indeed be said to follow the flag - certainly as far as BIOT: for unless the removal of the Ilois from the Archipelago is shown to have been done according to law, the applicant in these proceedings must succeed; and while in that case there might perhaps be questions as to the appropriate form of relief, it cannot be and is not suggested that any prudential considerations (such as the strategic importance of the military base) should stay the court's hand.”

Status of Chagos as part of Mauritius

An interesting thing about the judgment is that it is categorical about the status of Chagos: It is part of Mauritius. The judgment reads: “It is beyond question that BIOT was in 1814 part of a ceded colony. When it was split from Mauritius by the BIOT Order, that position cannot have been changed.”

Forcible removal: For “Peace, Order, and Good Government” or not?

This part of the judgment is the part on which the case was decided in favour of Bancoult and the Chagossians, declaring Section 4 null and void, and thus allowing them the right to return to where they came from.

¹⁹ *Calder v AG of British Columbia* (1973) 34 DLR (3rd) 145, at p. 203

The question is; was the Ordinance (Section 4) empowered by Section 11 of the BIOT Order.

The judges say that all the past authorities “demonstrate beyond the possibility of argument that a colonial legislature empowered to make law for the peace, order and good government of its territory is the sole judge of what those considerations factually require ... But the colonial legislature's authority is not wholly unrestrained; peace, order and good government may be a very large tapestry, but every tapestry has a border. In *The Trustees Executors and Agency Co (1933)* 49 CLR 220 Evatt J in the High Court of Australia stated at 234:

“ ‘The correct general principle is... whether the law in question can be truly described as being for the peace, order and good government of the dominion concerned.’

“And at 235:

“ ‘The judgment of Lord Macmillan [sc. in *Croft v Dunphy* [1933] AC 156] affirms the broad principle that the powers possessed are to be treated as analogous to those of 'a fully sovereign State', so long as they answer the description of laws for the peace, order, and good government of the constitutional unit in question...’ ”

The judgment reads: “In answering the question whether a particular measure, here section 4 of the Ordinance, can be described as conducing to the territory's peace, order and good government it is I think no anachronism, and may have much utility, for the court to apply the classic touchstone given by our domestic public law for the legality of discretionary public power.²⁰ Could a reasonable legislator regard the provisions of section 4 [the forcible removals] as conducing to the aims of section 11[peace, order and good government]? In answering the question, the force of the cases shows that a very wide margin of discretion is to be accorded to the decision-maker; yet in stark contrast our modern domestic law tends in favour of a narrower margin, and a more intrusive judicial review, wherever fundamental or constitutional rights are involved.” This is a key part of the judgment.

The Legality of the Ordinance

The judgment goes on to make this point even more clear, and we quote: “Section 4 of the Ordinance effectively exiles the Ilois from the territory where they are belongers and forbids their return. But the "peace, order, and good government" of any territory means nothing, surely, save by reference to the territory's population. They are to be governed: not removed.”

The phrase we have just quoted is truly the heart of the judgment.

The judge who read the judgment, Justice Laws, then quoted his colleague judge, Justice Gibbs who gave “what with respect seems to me to be an illuminating example of the rare and exceptional kind of case in which an order removing a people from their lawful homeland might indeed make for the territory's peace, order and good government: it would arise where because of some natural or man-made catastrophe the land had become toxic and uninhabitable.”

And the judge goes on to make a clear statement: “Short of an extraordinary instance of that kind, I cannot see how the wholesale removal of a people from the land where they belong can be said to conduce to the territory's peace, order and good government.”

He even qualifies his broad statement by saying: “The people may be taxed; they should be housed; laws will criminalize some of the things they do; maybe they will be tried with no juries, and subject to severe, even brutal penalties; the laws made for their marriages, their property, and much besides may be far different from what obtains in England.”

He then introduces again the concept of “belongers”, that is to say people who “belong” somewhere: “These people are subjects of the Crown, in right of their British nationality as belongers in the Chagos Archipelago.” And he quotes someone who in 1820²¹, who said “the Queen has an interest in all her subjects, who rightly look to the Crown - today, to the rule of law [our underlining] which is given in the Queen's name - for the security of their homeland within the Queen's dominions. But in this case they have been excluded from it.”

He goes on to look at the reasons given for this exclusion: “It has been done for high political reasons: good reasons, certainly, dictated by pressing considerations of military security. But they are not reasons which may reasonably be said to touch the peace, order and good government of BIOT. ... In short, there is no principled basis upon which section 4 of the Ordinance can be justified as having been empowered by section 11 of the BIOT Order. And it has no other conceivable source of lawful authority.”

Does lack of land-ownership impinge on rights to belong to a place?

The judgment says the lack of land-ownership by Chagossians does not decrease their rights. “That,” says the judgment, “cannot affect the position in public or constitutional law. Nor can the making of

²⁰ As it is enshrined in *Wednesbury* [1948] 1 KB 223.

²¹ Chitty

any monetary compensation.” In other words, one cannot buy away someone’s rights to belong somewhere either.

The judge says that in his judgment “the apparatus of section 4 of the Ordinance has no colour of lawful authority.”

The judge then quotes a very old Latin saying, as follows: “It was Tacitus who said: They make a desert and call it peace - Solitudinem faciunt pacem appellat (Agricola 30). He meant it as an irony; but here, it was an abject legal failure.”

The British Government's Motives

Towards the end of the judgement, the Judge, Lord Justice Laws quotes the Bancourt Lawyer, Sir Sydney Kentridge as having argued about the motives of the British Government. This is what the judgment says: “Sir Sydney advanced a further argument to the effect that section 4 of the Ordinance was made for an ulterior motive. He submitted it was done as it was done not only to facilitate the base on Diego Garcia (itself an impermissible purpose, given section 11 of the BIOT Order), but also to keep the whole business as secret as possible, having regard to the concerns of the British government as to the possible scrutiny to which their intentions might be subjected by the United Nations. It is in part out of respect to this argument that I have set out in detail the course of the government's approach to the establishment of the military base in the years leading up to 1971.” Then he says this secrecy was only “ancillary, not separately objectionable”.

Could the forcible removals have been done legally some other way?

The judge says: “I entertain considerable doubt whether the prerogative power extends so far as to permit the Queen in Council to exile her subjects from the territory where they belong.”... “it would be one thing to send a Chagos belonger to another part of the Queen's dominions, and quite another to send him out of the Queen's dominions altogether. I would certainly hold this latter act could only be done by statute. Now, of course, Mauritius is an independent State.”

But of course, the British State could not act publicly. It had to act behind the backs of all its other own citizens in the UK. And here is the importance of this judgment. It shows everyone in the United Kingdom and the world how in fact the British State acted. And these imperialist, colonialist, actions were done, it should be remembered, by a Labour Government.

The Ruling of the Judgment

The judge ends briefly: “For all the reasons I have given I would allow the application. If my Lord agrees, we will hear argument as to the relief to be granted. I apprehend it will be appropriate merely to quash section 4 of the Ordinance.”

Government documents

The judge then proceeds to do a most unusual thing. He congratulates the State and its representatives for having produced with honesty official British Government documents that he describes as “embarrassing or worse”. We have quoted from them in our article. The Judge says: “I wish to commend the wholly admirable conduct of the relevant government servants and counsel instructed for the respondents who have examined and then disclosed without cavil or argument all the material documents contained in the files of government departments, some of which (as will be obvious from the narrative I have given) are embarrassing and worse.”

He adds, no doubt so that the State can hold on to some semblance of dignity in the face of the terrible disclosures: “This has exemplified a high tradition of co-operation between the executive and the judiciary in the doing of justice; and upholding the rule of law.

Words added by the Justice Laws’ colleague, Mr. Justice Gibbs

Mr. Justice Gibbs adds, amongst other things that “Each of the words "peace", "order" and "good government" in relation to a territory necessarily carries with it the implication that citizens of the territory are there to take the benefits. Their detention, removal and exclusion from the territory are inconsistent with any or all of those words. To hold that the expression used in the Order could justify the provisions of the Ordinance would thus in my judgment be an affront to any reasonable approach to the construction of language. I conclude therefore that the Ordinance was unlawful.”

He also expressed consternation at the way in which what we refer to as the plot or conspiracy was hatched: “It is clear from some of the disclosed documents that, in some quarters, official zeal in implementing those policies went beyond any proper limits. It would be no answer to say that these documents reflected the standards of a different period. I venture to think that the impression on right thinking people upon reading them would have been similar, then as now.”

Conclusion

We, the authors of this article, would like to appeal to you as readers to make the contents of this judgment known as widely as you possibly can. If you would like a copy of this article in electronic form to send to your contacts by e-mail, please contact us.

Welcomed by the bourgeoisie in South Africa and Mauritius AGOA – an instrument of the US ruling class

The US African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) is directly linked to the question of the US base on Diego Garcia. Mauritius is immediately brought to heel, like a pet poodle, when its representative at the UN intimates that Mauritius may not support the US resolution on Iraq. (B-2's and B-52's set off from Diego Garcia for attacking Iraq.) The AGOA condition about submitting to US foreign policy is quoted in the press here, as a reason for cowtowing.²² Not only that, AGOA is becoming an important link to all kinds of events on the political and economic scene in Mauritius. Privatisation, liberalisation, the government voting a "Prevention of Terrorism Act", factory closures, delocalisation, all these events are connected in one way or another to AGOA. This article explains how and why.

The US has acquired a new colonial device to get African States to submit to US imperialist rule, with the active support of African ruling classes. The US *African Growth and Opportunity Act* (AGOA), enacted in the year 2000 (after literally years of trying to get it through), gives President Bush king-size powers to decide which African State he will open the US market to, and which African State he will close the US market to. AGOA is ridden with conditionalities that African States have to submit to in order for President Bush to favour them by opening the US market to their capitalists' goods and services. At least once every two years, under AGOA, President Bush calls in African States that he deems "eligible" to an AGOA Forum²³ to tell them what he thinks their political and economic agenda should be. This colonial performance is what the Mauritian government is congratulating itself on hosting in January 2003.

When President Bush announced he would not be at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in South Africa, he also added that he was planning a visit to Africa in January 2003. Clearly, President Bush believes the AGOA forum to be more of a priority than world sustainable development. An "AGOA business forum" is also being held at the same time as the official "AGOA Forum" in January. At this second Forum US businessmen will be looking for African "brokers" to facilitate their implantation in those African States labelled "eligible" by President Bush. The Mauritian private sector is eagerly offering itself as the African "broker" for US multinationals. This is why the Mauritian ruling class has been tripping over its own feet as it's in such a hurry to get the AGOA business forum going. The United States Information Service (USIS) has been funding programs all over Africa to explain how AGOA can be used to create "Public-Private Partnerships" (the latest fashion in privatisation) in African countries. The USIS is also explaining how to use AGOA for "matchmaking" (their term) between African and American capitalists.

US business and African capitalists see in AGOA, growth and opportunity for themselves, and are busy negotiating joint ventures in regions of Africa where working people have less social and economic rights and where wages are the lowest. In countries like Mauritius or South Africa, there are massive delocalisation plans in process that will downslide wages, working conditions, and social and economic conditions of all the peoples of Africa.

Where the US African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) comes from

AGOA has had many names. These last years, it has been called the *Africa Bill*, the *African Growth and Opportunity Bill*, the *Africa Act* or the *Trade and Tariff Act*. The voted version is now known as the *African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA)*²⁴ and is part of a law called the *Trade and Development Act of 2000*. It has had so many names partly because it was so unpopular that each time it got defeated in the US Congress, it had to be re-introduced by another name. It has taken several years for AGOA to be enacted. The US ruling classes have been persistent in pushing through AGOA because it is so central for the US imperialist strategy that dates from the 1990's.

²² *L'Express*, Saturday, 26th October, 2002 gives an example of this.

²³ The purpose of the "United States - Sub-Saharan Africa Trade and Economic Cooperation Forum" under Section 105 of AGOA is "to discuss expanding trade and investment relations between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa and the implementation of this title including encouraging joint ventures between small and large businesses. The January AGOA Forum will be the second Forum of this kind.

²⁴ AGOA can be downloaded from the Internet at www.usinfo.state.gov/regional/af/trade.htm

In the 1990's, there was a major shift in US policy towards Africa. The US decided to make Africa a new zone for US capitalist implantation. This was clearly announced by the late Commerce Secretary Ron Brown of the Clinton administration in 1995²⁵. The Clinton Administration Record²⁶ quotes Ron Brown: " the United States would no longer concede the African market to former colonial powers."

Clinton's regime had two over-arching, long-term policy goals²⁷. Firstly, it was in favour of US business interests. What the US wanted was to implant US multinationals in Africa for them to control the rich natural and mineral resources including oil, gold, copper, diamonds, and for them to get a larger share of the African market. The Clinton Record refers to this goal in terms of accelerating Africa's "integration into the global economy" which would "advance American commercial interests through an invigorated emphasis on trade and investment". The second US policy goal was to get a firmer military hold on Africa. The Clinton Record refers to this goal as addressing "security threats" emanating from Africa. AGOA is based on both these US long-term policy goals: it imposes conditionalities that dictate economic policy in Africa so that US multinationals can operate lucratively and at the same time, coerces African States into supporting US foreign policy and "national security" interests. Ever since George W Bush was installed as US President, AGOA has become an instrument that perfectly addresses the needs of his regimes' aggressive military policies.

What does AGOA mean?

This law means that up till September 2008, the US President, just like a King, can open the gates of the US market to African goods and services from 48 African States, but will do so *only* if they accept US *conditionalities*. In AGOA, overt conditionalities are referred to as "eligibility requirements". Up to now, the US President has "declared" 36 African countries "eligible". AGOA "eligibility requirements" are actually being used by President Bush to close the US market to goods and services coming from nine "non-eligible" African countries: Angola, Burkina Faso, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Liberia, Togo and Zimbabwe.²⁸ Sudan, Somalia and the Comoros have not sought the "eligibility" favour from the US President, so, they have escaped AGOA's zone of influence. Since AGOA has been enacted, the US President has presented two annual reports to the US Congress which actually includes a country-by-country report on whether African States are observing AGOA conditionalities or not.

The United States government constantly harps on the need for *the rest of the world* to give capitalism a free rein. It wants, in the long-run, to transform everything, from goods to services, from water to the land, into commodities that are bought and sold for profit, without taxes, without regulations, without any public or democratic control. This is what it calls the "free-market". When it comes to its own market, the United States is not inclined to subscribe to "free-market" policy – it adopts protectionist policies in the interest of US capitalists that do not want their profit restrained by the entry of cheaper goods and services into the US market.

Supporters of AGOA acclaim it as being some kind of new "Lomé Convention" for Africa. Strangely enough, these supporters refrain from mentioning that "free" access of goods and services into the US market (as any other market), without conditionalities being attached, is due very soon in any case. The US is part of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and is supposed to be committed, like other countries in the WTO, to opening its market *without any conditionalities being imposed*. Other protectionist agreements outside the WTO are also on the way out. The Multifibre Agreement, for instance, is supposed to be phased out in 2004. So why do our Governments accept all the conditionalities in AGOA, when the US market is supposed to have no gates soon, anyway? We do not know.

There are many conditionalities. Some are overt ones called "eligibility" requirements in AGOA, and others are covert ones, that are implied by the AGOA law. Let us look at just a few of them.

²⁵ Ron Brown made this statement when he led a substantial U.S. private and public sector delegation to the Africa-African American summit in Dakar, Senegal in 1995.

²⁶ The Clinton Administration Record in Sub-Saharan Africa <http://usinfo.state.gov>

²⁷ The Clinton Administration Record

²⁸ US President's report to US Congress "2002 Comprehensive Report on US Trade and Investment Policy toward Sub-Saharan Africa and Implementation of the African Growth and Opportunity Act, The Second of Eight Annual Reports", May 2002.

AGOA says: “Accept the US President as your King”

AGOA transforms the US President into a King with an empire in Africa. It is the US President who decides which African country to open or close the US market to. It is the US President who decides whether African countries are following AGOA conditionalities or not. It is the US President who orders African Heads of States to an AGOA Forum at least once every two years. It is he who decides when and where to call them to. It is the US President who also decides which goods and services from which countries he will give duty-free treatment to. If the US President decides that an African country is not in line with AGOA conditionalities, he can close the US market to that country.²⁹ The US Congress has given itself so much power that it can now decide which African country is “poor” or not. The US Congress has just amended AGOA (referred to as AGOA II), to give Botswana and Namibia “poor country” status even though the US barometer used in the first version of AGOA does not classify these two countries as being “poor”.³⁰

Another important point concerning AGOA is the procedure used for its establishment. AGOA is not a multilateral agreement negotiated between the US and African countries. It was unilaterally imposed by the US. It was proposed by the US President and voted in by the US Congress. This US law is a kind of “extra-territorial” legislation, as if Africa was a US colony.

Many African countries in Northern Africa (West Sahara, Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco, Libya and Egypt) do not fall under the AGOA “zone of influence”. The colonial “carving up” of Africa lives on: the US can now, if it is not stopped, establish its own “colonies” in Africa that will be governed by AGOA.

AGOA says: “You must follow US foreign policy”

AGOA crudely states that African States, in order to fulfil requirements for eligibility, must not “engage in activities that undermine United States national security or foreign policy interests”³¹. This “conditionality” is *real*: it has already been used by President Bush. Burkina Faso has been refused “eligibility” under AGOA partly because it does not submit to US foreign policy. The US President's May 2002 AGOA report to the US Congress specifically mentions this under the heading “US National Security and Foreign Policy Interest”. In this section, the US President states that “Burkina Faso has played an unhelpful role regionally, undermining stability and US foreign policy interests”.

Already, Mauritius is feeling the weight of this conditionality. Since the passing of AGOA, the Mauritian government has unconditionally backed the US attack on Afghanistan, has blindly followed the US lead in voting through the *Prevention of Terrorism Act*, and is now shamelessly poised to support US warlords in aggressing the people of Iraq.

As the US pushed hard to get the UN Security Council to follow its war-mongering lead, the Mauritian government took the decision to support the key US resolution in the build-up towards attacking Iraq. This decision was made, according to Raj Meetarbhan of *L'Express*³², after Mauritian Ambassador Koonjul in Washington signified the Mauritian government's intention not to vote for the US resolution. It must be said that a few days earlier, *Le Mauricien*³³ had reported Prime Minister Jugnauth as asserting, on the question of Iraq, that he was “confident that a diplomatic way out is still possible and that war can be averted.” He was quoted from his message on the occasion of the 57th anniversary of the United Nations.

After the government's new decision on the US resolution to be brought to the UN Security Council, Foreign Affairs Minister Gayan was quoted by Raj Meetarbhan as saying that the government must not “put the country's interests in peril”³⁴. It is not the “country's” interests he is talking about: he is talking about the interests of the Mauritian capitalist class that wants juicy tidbits out of AGOA. Even if it means the loss of thousands of lives in Iraq. Even if it means the dispossessing of peoples' means of livelihood in Mauritius and all over Africa. Even if it means the loss of peoples' basic fundamental rights. Typically, Raj Meetarbhan of *L'Express*, true to his tradition of mouth-piecing for Mauritian

²⁹ Section 104(b) of AGOA

³⁰ The first AGOA of the year 2000 uses *World Bank* measurements to decide whether an African country is poor or not. AGOA was amended this year to include Botswana and Namibia as “lesser developed beneficiary country” by using *International Bank for Reconstruction and Development* measurements in their cases.

³¹ Section 104(2) of AGOA

³² *L'Express*, 26th October, 2002

³³ *Le Mauricien* of 24th October, 2002

³⁴ *L'Express* of 26th October, 2002

capitalists and their regime, qualified Ambassador Koonjul's resistance to savage US cowboy-style intervention, a "diplomatic blunder".

It must also be said that ever since AGOA was still a Bill, the press in Mauritius has persistently avoided commenting the fact that AGOA contains stringent conditionalities. For the first time, as if conditionalities in AGOA were the most normal thing, the press is now pointing to conditionalities in AGOA. Raj Meetarbhan of *L'Express* even quotes the section in AGOA about how African countries must not go against US national security policy and foreign policy.

AGOA says: "Protect US national security over security of peoples of Africa and the rest of the world"

The Mauritian ruling class does not care a whit about Mauritian people's real national security. It is willing to sacrifice this just to let people like Mr. Vigier de la Tour sell a few T-shirts and shorts on the US market. It has supported AGOA and lobbied intensively for other African countries to accept all its conditionalities even though AGOA might imperil the struggle to close down the US military base on Diego Garcia, part of the Republic of Mauritius. Or even other bases in Africa such as the US military base in Kenya. In Kenya, the US occupies an air base which was used in the attack against Afghanistan after the 11th of September, 2001. In Mauritius, the United States occupies a military base on Diego Garcia, an island illegally dismembered from Mauritius by the United Kingdom during independence negotiations in the 1960's. This island was "depopulated" by UK-US in order to transform it into a military base. The Mauritian people living there were forcibly removed to the main island of Mauritius and to the Seychelles. The base has subsequently been used to bomb Iraq in 1991 during the "Gulf war", to bomb people in Afghanistan last year, and is now to be the USA's main launching pad to bomb people in Iraq yet again. AGOA, and new US policy in Africa has very serious implications for the struggle to close down the US base on Diego Garcia, other US bases in Africa and for the struggle to demilitarise the whole African and Indian Ocean region.

AGOA and Diego Garcia

Since independence, the struggle for the closing-down of the US base on Diego Garcia and the re-unification of the Chagos with the rest of Mauritius has often been used by the Mauritian State as a negotiating point for "trade" on behalf of the Mauritian capitalist class. This sordid deal has now become "institutionalised" in AGOA: the Mauritian State's silence on the closure of the US base in return for the entry of Mauritian capitalists' goods and services into the US market. Mauritian capitalists and their State were so eager to get AGOA passed by US congress, that they undertook to get other African States in the region (through regional blocks such as COMESA³⁵, the SADC³⁶ and the now defunct OAU³⁷), to lobby for support to encourage the US Congress to pass AGOA with all its conditionalities.

AGOA can now be used as an instrument to keep the US base on Diego Garcia intact for what the US would probably call its "national security or foreign policy interests". Particularly in the interests of its multinationals in the oil and armament business. The new Bush regime is aggressively using AGOA to secure these interests through military means. In the first *United States-Sub-Saharan Africa Trade and Economic Cooperation Forum* held in October 2001, barely a month after the 11th of September, President Bush made it quite clear what he thought African States' political priorities should be: to follow the US lead in combating US-defined "terrorism" including providing "the basing and overflight rights (...) by African countries", show commitment to "cracking down on terrorist financing", and ratify the 1999 Algiers Convention Against Terrorism. Of course, President Bush failed to mention that it is the US Government which is the only one ever found guilty of "terrorism" by the World Court on Nicaragua.

President Bush also made it clear that African States should change their stand after the WTO Conference in Seattle held in 1999. In the Seattle Conference, African States, acting as a block, managed to oppose new rounds that would have further entrenched the world into capitalist rule. This is why President Bush was so concerned about getting African States to stop this kind of resistance. He told African States represented at the 1st AGOA Forum that they should become "a powerful voice for

³⁵ *Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa*

³⁶ *Southern African Development Community*

³⁷ *Organisation of African Unity*

the launch of a new round of global trade talks in Doha, due to begin next month." The quasi-ultimatum of President Bush was hardly veiled; at this forum; he said in very clear terms: "Every nation that adopts this vision will find in America a trading partner, an investor, and a friend."³⁸ If they did not accept the US vision, he would close the US market to them.

Of Oil, US militarisation and AGOA

There has been a growing interest by the US ruling class in African oil. Africa already provides some 15% of US crude oil imports. This is likely to increase still more through new production in West Africa and the construction of a pipeline linking southern Chad to Atlantic ports. In addition, there have been recently discovered offshore reserves on the West African coast. Particularly after the 11th of September events, Africa has become of key strategic importance to the US ruling class. The US no longer wants to be dependent on countries like Saudi Arabia, an ally that is not giving unconditional support to the US. The US wants to accentuate its strategy to increase its oil supply from Africa as it prepares for a US invasion of Iraq. At the same time, what US oil multinationals are clamouring for, is for the US to step up pressure for African States to give them "legally protected land ownership" i.e. to privatise land, and give US multinationals the land titles. They also want the US military to secure their operations in Africa. A *New York Times* article has made this public knowledge. The article, explaining how Africa has become strategically important for the US because of its oil, states quite clearly "There has also been discussion in Congress and the Pentagon about increasing military exchanges with West African countries and perhaps establishing a military base in the region, possibly on São Tomé, an island nation in the Gulf of Guinea".³⁹

The new US strategy for oil in Africa would also have the effect of breaking up the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries⁴⁰ (OPEC), the Middle East-centred oil cartel that has considerable control over oil production and prices. The *New York Times* article mentions that Gabon was an OPEC member but quit in 1995, and that now, Nigeria is considering quitting OPEC. The hacking up of OPEC would greatly enhance US oil multinationals' power in the oil industry.

There is a strong Israel-based lobby allied to the US oil industry lobby that wants the US to use AGOA to open up West Africa to the US oil industry and to secure this hold by setting up a military base on Sao Tome and Principe in West Africa. This lobby even has a name. It is called the *African Oil Policy Initiative Group*. This working group grew out of a symposium held in Washington, in January 2002, organised by the *Institute for Advanced Strategic & Political Studies (IASPS)* which describes itself as a "Jerusalem-based think tank".⁴¹

In a document produced by this "think-tank", they have quoted declarations made by the Chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Africa, Ed Royce, linking the US oil strategy to both AGOA and also to the *New Economic Partnership for African Development* (a plan generally known as NEPAD, concocted by a few African Presidents to open up Africa to global capitalism). Both AGOA and NEPAD are seen as being instruments to ensure US control over African oil. Note that NEPAD is to be one of the main themes discussed in the official AGOA Forum.

AGOA imposes economic dictatorship

One of the conditionalities in AGOA⁴² is that African countries must have a "market economy" in order to qualify for "eligibility". This means that the whole economy must operate on a profit-basis. Even basic services such as health, education, pensions, water, electricity, telecommunications,

³⁸ President Bush Addresses African Growth and Opportunity Forum, October 29, 2001 (<http://usinfo.state.gov>)

³⁹ James Dao, *New York Times*, 19th September, 2002.

⁴⁰ OPEC has 11 country members. They are Algeria, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Libya, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela and Nigeria.

⁴¹ See document available on internet titled "African Oil: A priority for U.S. National Security and African Development": african%20oil.htm

⁴² **Extract from AGOA: "Section 104. Eligibility Requirements**

(a) IN GENERAL.-The President is authorized to designate a sub-saharan African country as an eligible sub-Saharan African country if the President determines that the country-

(1) has established, or is making continual progress toward establishing-

(A) a market-based economy that protects private property rights, incorporates an open rules-based trading system, and minimizes government interference in the economy through measures such as price controls, subsidies, and government ownership of economic assets;"

transport, and other social services must be transformed into "commodities" sold by capitalist business-operations. Measures to re-distribute wealth and to restrict class inequality such as taxes on companies, on capitalists, on business operations, must be gradually scrapped until they disappear altogether. This is an AGOA condition. A completely "free-market" one, where democratic control does not exist, because everything is run by private companies. In Mauritius, as in many African countries, there has been intense resistance against such a system. In the 1970's, the *IMF-WB* (*International Monetary Fund - World Bank*) tried to get the government to impose such a system on Mauritius, but people opposed this so much, that the government fortunately failed to impose key measures in the *IMF-WB* programme. And strong opposition has continued in the trade union movement until today, thus slowing down the move towards privatising everything.

AGOA says: "Sell off everything that is public-owned"

Another condition is that people cannot *own* and *control* anything collectively. This is what the public sector was supposed to be: the people owning, running and controlling sectors of the economy. In nationalised sectors, public ownership and control was already far too limited in that it was, in practice, governments and their bureaucrats who exercised control. It was not, even at its best, workers and service-users who exercised control. However limited this form of control, the possibility of people organising and taking democratic control over the public sector remains an open one. What privatisation does is to make it much more difficult to regain any democratic control. It is a form of dispossessing of our collective heritage.

In African countries, the public sector's expansion was a means of decolonisation to stop foreign companies and their governments from controlling strategic sectors of the economy, and whisking away all the profits. Privatisation wipes away the historic progress in terms of decolonisation and exposes African countries to re-colonisation.

AGOA says: "Remove subsidies"

Yet another condition is that African States must eliminate subsidies altogether. This includes subsidies to ensure food security: subsidies on basic food such as rice and flour, subsidies on medicine, on vaccines, on contraception. Subsidies on agriculture for small-scale planters and farmers, subsidies on fishing, on animal farming; subsidies that are vital to the lives of many, many people in Africa will have to be wiped out. Subsidies on export-oriented industry will have to be removed. The US ruling class wants African States to eradicate subsidies stimulating local production so as to decrease importation. It wants to remove all other subsidies that were part of the de-colonisation process altogether.

AGOA says: "Eliminate Price Control"

Withdrawal of price control is included as another conditionality. The ruling class does not even want price control over the most basic of goods and services. It does not care a whit if water, electricity, staple foods, that are essential for peoples' survival, is too expensive for poor people to buy.

AGOA says: "Submit to foreign companies"

AGOA imposes on African States that they must give foreign capital the same *treatment and measures* as national capital.⁴³ In other words, key measures to protect the sovereignty of African countries will be eradicated. Measures such as giving subsidies for local production or putting taxes, duties or tariffs on foreign goods to protect local production will no longer be possible. It also means that governments, to protect employment, will no longer be able to pass and enforce regulations on foreign firms that they employ workers of that country. Governments will no longer be able to limit foreign multinationals repatriating all their profit to their country of origin. This conditionality has even more

⁴³ Section 104 (1) (C) that reads: "*the elimination of barriers to United States trade and investment, including by-*

(i) *the provision of national treatment and measures to create an environment conducive to domestic and foreign investment;*"

serious implications: governments will no longer be able to stop foreign capitalists from actually *buying* land. There is now a strong multinational lobby in the US that wants governments around the world to sell them land, particularly where there are precious mineral resources, or oil, and hand them over the land titles. Since independence, laws protecting land and territorial integrity have been vital in protecting independence and sovereignty of countries with a history of colonisation. A State is defined partly by its territory. If governments are able to sell off land to non-citizens and their companies, then this could threaten independence itself.

The concept of “national treatment” for foreign companies was a key concept of the “Multilateral Agreement on Investment” (MAI) concocted by the *OECD*⁴⁴, a clubbing up of governments in the richest States in the world. The MAI was a kind of world-scale Constitution to give multinationals power over nation States – they could sue States for voting laws and regulations to protect the environment, workers’ rights, to protect social services, strategic sectors of the economy, or to protect sovereignty. Giving foreign companies the same “treatment” as national ones, was part of the MAI agenda. The MAI was defeated because it was so unpopular world-wide, but parts of it are seeping into agreements and laws such as AGOA.

AGOA lowers wage rates and slashes work conditions in Africa

There are other specific conditionalities mentioned in AGOA that threaten employment in countries like Mauritius that are pushing down wage rates and slashing up work conditions in the region.

AGOA imposes conditions on a country’s imports

Under AGOA⁴⁵, the US will only open its market to garments made from yarn or fabric produced and assembled in the US or an African country. This concession was made by the US Congress to US capitalists in the textile sector that saw AGOA as being a threat to the American textile business. The only exception to this “rule” is in the case of “lesser-developed” African countries. “Lesser-developed” African countries are defined in AGOA as those with a per capita gross national product of less than \$1,500 a year in 1998 (i.e. all "Sub-Saharan" African countries except Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Mauritius, Seychelles, and South Africa).⁴⁶ In the case of “poor” countries, the US will not be fussy about where the fabric and yarn come from. This exception will only last up till the 30th September, 2004.

In Mauritius, there is no cotton grown, no yarn produced. So Free Zone capitalists in the textile business have a pretext to close down local textile assembly plants and re-open them in African countries either where yarn or thread is produced. Or they can move to countries that fall under the Special Rule for “lesser developed” African countries. There, they can continue importing yarn and fabrics from Asia, where it is cheaper, and export clothes, in certain cases, duty-free to the US. The biggest and oldest textile plant, *Floréal Knitwear*, had already started sacking workers. Almost 40% of its operations had been moved to Madagascar, before the political crisis that occurred when there were Presidential elections in Madagascar. Other factories followed suit. 100,000 jobs in the Free Zone are under threat. In the run-up for the AGOA Business Forum in January 2003, official State delegations from African countries such as Tanzania and Madagascar are already coming to Mauritius in order to entice Mauritian capitalists into delocalising their operations to these countries.

In Mauritius and South Africa, capitalists, particularly in the textile free zone sector and in the sugar industry, were already poised to delocalise to African countries where wages and work conditions are inferior to that of Mauritius. The “Special Rule” for “lesser-developed” African countries is accentuating delocalisation.

The irony about this “Special Rule” is that it is an incentive for African countries to get poorer, instead of inducing countries to work towards economic growth.

⁴⁴ *Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development*

⁴⁵ Section 112 of AGOA

⁴⁶ Botswana and Namibia have both obtained “lesser-developed country” status in AGOA II this year even though official figures show that they have a per capita GNP higher than \$1,500.

AGOA is a key "driver" in pushing wage rates and work conditions down in the African region: business can move around to wherever in Africa wages are lowest, trade union activity, the weakest, and oppressed people less organised.

"Growth and Opportunity" for US business

The US, through AGOA, guarantees that the entry of African goods and services into the US market will not cut into US business and profits. For instance, whenever certain African textiles or apparel threatens the US textile industry, the US President can suspend duty-free treatment.⁴⁷ African States have to conform to US directives on customs regulations so as to satisfy the US textile companies. Officials of the US can even snoop around in the Customs offices of African countries seeking AGOA eligibility, to check whether they are conforming to US Customs directives.

Not only does AGOA aim to pry open the African market to US business by imposing conditionalities, it also sets up a whole state bureaucracy in the US to assist US multinational implantation in Africa.⁴⁸ The US is also subsidising its capitalist implantation into Africa. In the October 2001 AGOA forum, President Bush had already announced the creation of a \$200 million *Overseas Private Investment Corporation* support facility to give American firms "access to loans, guarantees and political risk insurance for investment projects in sub-Saharan Africa."

Since AGOA was enacted, the USIS has been preparing the way for US multinationals. It has been funding programs in Africa to explain how AGOA can be used as "the jumping-off point to create public-private partnerships in African countries and to establish matchmaking between African and American entrepreneurs".⁴⁹

It is not surprising then, that so many profit-greedy US companies lobbied hard to get AGOA through the US Congress (see Annex).

US administrative blockades disguised as "human rights" infringements

As a concession to the wave of resistance against conditionalities in AGOA, the final version of the law contained a condition that African countries must respect "labour rights" and other "human rights" in order to be "eligible". The United States is renowned for interpreting "human rights" in its own narrow imperialist interests. In Mauritius itself, the *Industrial Relations Act (IRA)* makes the quasi-totality of workers' strikes illegal. Yet the US does not treat this as an infringement of labour or human rights. Or not yet. If the Mauritian representative at the UN does not follow the US line, then perhaps they will suddenly see the IRA as an infringement of human rights.

Customs definitions

The United States also interprets "eligibility" in a manner that corresponds to its own interests. The US Customs refused duty-free entry of Mauritian pullovers on the basis that they consisted of "Knit to Shape" that according to them, do not fall under AGOA. This US Custom's stand came shortly after the Mauritian government's announcement that it would formally re-iterate its demand for the return of Diego Garcia to Mauritius.

Ironically, it was *Floréal Knitwear*, the Mauritian textile company that lobbied the most for AGOA, that had its pullovers denied duty-free access! Some weeks later, Mauritian garments were again refused duty-free entry into the US because the material used to make the pockets came from Asia.

⁴⁷ Extract from AGOA: *Section 112 (3) C*

"(ii) DETERMINATION OF DAMAGE OR THREAT THEREOF.- Whenever the Secretary of Commerce determines, based on the data described in clause (I), or pursuant to a written request made by an interested party, that there has been a surge in imports of an article described in this paragraph from a beneficiary sub-Saharan country, the Secretary shall determine whether such article from such country is being imported in such increased quantities as to cause serious damage, or threat thereof, to the domestic industry producing a like or directly competitive article. If the Secretary's determination is affirmative, the President shall suspend the duty-free treatment provided for such article under this paragraph. If the inquiry is initiated at the request of an interested party, the Secretary shall make the determination within 60 days after the date of the request.

(iii) FACTORS TO CONSIDER.- In determining whether a domestic industry has been seriously damaged, or is threatened with serious damage, the Secretary shall examine the effect of the imports on relevant economic indicators such as domestic production, sales, market share, capacity utilization, inventories, employment, profits, exports, prices and investment."

⁴⁸ Section 125 of AGOA

⁴⁹ *Washington Line*, September 12, 2002

Mauritian capitalists and the Mauritian State had to run to the US President, to get AGOA clauses revised in their favour.

And in August this year, after the Mauritian State backed the US bombing of Afghanistan in the UN Security Council, after the Mauritian State passed the "*Prevention of Terrorism Act*" this year, despite widespread opposition to the extent that two Mauritian Presidents handed in their resignations because of the attacks on human rights and sovereignty contained in this repressive law, the US amended AGOA to satisfy Mauritian textile company interests (AGOA II). Even after the passing of AGOA II, African capitalists in the textile business are scared stiff of the law being reverted to stop their Knit-to-Shape from getting into the US market duty-free. According to *L'Express*, three US Senators are already challenging a Bill that proposes to refund duty already paid on Knit-to-shape clothes from Africa as from October 2000.⁵⁰

Since AGOA's apparition as a Bill, various viewpoints emanating from different economic and political sectors in Africa and the US have been expressed:

US and African Ruling Classes push for AGOA with all its conditionalities

AGOA, as we have seen, embodies the economic, political and military aims of the US ruling class in Africa. No wonder it galvanised the support of so many US multinationals, and was voted by both Democratic and Republican members of the US Congress.

The Mauritian and Kenyan States were particularly active in pro-AGOA lobbying work within COMESA. Ex-President Nelson Mandela, in the name of the South African government, initially opposed conditionalities being proposed in AGOA (when it was still a Bill). This kind of State resistance was quickly quelled through the intervention of US-backed African countries. In the SADC conference held in Mauritius, the Mauritian PT-PMXD government proposed that a pro-AGOA statement be adopted by the SADC - this was during a crucial period when resistance against AGOA conditionalities within the labour movement and peoples' organisations in Africa and in the US was rising. African Ambassadors, including Mauritian Ambassador Jesseramasing in the US also actively lobbied for the US Congress to adopt AGOA. Prime Minister Navin Ramgoolam personally went to the United States to give his unconditional support to AGOA.

No wonder the State of Mauritius, with US support, dislodged Sudan (the officially OAU-backed African candidate) and made its unholy way into the UN Security Council. The new Jugnauth-Berenger government took to AGOA with the same ardour as the previous government. As a member of the UN Security Council, the new Mauritian Foreign Affairs Minister Gayan backed the US-led coalition's bombing of Afghanistan, called for the passing of laws to "prevent" terrorism, which has been used as pretext for ruling classes in various countries to pass repressive laws that whittle down fundamental human rights. The Jugnauth-Berenger government is now meekly following President Bush on his warpath to bomb Iraq, in case he takes offence and closes the US market to Mauritian capitalists' goods and services.

Mauritian capitalists in the Textile Free Zone paid huge sums of money to lobby for AGOA. *Floréal Knitwear* even delegated one of its officials, Mr. Vigier de la Tour, to work full-time, gathering support in the US Congress for AGOA. He worked hand in hand with the Mauritian State in this lobbying operation. There was also a *Mauritius-United States Business Council* (MUSBA) that lobbied for the adoption of the Bill.

Opposition to AGOA conditionalities in Africa, US and internationally

In Africa, political organisations such as *Lalit* spear-headed the political campaign against AGOA conditionalities. When Prime Minister Navin Ramgoolam went to the US to support AGOA when it was still a Bill, Ram Seegobin, *Lalit* member went to the US to expose AGOA conditionalities, and campaign against them at the *Open World Conference* held in California, US, where representatives of some 55 countries were present. There, there was also a very strong delegation of the US trade-union movement. Within the African labour movement, there was widespread resistance against AGOA conditionalities particularly in Zimbabwe, Uganda and Mauritius.

⁵⁰ *L'Express* of 21st October, 2002

In Mauritius, trade union leader Atma Shanto and *Lalit* member Ashok Subron were publicly insulted when they opposed AGOA conditionalities in the name of the labour movement united in the *All Workers Conference*. They were qualified as being “*indécrottable*” (a derogatory French term) by *Le Mauricien* editorialist, Gilbert Ahnee. Some time after, he invited Ram Seegobin and Mr. Vigier de la Tour for a face-to-face debate on AGOA. Ram Seegobin accepted this challenge debate at once. Mr. Vigier de la Tour refused to debate AGOA, and fled.

The pan-African women's network *Women in Law and Development in Africa* (WiLDAF) called on OAU Heads of States and US Senators to oppose AGOA conditionalities. A wide range of African-based networks, including *SAPSN*⁵¹, also took the same stand. Networks in Africa such as the *Third World Network* have also stood against AGOA conditionalities.

The US labour movement opposed AGOA partly because of its neo-liberal conditionalities, partly because it meant a downsliding of wages on a global scale and partly because of the threat against US jobs, particularly in the textile sector. A wide range of networks, workers' organisations and political organisations in the US such as the *Citizens trade campaign*, *50 years is Enough*⁵², the *International Liason Committee* campaigned against AGOA arguing that it meant a “*NAFTA*⁵³ for Africa”.

US capitalists took fright at the thought of cheap African goods and services getting in, duty free, into the US market. US capitalists in the textile sector were particularly known for having lobbied against AGOA on the basis that it was a menace to US business. This is why major concessions were made to them in the final version of the law.

Other international networks such as *ATTAC*⁵⁴ and *CETIM*⁵⁵ have campaigned against conditionalities in AGOA. *CETIM* and *WiLDAF*, in collaboration with *Lalit*, have, in the last session of the UN Commission on Human Rights, circulated a statement outlining the many infringements to human rights contained in AGOA.⁵⁶

Resistance in the US and in Africa led to an alternative Bill called *Hope for Africa* being presented in the House of Representatives by Jesse Jackson (jnr). Although this Bill did not pass through, it drew attention to the colonial nature of AGOA.

One interesting development in the resistance movement against AGOA is that the US labour movement and anti-neo-liberal organisations and networks in the US, started taking up the arguments put forward by the more progressive section of the labour movement in Africa and by anti-capitalist globalisation forces in the region. The *AFL-CIO*⁵⁷, the confederation of the labour movement in the United States, for instance, transmitted the Mauritian *All Workers Conference* (platform of the quasi-totality of the Mauritian labour movement) call on US Senators to oppose conditionalities in AGOA. The US network called *Public Citizen* delivered a similar appeal of Pan-African women's network *WiLDAF*, to each US Senator. *WiLDAF* at the same time, submitted an appeal to all African Heads of State to oppose conditionalities in AGOA. Both *WiLDAF* appeals were endorsed by 216 women's organisations in Africa.

⁵¹ *Southern African Peoples' Solidarity Network*

⁵² A network against *International Monetary Fund – World Bank* 50-year reign, hence the name.

⁵³ *North American Free Trade Agreement* that progressive organisations and the labour movement have opposed because it attacks workers' rights and fundamental human rights.

⁵⁴ “*Association pour la Taxation des Transactions Financieres pour l'Aide aux Citoyens*” declaration at the International July 1999 meeting in Paris.

⁵⁵ *Europe-Third World Center*

⁵⁶ Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in any part of the world, Joint written statement submitted by *Europe-Third World Center* (non-governmental organization in general consultative status and *Women in Law and Development in Africa (WiLDAF)* (non-governmental organization in special consultative status), circulated in the 57th Commission on Human Rights on the 19th of March 2001, No.

AGOA is an instrument of US and African ruling classes

We must continue to expose AGOA for what it really is: a tool of US imperialism. At the same time we must expose the role of African ruling classes in using AGOA to dispossess peoples in Africa of our collective property, of our economic, social, civil and political rights, and of our sovereignty.

Annex

May 19, 1998
The Honorable Trent Lott
United States Senate Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Lott:

As representatives of U.S. businesses that compete globally, we are writing to voice our strong support for S. 778, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act. S.778 is pending before the Senate Committee on Finance and may soon be considered by the full Senate.

We urge you to support the passage of this important legislation. Similar legislation, H.R. 1432, has been passed by the House.

S. 778/H.R. 1432 provides effective responses to the challenges facing sub-Saharan Africa in increasing trade and attracting new investment. The bill would expand the availability of export finance, insurance and guarantees that support increased U.S. exports and promote more export-related jobs for American workers.

For example, risk insurance and financing by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) and loans and loan guarantees by the Export-Import Bank of the United States will help U.S. exporters gain access to the sub-Saharan developing markets.

To help stimulate African exports, the bill, in turn, builds on the well-established principles of the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) to support African entrepreneurship and trade-related employment. These programs are important to a potential market of some 800 million consumers which has already been recognized by our European competitors. British and French investments were 300% and 200% greater, respectively, than U.S. investments during the early 1990s. These investments helped ensure European long-term presence in the region. Enactment of the African Growth and Opportunity Act intends to change this equation by helping U.S. companies compete with this already-established, and growing, market presence.

S. 778/H.R. 1432 would thus make a significant contribution to the economic development of sub-Saharan Africa. By harnessing the resources of private investment and trade, S. 778/H.R. 1432 would help raise the standard of living for the people of this region and create prosperity that is fundamental for long-term growth. Economic progress would, in turn, contribute to stability, peace and democracy, which are key goals of U.S. foreign policy and long-term objectives of the more than 40 reforming African nations that this bill intends to reach.

Essentially, this legislation creates a "win-win" for both American and African interests. We urge you therefore to support S. 778/H.R. 1432 and contribute to prosperity and democracy for the people of sub-Saharan Africa, as well as to new markets for American exports.

Sincerely,

Arkel International
Inc. Bechtel Corporation
The Boeing Company
Case Corporation
Caterpillar Inc
Dayton Hudson Corporation
Dillingham Construction Corp.
Dresser Industries Inc
Enron Corp
Fluor Daniel Inc
Fuller Company
Kmart Corporation
Motorola Inc.
The M. W. Kellogg Company
PEP BOYS
Raytheon United Technologies Corporation
International Energy Development Council (IEDC)
AEP Resources Inc.
The AES Corporation
Bank of America
Bechtel Enterprises Inc.
Intergen Company Citicorp N.A. Inc.
CMS Energy
Destec Energy
Edison Mission Energy
ENRON Development Corp.
Entergy Power Development
Fluor Daniel Corporation
Foster Wheeler Power Systems
Raytheon Engineers & Constructors Inc.

Southern Energy International Inc.
Texaco, Inc.
Westinghouse Electric Corporation
African Growth and Opportunity Act Coalition Inc.
Ford Motor Company
Co-Chair Moving Water Industries
Co-Chair United Meridian Corporation
Kmart Amoco Coca-Cola Company
Texaco Chevron Corporation
American International Group, Inc.
Barden International
CAMAC Holding
Citibank
C/R International
Enron Corporation
General Electric
Tyco Submarine Systems Ltd.
Cohen and Woods International
Coopers and Lybrand
Harris Corporation
Holland and Knight
Anthony Carroll, Esquire
Lehman Brothers
Leon Tempelman and Son Occidental International Corporation
Pryor McClendon Counts and Company
SBC Communications, Inc.
The Obi Group
Westar Group, Inc.
Bristol-Myers Squibb Company
ANSELCO
Reichler, Milton & Medel
ABT Associates
WorldSpace, Inc.
Caterpillar, Inc.
Iridium West African Distributors
Bally's Lake Shore Resort
Teledesic Seaboard
Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Corporation
The Bellamy Group Advisory Board
The Honorable David Dinkins Constituency for Africa
C. Payne Lucas
AFRICARE
Daniel O'Flaherty U.S.-South Africa Business Council
The Honorable Chester A. Crocker Georgetown University Ambassador David C. Miller, Jr. Corporate Council on Africa
The Honorable Herman Cohen Cohen and Woods International

Losean Indyin Zonn de Pe ubyin Zonn de Ger?

par Ashok Subron

Avek lafin “lager frwad” an 1989, buku dimunn ti panse ki anfin rev pu fer Losean Indyin vinn enn Zonn de Pe pu vinn enn realite, ki baz militer pu ferme ek Chagos pu return dan Republik Moris. Byin vit sa rev la finn anvole ek trayir. Azordi baz militer lor Diego finn vinn enn baz prinsipal: li o-servis nuvo faz destruktif kapitalism global su ezemoni Leta Zini. Olye Zonn de Pe se lozik Zonn de Ger ki pe prevalwar. Sa lartik-la viz pu fer listorik sa proze Losean Indyin Zonn Pe ek so sabotaz sistematik par Leta Zini, analiz konportan bann parti politik Morisyin ek klas dirizan Morisyin par rapor a baz militer, ek argyu ki se lintere klas kapitalist lokal ki finn a-la-baz detasman Chagos depi Moris an 1965, ek *ki se lintere klas kapitalist lokal ki pli gran obstak politik dan Moris pu re-inifikasyon teritwar Moris*. Se dan sa kontext-la ki nu bizin get AGOA Business Forum ek vizit anonse George W. Bush dan Moris an Zanvye 2003. Eski sa vizit-la kumansman enn ‘*remake*’ seki ti arive an 1965?

Lane 60

Bann lane 60 ti konkretiz tranzisyon ant enn kote Rwayom Ini (UK), ansyin pwisans imperial ki ti dominn lemond depi lepok revolusyon indistriyel, ek lot kote Leta Zini, nuvo pwisans imperial ki emerze apre dezyem ger mondyal. Rwayom Ini kuma enn pwisans ekonomik ti an deklin ek ti pe oblize ferm so bann baz⁵⁸ dan plizyer rezyon lemond, i-konpri Losean Indyin. Li ti aksepté ki Leta Zini vinn nuvo zandarm pu “defans de lwes”. Anplis Rwayom Ini ti su presyon bann muvman anti-kolonyal partu dan Lemond pu antam prosesis dekolonizyon so bann koloni.

Paralelman ti ena agrandisman pwisans militer ex-Linyon Sovyetik ki ti ena lyan avek plizyer muvman anti-kolonyal dan sa rezyon lemond-la. Sa ti trakas buku UK/USA.... Alor finn ena seki a lepok ti apel lekurs zarm, “*cold war*”, ki ti kapav menas mem sirvi limanite avek kantite zarm destruksyon masif ki ti pe devlope ek akimile.

Detasman Diego limem ti form parti enn tranzaksyon zarm ant Leta Zini ek Rwayom Ini. Ti ena enn tranzaksyon sekre misil, misil Polaris ant UK ek USA. UK ti ofer Diego ek konpansasyon pu detasman Diego, kuma so par dan sa tranzaksyon misil-la⁵⁹.

Se kumsa ki finn kokin enn but later nu pei pu fer li vinn baz militer. Dan kumansman UK ek USA ti koz manti, zot ti dir ki sete zis bann “fasilite kominikasyon” ki pu ena lor Chagos. Me zordi se enn baz militer kot bato de ger kapav akoste, kot bann gro bombardye B52, avyon de ger F16 ek B2 kapav aterir ek dekole. Buku navir deger ek avyon de ger zot ekipe avek misil nikler. *Lalit*, deza depi 1982, finn amenn prev ki ena lekipman nikleer ek posibleman instalasyon nikleer lor Diego⁶⁰.

Lape napa Lager

Fas a lozik de ger destruktif, buku pei ki finn gayn lindepandans a-lepok ti pe pronn Lape. Sa bann pei-la ti fer tann zot lavwa atraver Muvman Non-Aliyne. A-lepok Muvman Non-Aliyne ti koz enn “nuvo lord ekonomik mondyal” ek kestyon demilitarizasyon ti enn bann pwin fondamental dan zot konba. Se dan sa kontext-la ki dan Trwazyem Some Muvman Non-Aliyne ki ti fer dan Zambani an 1970, lor propozisyon Sri Lanka, finn adopte enn Rezolisyon pu ki Losean Indyin vinn enn Zonn de Pe, kot pena okenn baz militer. Avek lafors Muvman Non-Aliyne a lepok, sa mosyon-la ti oblize debat dan Nasyon Zini.

Evolusyon konsep Losean Indyin Zonn de Pe dan Nasyon Zini

1971: Nasyon Zini adopte enn versyon modifye rezolisyon⁶¹ ki Muvman Non-Aliyne ti prezante lor Losean Indyin Zonn de Pe (I.O.Z.P.⁶²): 61 pei vot an faver, 55 ti abstenir. Bann pei Oksidental, kuma US, UK, Lafrans ti abstenir. Linyon Sovyetik ek so bann alye ti abstenir. Li inportan sulye ki Moris ti absan kan Nasyon Zini ti vot sa rezolisyon-la¹. E Moris zame finn fer kone ki li ti ena lintansyon vot an faver sa mosyon-la!

⁵⁸ e.g Aden dan Yemen, Ref. Arming and Disarming the Indian Ocean, A CDIO Publication, 1983

⁵⁹ Get Rapor Select Committee 1982 ek Diego Files par Henri Marimootoo, publiye dan Week-End

⁶⁰ *Lagazet Lalit 21 Ut 1981*, kot *Lalit* finn prodwir bann dokiman ladwann Oland pu demontre ki bann lekipman nikler finn tranzit laba pu vinn Diego Garcia.

⁶¹ Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, Resolution 2832(XXVI), 16 December 1971(see annex)

⁶² Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace (I.O.Z.P.)

1972: Nuvo votman dan Nasyon Zini: 95 pei vot anfavor. Nasyon Zini met dibut enn *Ad-Hoc Committee* pu inplemant rezolisyon 1971. Dan sa Komite-la ena 12 pei ki tom dan Losean Indyin, anplis de Lasinn ek Zapon.

1973: Dan *Ad-Hoc Committee* aster ena 23 pei. Li fer 11 renyon.

Ant 73-74: Bann mamb Komite Ad-Hoc pa reysi tom dakor lor “terms of reference” komite-la. A 2 repriz, finn bizin tir bann propozisyon divan Nasyon Zini. Ti pran desizyon pu konvok enn Konferans Internasyonal lor Losean Indyin Zonn de Pe, dan Colombo, Sri Lanka

1974: US Senate apruv enn plan pu extansyon bann fasilite militer lor baz Diego Garcia.

1975: Tu bann pei rivrin Losean Indyin pu premye fwa an favor enn Losean Indyin Zonn de Pe. Me Lostrali nepli opoz ekspansyon Diego Garcia, parski li ti pe renegosye so lakor naval avek USA.

1976: Dan Sesel ti ena enn bel muvman pu re-inifikasyon teritwar Seselwa. Sesel ranport enn viktwar inportan sa lane-la. USA anil bay 60-an ki li ti ena avek UK lor bann zil Seselwa Aldabra, Desroches ek Farquhar, ki zot mem ti form parti dan B.I.O.T⁶³. UK return sa bann zil-la a Sesel.

1977: Sanzman inportan dan Rapor de fors. Linyon Sovyetik/Lerop de Les ki avan ti pe abstenir, vot an favor Losean Indyin Zonn de Pe. Aster 123 pei lemond anfavor rezolisyon

1971: Avek sanzman dan rapor de fors, bann pei ki ti kont lide enn Losean Indyin Zonn de Pe, oblize sede. Bann mamb permanan Konsey Sekirite (USA, UK, Lafrans, USSR) zwenn Komite Ad-Hoc. Me anmemtan plizyer fwa pe ranvway dat Konferans Colombo.

1989: USA, UK ek Lafrans retir zot depi Komite Ad-Hoc, pu sabot gran Konferans Colombo ki ti fikse ant le 2 – 13 Ziyet 1990. Zot rod definitivman sabot proze pu fer Losean Indyin vinn enn Zonn de Pe. Zot anfet konteste Rezolisyon UN 1971 limem. Zot dir ki etan done ki rivalite ant bann siperpwisans inn diminye avek lafin lager frwad, pena okenn zistifikasyon pu enn Zonn de Pe dan Losean Indyin!

1990: US ogmant so prezans militer lor Diego dan kad preparasyon pu bombardman Lirak. Se lane turnan dan proze pu fer Losean Indyin vinn enn Zonn de Pe, demilitarizasyon Losean Indyin, ek demantelman baz Diego. Bann gran traktasyon zeo-politiko-ekonomik inn kumans pran form apartir sa lane-la. Buku evennman zordi, mem AGOA Forum ek vizit prozete G. W. Bush truv so lasurs dan kad sa bann traktasyon mazer dan zeo-politiko-ekonomik ki finn kumanse depi lepok 1989-90-91.

Li bon note ki su linisyativ *Lalit*, enn muvman protestasyon ti leve pu proteste kont sobotaz proze Zonn de Pe, kan ex-Prezidan Lafrans, F. Mitterand, ti vizit Moris an Zin 1990.

1991-1997: Komite Ad-Hoc Nasyon Zini lor Zonn de Pe finn kontinye so travay, san USA, UK ek Lafrans. Me lezot pei Lerop de Lwes nepli prezan. Lasanble Zeneral Nasyon Zini sak lane pe renuvle⁶⁴ rezolisyon 1971, me kumans met proze pu fer enn UN Conference lor Zonn de Pe⁶⁵ an veyez ek evok bann mwayin alternativ pu met an aplikasyon rezolisyon 1971. An 1993, Komite Ad-Hoc kumans lye lezot size kuma trafik ladrog, lanvironnman ek explwatasyon resurs marinn avek kestyon sekirite Losean Indyin. Ena presyon intans pu ki Nasyon Zini abandonn kompletman proze I.O.Z.P.

1998: USA aster kestyonn⁶⁶ lekzistans mem Komite Ad-Hoc UN lor Zonn de Pe. USA dir bizin elimininn sa komite-la, lakoz bizin diminye depans “overheads” Nasyon Zini. Sa ti ekivo a eliminasyon final proze I.O.Z.P.

1999 - 2001: Muvman Non-Aliyne met presyon pu ki proze Losean Indyin Zonn de Pe pa disparet. An Novam 2001, lor enn mosyon Sid Afrik lor nom Muvman Non-Aliyne, Nasyon Zini re-adopte enn nuvo Rezolisyon lor Losean Indyin Zonn de Pe⁶⁷: 110 pei inn vot an favor. USA, UK ek Lafrans finn vot kont ek zot finn reysi fer 41 pei abstenir.

Proze Demilitarizasyon Losean Indyin enn obstak pu baz US lor Diego

Li evidan ki proze Losean Indyin Zonn de Pe enn obstak a lekzistans prezans militer US lor Diego. Se pu sa rezon-la ki USA, UK ek Lafrans finn sistematikman sabot sa proze-la. Depi 1971 ziska 1990, zot finn tir pretext “drwa internasyonal” ubyin rod sanz size deba par evok lamonte bann pwisans rezyonal

⁶³ British Indian Ocean Territory (B.I.O.T) ki ti met anplas par UK pu detas Chagos ek bann zil Sesel

⁶⁴ UN A/RES/47/59, 81st plenary meeting, 9 December 1992 - Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

⁶⁵ Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, G.A. res. 49/82

⁶⁶ Press Trust of India, 30 April 1998

⁶⁷ Resolution 56/16 – Un General Assembly, November 2001

pu sey refiz inplemant sa proze-la. Apartir 1990, USA finn met an plas enn stratezi pu *eliminasyon total* sa proze I.O.Z.P. pu protez so baz lor Diego.

Buku dimunn naivman ti panse ki avek ekrulman ban rezim Stalinyin dan Linyon Sovyetik ek Lerop de Les, ti kapav ena enn lespwar pu ki anfin Losean Indyin kapav demilitarize aköz Diego pu nepli “neseser pu defans de lwes”. La realite seki zame Diego ti “neseser pu defans de lwes” kont “Les” me ti neseser pu *defans lintere klas kapitalis USA ek so bann alye*. Losean Indyin li larut tranzit ant Lafrik ek Lazi. 25% petrol ki USA servi tranzit par Losean Indyin. Pre 50 komodite stratezik pu USA travers par Losean Indyin: metal kuma manganez, kobalt, titanium, krom, platinyum, letin, nikel, tungsten, fer, diplon ek kwiv. Lamonte bann pwisans ekonomik ek militer dan larezyon kuma Lind ek Lasinn reprezant enn menas direk pu kapitalis USA. USA bizin Diego pu kapav intervenir dan Mwayin Oryan ek Lafrik kot zot pe re-oryant zot avek AGOA. Alor sabotaz proze Zonn de Pe, li koresponn a lintere ekonomik, politik ek militer USA.

Mem si ena lezot fakter ki finn kontribye pu fer ki proze Zonn de Pe pann kapav abuti ziska-ler, kuma problem avek Muvman Non Aliyne limem, kuma natir Nasyon Zini limem kot se bann mamb ki ena “bom nikleer” ki ena drwa de veto, kuma prezans militer ek kolonyal Lafrans dan Losean Indyin, se prezans baz militer US lor Diego Garcia ki finn pli gran obstak a proze demilitarizasyon Losean Indyin.

Esek proze I.O.Z.P ek lekzistans baz US lor Diego pe ankuraz enn nuvo lekurs militer danzere dan rezyon Losean Indyin. Dan bann dernye lane bann pei kuma Lind ek Pakistan inn kumans devlop zot usi bann zarm nikleer. Israel osi inn kumans fer bann test nikleer, an sekre dan Losean Indyin, pre kot lakot Sri Lanka⁶⁸. Li paret ki mem ena kolaborasyon ant Lind, Sri Lanka ek Israel, pu devlop zarm ek fer test nikleer dan rezyon Losean Indyin.

Apré lager Golf an 1991 ek sabotaz tu proze pu lape dan lemond ek Losean Indyin, Leta Zini pe antrenn lemond dan enn lozik de ger ki kapav menas lekzistans mem limanite.

Kimanyer Leta ek bann parti politik ek bann “opinion leaders” finn rispond a nuvo stratezi USA pu eliminn proze Losean Indyin Zonn de Pe?

1990: Lane turnan

Lane 1990 reprezant enn turnan dan lalit pu demilitarizasyon Losean Indyin ek retur Chagos. Leta Zini, apre sabotaz proze Losean Indyin, finn kumans inflyans politik interyer bann pei kuma Moris. Fas a stratezi USA, dan Moris finn kumans ena enn *redefinision mazer* dan pozisyon Leta, bann parti politik, sirtu MMM ek sertin editoryalist. Olye servi nuvo kontext pu pus ver demantelman baz Diego ek so retur dan teritwar Moris, nu truv enn stratezi devlope pu *separ kestyon baz militer avek retur Chagos*. Bann istoryin enn zur devet pu truv sa lepok-la kuma kumansman dezyem trayizon Leta Morisyin, apre seki finn arive an 1965, anver kestyon Lape, integrite teritoryal nasyonal ek anver drwa bann sitwayin Morisyin-Chagossien.

Moris depoz mosyon divan UN

Le 11 Me 1990, Moris pu premye fwa depoz enn mosyon ofisyel⁶⁹ dan Nasyon Zini pu met kestyon *Diego and the Chagos Archipelago* lor azanda Lasanble Zeneral, 45^{ye}m sesyon, Nasyon Zini. Sa ti enn muv byin pozitif ki kadre avek nuvo kontext mondyal. Dan so mosyon, reprezantan Moris dir “*In accordance with rule 13 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, I have the honour, on behalf of the government of Mauritius, to request the inclusion in the Provisional Agenda of the Forty Fifth session of the General Assembly of an item entitled: “The question of Diego Garcia and the Chagos Archipelago...”*”. Mosyon-la ti sutenir par enn *Explanatory Memorandum* ki explik an 15 pwin, argiman Leta Morisyin lor sa size-la. Ek mosyon-la konkliir par dir “*qu’une solution juste à la question de Chagos sous l’égide des Nations Unies contribuerait grandement à promouvoir la paix dans la région de L’Océan Indien, particulièrement, à un moment ou quelques pays occidentaux ont décidé de ne plus participer aux travaux du Comité Adhoc sur l’Océan Indien*”⁷⁰. Lapres Moris a lepok ti raport sa nuvel-la.⁷¹

⁶⁸ Arms race in the Indian Ocean region, Jul. 11, 2000, TamilCanadian.com

⁶⁹ New York/United Nation/395

⁷⁰ Raporte par Henri Marimootoo, *Week-end*, 25 January 1998

⁷¹ *L’Express*, 3 June 1990 - “Les Nations Unies saisies d’une demande Mauricienne”

Le 4 Zin 1990, lapres Moris fer enn reportaz ek kont-randi lor sa mosyon ki Moris finn depoze dan Nasyon Zini ek lor rankont ki Guvernman ek Lopoziyon finn ena avek M. Patrick Fairweather, Su-Sekreter Deta dan *Foreign and Commonwealth Office*. Kan pe raport pozisyon reprezantan MMM, *L'Express*⁷² dir ki “*M. Nababsing a rappelé que cette question comporte deux volets. Il y a la question de la souveraineté de l’île Maurice et ensuite la militarisation.*” *Le Mauricien*⁷³ so tanto sorti avek en tit “*Chagos: Maurice privilégie sa souveraineté sur la question militaire*” Dan sa lartik-la, siyne Jacques David, *Le Mauricien* presize “*cette thèse déjà avancée à deux reprises dan Le Mauricien privilegie la souveraineté nationale sur l’archipel et place dans le contexte des négociations globales pour la paix dans le monde, la question des bases militaires. Ce qui équivaut, en fin de compte, à l’acceptation par Maurice de la présence militaire américaine sur l’archipel mauricien jusqu’au règlement de la question militaire par toutes les parties concernées, notamment les grandes puissances.*”⁷⁴

Moris retir mosyon divan UN!

Le 27 Zin 1990, revirman total dan pozisyon Leta Morisyin. *L'Express* 27 Zin 1990 anonse ki “*Diego et les Chagos pas à l’agenda de la session de L’ONU*”. Anfet se 8-an plitar, an Zanvyé 1998, ki lepep Moris pu kumans konn laverite seki finn arive, par 2 lartik dan lapres par Henri Marimootoo⁷⁵. USA ek UK ti deklans enn kanpayn kont Moris dan Nasyon Zini ek guvernman Moris finn sede ek kapitile. Sir Satcam Boolell, ki ti Minis Zafer Etranzer a-lepok dir “*Le GM a privilégié le quota textile au débat académique sur les Chagos*”. Li poz kestyon: “*D’après vous, combien de Chagossiens vont vouloir retourner sur les îles de Peros Banos?*” Li dir ki “*l’ancien Premier Ministre britannique Mme Margaret Thatcher a archidit et répété que les Chagos seront rendues à Maurice quand ce ne sera plus nécessaire pour la défense de l’Occident. Nous avons eu à choisir l’intérêt économique immédiat et c’était logique.....*”

Retre sa mosyon-la reprezant trayizon istorik Leta Morisyin lor kestyon demantelman Diego ek suvrennte Moris lor Chagos. Seki finn arive an 1990 li kilminasyon enn seri desizyon ki Leta finn pran depi 1982: Lakor lor Konpansasyon pu Zilwa an 1982 par guvernman PTr ek apre MMM/PSM, desizyon pu permet ravitayman Diego ek pu ki Morisyin al travay lor baz Diego an 1983, desizyon ki ti pran par guvernman MSM/PTr/PMSD, su presyon Gaetan Duval.

Moris separ kestyon baz Diego ek suvrennte Chagos

Dan mem lepok ki Leta Morisyin finn retir sa mosyon istorik-la, kumans ena bann traktasyon pu enn lalyans ant MSM ek MMM. Paul Berenger propoz enn nuvo proze⁷⁶. Li dir ki aster bizin enn “*South West Indian Ocean and Southern Africa Nuclear Free Zone Treaty*”. Li dir ki “*Following the withdrawal in April 1990 of the US, UK and France from the United Nations Indian Ocean Zone of Peace Conference Preparatory Committee, the idea of a huge conference being held to make the Indian Ocean a Zone of Peace might as well be considered as dead*”. Seki Paul Berenger ti pe propoze anfet se **ranplas** proze Losean Indyin Zonn de Pe par enn Proze Losean Indyin Zone Deniklearize, tandi ki deniklearizasyon **form parti** dan proze Losean Indyin Zonn de Pe. E konklizyon pratik so propozisyon, se *mintyin lekzistans baz militer* lor Diego. Le 19 Ziyet 1990, MSM ek MMM fer enn nuvo lalyans, ek Paul Berenger etranzman nome kuma “*konseye lor kestyon dezarmaman*”. MMM dan guvernman, politik pu sey lezitimiz baz US kumans ofisyalize. Jean Claude de l’Estrac, nuvo Minis Zafer Etranzer, fer plizyer deklarasyon pu ofisyaliz sa nuvo pozisyon-la. Li dir “*Personne ne conteste l’importance stratégique de cette base dans la défense légitime des intérêts occidentaux dans la région.....L’île Maurice reconnaissant l’importance de cette base pour les américains, pouvons nous faire reconnaître en même temps, nos droits historiques? Le moment n’est-il pas propice à une négociation*”⁷⁷? Enn mwa apre li dir “*Le gouvernement n’a pas dit qu’il était prêt à monnayer la présence Américaine à Diego Garcia, mais il estime nécessaire une réflexion nouvelle qui consiste à séparer les deux questions qui y sont liées, à savoir la souverainete mauricienne et la sécurité militaire née de la situation dans le Golfe*”⁷⁸

⁷² *L'Express* 4 June, 1990

⁷³ *Le Mauricien*, 4 June 1990

⁷⁴ LALIT ti deza a-lepok opoz sa stand-la dan Revi Lalit no. 74, Avril 1990 ek Revi Lalit no. 79, Novam 1990

⁷⁵ *Week-end*, 25 January 1998

⁷⁶ Pibliye an exklizivite dan *Le Mauricien*, 9 July 1990

⁷⁷ Interview dan *Cinq Plus Dimanche*, 16 Septam 1990

⁷⁸ *Week-end* 28 October 1990

Apré later Chagos, UK kontrol lamer Chagos

Leta Morisyin gayn enn rakle dan so stratezi “negosyasyon” avek UK. Le 7 Ut 1991, anfet sann-kut-la, UK, olye negosye, proklam 200 mil lamer tu-otur Chagos kuma so zonn marinn eksklizif. An Zanvye 1992, kan Paul Berenger vinn Minis Zafer Etranzer, apre eleksyon zeneral an 1991, li lans enn “iltimatum” a UK ek menas pu remet kestyon Chagos lor azanda Nasyon Zini⁷⁹. Li sirkil o-nivo internasyonal enn dokiman ki dekrir demambreman Chagos. Lobzektif Leta a-lepok kler. Sa muv-la li tipik latitud Leta Morisyin: menas pu sulev kestyon Diego dan UN pu fors UK negosye lor kestyon suvrennte. Anmemtan ena plizyer lartik pu dir ki Leta Morisyin pe fer plizyer propozisyon a UK.⁸⁰ Zame sa bann propozisyon-la pa finn rann piblik.

Lakor Lapes, baz ek suvrennte

An 1993, apre kasir guvernman MSM/MMM, Swaley Kasenally vinn Minis Zafer Etranzer ek anonse dan Nasyon Zini ki ena “*meaningful dialogue*” avek UK lor kestyon Diego. Ki ete sa? Se anfet enn Lakor Lapes pu kre enn *British/Mauritius Fisheries Commission*, ki fer le 27 Zanvye 1994⁸¹. Paul Berenger ki dan lopoziyon revandik paternite sa lakor-la⁸². Ki implikasyon sa lakor⁸³, ki premye Lakor ofisyel ki ena ant Leta Morisyin ek Leta Britanik depi ki finn demambre Chagos ek met baz militer? Pu premye fwa dan enn dokiman ofisyel Leta Morisyin aksepte uvertman lekzistans enn baz militer lor so teritwar. Mem ki lakor-la ti enn Lakor lor Lapes, guvernman sa lepok-la ti devet met dan preambil Lakor-la so lopoziyon a lekzistans baz militer. Dezyeman, Leta Morisyin al fini par rekonet implisitman suvrennte Britanik lor Chagos kan li aksepte ki definir Chagos Archipelagos kuma B.I.O.T, kan an mem tan dan so preambil li pe aksepte pu pa sulev konfli lor kestyon suvrennte. Kan Leta finn separ kestyon suvrennte avek kestyon baz militer, ala ki arive: li al fini par *e* aksepte prezans baz militer *e* rekonet dan lapratik suvrennte Britanik. E pu kuronn le tu, pu premye fwa dan listwar enn Minis Repiblik Moris al vizit Diego. Minis Kasenally al vizit Diego ek kan li returne li dir pena zarm nikler laba ek tu siper laba⁸⁴! Ala rezilta negosyasyon ki finn dire plis ki 2-an: fer aksepte Baz US lor Diego.

Pelindaba Treaty, Baz Militer Diego ek suvrennte

Apré Lakor lor Lapes, Trete Pelindaba ti dezyem gran manev dan lekel Leta Morisyin ti implike depi 1990. An Avril 1996 Trete Pelindaba⁸⁵ adopte apre enn konferans ki ti fer dan Cairo. Li viz pu etabli enn Zonn san zarm nikleer dan Lafrik, ki inklir Losean Indyin. Trete Pelindaba finn integre proze ki Paul Berenger ti propoze an 1990. E se Paul Berenger, ki Minis Zafer Etranzer dan Lalyans PT/MMM ki ti al siyn sa Trete-la dan Cairo.

Trete Pelindaba sulev bann kestyon de fon. Premyerman pena ditu referans a rezolisyon UN 1971 lor Zonn de Pe, ki pu premye fwa finn evok kestyon nikleer dan Losean Indyin. Pa mem finn mansyonn li dan so preambil e Moris finn zwe enn rol santral dan draftaz Trete Pelindaba⁸⁶. Dezyeman ena 2 Protokol atase avek Pelindaba Treaty ki uver a sinaytir bann pei kuma USA, me ki pa ditu remet an kestyon aktivite nikleer lor Diego Garcia. Dayer USA ek UK ti fer li byin kler ki “*le traité ne concernait pas leurs activités à Diego Garcia, située au milieu de l’océan indien*”⁸⁷. E trwazyeman Leta Morisyin finn bizin aksepte met enn dut lor so suvrennte lor Diego, kan Paul Berenger finn aksepte ki met bann “*dotted lines*” pu anserkle Diego dan Map Trete Pelindaba⁸⁸. Alafin muv ki Paul Berenger ti inisyé an 1990, ki finn vinn Trete Pelindaba, finn sey lezitimiz baz militer lor Diego san kestyonn aktivite nikleer US laba ek osi met enn dut pu premye fwa dan listwar suvrennte Moris lor Chagos! Ala ki arive kan separ kestyon baz ek kestyon suvrennte. U pa gayn nanye. Mem si Trete

⁷⁹ *L’Express*, 17 January 1992 - Ultimatum avant de faire appel à L’ONU: Maurice donne à Londres un délai de 2 mois pour rouvrir le dossier Diego

⁸⁰ *Le Militant* 15 February 1992 - De Nouvelles propositions mauriciennes envers Londres

L’Express 14 February 1992, - Initiative mauricienne vis-à-vis de Londres

L’Express 29 December 1992 - Diego: Des Propositions à Londres bientôt

⁸¹ *Week-end*, 16 January 1994 – Au Foreign Office le 27 prochain: Signature d’un accord de pêche entre Londres et Port Louis.

⁸² *L’Express* 22 January 1994 – Paternité mauve pour l’accord sur les Chagos

⁸³ Text integral Lakor-la ti rann piblik apre ki *Lalit* dan *L’Express* 22 January 1994, ti lev enn tole. Get *Le Mauricien pluriel*, 16 Avril 1994 pu text integral lakor-la.

⁸⁴ *L’Express* 20 May 1994 – “Diego: No nuke” fait ressortir Kasenally à son retour d’une visite-éclair dans l’archipel.

⁸⁵ African Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone Treaty, (Pelindaba Treaty) -UN General Assembly document A/50/426.

⁸⁶ *Le Mauricien*, 11 April 1996 - Rôle de premier plan pour Maurice lors de la rédaction du Traité

⁸⁷ *Le Mauricien* 12, April 1996.

⁸⁸ <http://www.opanal.org/>

Pelindaba enn progre dan lalit pu enn lemond san zarm nikler, li dan la pratik mintenir ek sey lezitimiz monopol bann gran pwisans lor zarm nikler... aster dan nu lamer ek nu later. Li inportan suliyne ki ziska lane 2001 USA ti'nn selman siyn sa Protokol-la me pa ti ankor ratifye ek depoz li⁸⁹.

Apré sinyatir Trete Pelinda finn ena plizyer lartik dan lapres, ek an partikilye enn lartik par Henri Marimootoo ki explik klerman ki danze nikleer ena dan Losean Indyin, sirtu dan Diego Garcia⁹⁰. An Avril 1999 pandan enn vizit ki ex-Prezidan US fer dan Lind li aksepte prezans zarm nikleer lor Diego⁹¹.

Laverite deor avek Diego Files Henri Marimootoo, me presyon pu sey lezitimiz lokipasyon militer Diego kontinye

Lane 1997 enn lot lane turnan dan lalit lor kestyon suvrennte ek demantelman baz militer lor Diego. Henri Marimootoo, zurnalist *Week-end* kumans bibliye enn seri lartik apartir bann dokiman deklasifye Leta Britanik. Laverite ki ti kasyet pandan 30-an finn deor. Li kriyel ek revoltan. Li donn tu dimunn ki pe milite lor kestyon Chagos pandan plizyer lane totalman rezon.

Me dan mem moman ki bann *Diego Files* pe bibliye, presyon pu sey lezitimiz baz Diego aksantye. Dan enn interview, Depite Britanik John Marek ki ti pe vizit Moris, dir ki USA pa bizin ena okenn krint lor transfer suvrennte Chagos a Moris⁹². Li rebran tez ofisyel Leta Morisyin. Li dir “...*de la pertinence du maintien de la base de Diego et la question de souveraineté sont deux questions totalement séparées, totalement différentes....*” “*le gouvernement américain ne devrait avoir aucune crainte d'un transfert de la souveraineté sur les Chagos à L'île Maurice*”.

Apartir 1998 enn seksyon klas kapitalis lokal, sirtu dan lindistri textil kumans enn lobby feros an konivans avek enn seksyon Leta USA, pu fer adopte *African Growth and Opportunity Act*. A okenn moman guvernman sa lepok-la (PTr) napa konteste bann kondisyon dan AGOA⁹³: kondisyon ki kapav met an kestyon suvrennte Moris lor Diego. O-kontrer zot ti tret *Lalit* ek *All Workers Conference* de bann “anti-patriot”.

Paralelman Moris eli mamb Konsey Sekirite Nasyon Zini. Moris ti ena ful baking US pu so eleksyon. Dan Lopozisyon, Paul Berenger tuzur byin interese avek “negosyasyon” lor Diego. Li poz enn PNQ a Navin Ramgoolam ki reponn par dir ki guvernman pu kumans bann negocyasyon ofisyel an lane 2000⁹⁴.

Enter Cassam Uteem

Sel lavwa o-nivo Leta Morisyen ki pa ti rim avek tu sa manev pu sey lezitimiz baz Diego, se Cassam Uteem, Prezidan La Repiblik a-lepok. Li finn fer plizyer staytment pu kondann bann bombardman ki USA/UK ti fer lor Lirak apartir Diego⁹⁵. Li finn pran pozisyon anfaver demantelman baz Diego, anfaver suvrennte Repiblik Moris ek lor drwa bann Morisyin-Chagosyin. An 2002 li finn demisyone, kan guvernman MMM-MSM, su presyon USA, finn vot lalwa anti-terorism (PoTA).

Nuvo rezim MSM/MMM: Prepar negocyasyon

Apenn nuvo rezim MSM/MMM inn pran puvwar an Septam 2000, kestyon negocyasyon Diego finn vinn lor latav byin vit. Madeleine Albright ki ti pe vizit Moris an Desam dir ki “*Diego est vitale pour les Etats Unis*”⁹⁶. Telman ki nuvo rezim ti anbale avek negocyasyon avek USA, ki Henri Marimootoo

⁸⁹ Inventory of international Non-proliferation organisations and regimes, 2001 Edition, Monterey Institute of International Studies, California, USA

⁹⁰ *Week-end* 8 Fevriye 1998, “Le danger nucléaire dans l’océan indien”

⁹¹ *Week-end* 10 January 1999, “Bill Clinton confirme impicitement que Diégo Garcia est nucléarisée”

⁹² *Week-end* 28 Septam 1997, Interview par Henri Marimootoo

⁹³ AGOA, *African Growth and Opportunity Act* (Get lartik par Rajni Lallah lor AGOA)

⁹⁴ *Le Mauricien*, 18 December 1999, “Chagos: Requête de Port Louis pour des négociation formelles en 2000”

⁹⁵ Enn lekzanp – *Le Mauricien* 6 January 1999

⁹⁶ *L'Express* 11 December, 2000

finn bizin ekrir enn dosye pu met an gard kont enn vye pyez ki USA pe konkokte depi 1965. Li finn servi bann nuvo dokiman deklasifye pu explike ki manyer sa konplo-la deza pe prepare depi 1965⁹⁷.

Plizyer deklarasyon depi bann Minis nuvo guvernman konfirm nuvo tandans Leta Morisyin. Pozisyon Leta Morisyin finn sibir enn evolision kalitatif inportan: separasyon ant kestyon suverennte ek kestyon baz Diego ki ti pe prone apre 1990, finn transforme an enn pozisyon *akseptasyon prinsip enn baz militer*. Anil Gayan plizyer fwa inn repete ki Moris pena okenn obzeksyon a prezans militer US lor Diego⁹⁸. Premye Minis dan enn repons a kestyon Parlmanter finn dir “*le retour des Chagos à Maurice ne remettra pas en cause la présence militaire américaine à Diego Garcia*”. “*Contester la présence américaine à Diego équivaldrait à se cogner la tête contre un mur*”⁹⁹. An Septam 2001, nuvo evolision, sann-kut-la, pa zis Leta Morisyin pa remet an koz baz US, me li truv li neser dan kanpayn US kont “*terorism*”¹⁰⁰. An Novam 2001, Leta Morisyin, par lavwa Paul Berenger konfirme ki ena bann nuvo negosyasyon sekre ki pe derule ant UK/USA/Moris. Dan *Le Mauricien* 24 Novam 2001, li dir “*Je transmettrai au gouvernement britannique de nouvelles propositions, approuvées par le Cabinet il y a quelque temps, en donnant les explications nécessaires*”(…) “*Nous donnerons le temps nécessaire à nos collègues Britanniques pour réagir. Nous ferons par la même occasion des démarches auprès de nos amis Américains pour les tenir informer de ces nouvelles propositions et éclaircir tout ce qui mérite d’être éclairci*”

Dan mem lepok Moris ofer limem kuma pei pu akeyir rankont ki Prezidan USA sipoze ena avek bann Sef Deta Lafrik su AGOA (get Lartik lor AGOA). President Bush finn anonse ki li pe vinn Moris an Zanvy 2003.

E finalman an Oktob 2002¹⁰¹, guvernman Moris pu premye fwa, resevwar ofisyelman enn reprezantan B.I.O.T.

Nuvo lakor stil 1965?

Ki negosyasyon sekre pe derule? Eski Leta Moris pa pe prepar enn nuvo lavant Diego, apre ki li finn vann proze Losean Indyin Zonn de Pe, apre ki li finn vann lalit pu demantel baz US, apre ki li finn vann drwa bann Chagossien? Eski ena enn nuvo negosyasyon stil 1965 ki pe prepare deryer nu ledo otur Forum AGOA ek Vizit Bush? Apre ki Leta Morisyin finn vann Diego ar UK, eski aster li pa pe prepare pu vann Diego ar US?

Antuleka enn premye konklizyon ki nu kapav tire depi analiz ek listorik ki nu finn devlope: se kan Leta finn separ trwa kestyon ki intiman lye ek inseparab - kestyon suverennte, kestyon baz militer ek kestyon drwa retur Chagossien lor Chagos - li finn anbank li dan enn proses trayizon *tu le 3 kestyon*. Nu finn truv sa arive dan premye Lakor lor Pwason, nu finn truv sa arrive otur Trete Pelindaba. Anfin de kont Leta riske komet mem trayizon ki ti derule an 1965: aksepte demambreman nu teritwar ek aksepte legzistans enn baz militer, kitfwa an esanz pu sertin lavantaz ekonomik pu burzwazi lokal.

Lintere klas kapitalist enn obstak pu Lape ek re-inifikasyon teritwar Moris

Dan bann lane 1960, burzwazi istorik¹⁰², dan kontext batay pu lindependans, ti pe pronn “*lasosyasyon*”. Set-a-dir ki Moris res enn koloni Britanik. Burzwazi lokal ti ena konportman klasik enn

⁹⁷ *Week-end* 3 Decembar, 2000, “L’Etat mauricien va-t-il tomber dan le vrai piège anglo-américain?”. Le gouvernement semble impressionné par une solution secrète peaufinée par le Département d’Etat depuis 1965 pour sauver la base militaire”.

⁹⁸ *L’Express* 27 Janvary 2001 – “Le Ministre des Affaires étrangères aussi ré-affirme la non-objection de Maurice à la présence militaire américaine dans l’archipel

⁹⁹ *Le Mauricien*, 19 May 2001

¹⁰⁰ *Le Mauricien*, 18 Septembar 2001 – Anil Gayan: “L’utilisation de Diego Garcia nécessaire dans les circonstances actuelles”.

¹⁰¹ *Week-end*, 13 Oktob 2002 – “Pour la première fois depuis 1965, le commissaire administrateur du B.I.O.T vient à Maurice”

¹⁰² Burzwazi istorik, burzwazi ki ne depi lepok kolonyal, ki vinn enn burzwazi apre abolisyon lesklavaz, sirtu avek konpansasyon ki puvwar kolonyal ti peye. Sa burzwazi-la finn istorikman kontrol mazer parti later, lindistri sikriyer, konpanyi impor/expor. Zordi li osi dan sekter Turism ek Zonn Frans ek pionye delokalizasyon kapital. Get “*L’Histoire d’une trahison*”, publiye par *Lalit* an 1987, lartik lor “*nesans enn burzwazi deta*” kot ena osi explikasyon lor nesans burzwazi istorik

burzwazi *komprador*¹⁰³. Set-a-dir enn burzwazi ki truv so lintere ekonomik lye avek bann pwisans kolonyal ek inperyalist. A-lepok se PMSD ki ti pe inkarn lintere burzwazi istorik. Dan lepok negosyasyon Konstitusyonel pu Lindepandans, kan kestyon detasman Diego kumans sulve, nu truv ki Leta pre-kolonyal, ki reprezante par seki ti apel a lepok enn “*gouvernement de tous les partis*”, adopte enn stand ki direktman reflet lintere sa burzwazi-la. Zot pa opoz detasman Diego ek konstriksyon enn baz militer. Seki zot anfet fer se met bann kondisyon swivan¹⁰⁴:

- a. *Zot propoz pu lwe Diego pu enn bay 90-an*
- b. *Zot dimann enn kota disik 300,000 a 400,000 par an lor marse US*
- c. *Zot dimann enn kota imigrasyon dan USA ek UK*
- d. *Zot dimann enn kota exportasyon pu 20,000 tonn pwason ton*
- e. *Zot dimann ki Moris gayn diri ek lafarinn lor enn pri ba.*

Kabine Minis ek delegasyon Moris ki ti al negosye dan Konferans Lancaster House dan Lond, reklam negosyasyon direk ar US. A-lepok PMSD ki ti reprezant zintere burzwazi istorik ti deza konfirm sa stand-la. *Le Mauricien* 6 Novam 1965, raport enn miting PMSD ek diskur Gaetan Duval ki dir li “*ne peut révéler les accord secrets du Conseil des Ministres.....mais se déclare d'accord pour une base si Maurice obtient un bon prix pour son sucre et si la Grande-Bretagne nous accorde un bon “contingent d’émigrants”*”. Koalisyon ant PMSD ek PTR eklate lelandime, ek lera Jules Koenig, dirizan PMSD dir “*Je tiens à déclarer de la façon la plus formelle que le PMSD n’est pas contre le principe de céder les Chagos ou que cette archipel devienne un centre de communications pour faciliter la défense de l’Occident. Le PMSD en approuve le principe: il est en désaccord sur les termes et les conditions de cette cession*¹⁰⁵”. De so kote Gaetan Duval dir ki li osi dakor “*pour contribuer à la défense de l’Ouest” et qu’il ajoute “Si l’Angleterre et les USA n’avaient pas d’argent, l’Ile Maurice leur aurait donné la base”*. Dan enn konferans de pres a-lepok Jules Koenig dir “*Nous ne sommes pas contre l’excision des îles pour les besoins militaires de l’Ouest...Il nous fallait une compensation adéquate plus un quota de sucre*¹⁰⁶”. Alor li evidan ki depi 1965, se lintere burzwazi, inkarne par PMSD, ki finn determinn latitud Leta pre-kolonyal a-lepok lor detasman Chagos ek instalasyon baz militer US lor Diego. PTR ek SSR finn konplis ek inkarn sa lintere-la a-lepok; dayer andan PTR ti ena bann kuran de drwat ki ti ideozikman byen pros ek PMSD. Lefet ki burzwazi enn kote ti pe pronn lasosyasyon ek lot kote ule negosye direk avek USA pu so lintere ekonomik, se sa ki ti reprezant bann eleman intern ki finn amenn detasman Chagos ek permet lekzistans baz militer lor Diego.

Latitud ki Leta pre-kolonyal ti adopte an 1965, samem ki finn karakteriz stand Leta post-kolonyal apre lindepandans. Se lekzistans enn muvman anti-kolonyal inkarne par MMM, *Lalit de Klas* ek lalit bann Zilwa ki finn fors Leta ant 1968-1982 pu reklam retur Chagos ek demantelman baz Diego. Kan MMM a-son-tur amors so viraz adrwat apartir bann lane 1982-1990, Leta Morisyin re-aliyn limem avek stand 1965. Servi Diego pu negosye, dan lintere burzwazi. Se samem rezon kifer Leta Morisyin zame finn provok enn deba lor kestyon Chagos dan Lasanble Zeneral Nasyon Zini. Sel fwa ki enn tel mosyon ti inskrir provizwarman, li finn retire, kuma an 1990.

Globalizasyon ek Diego

Azordi avek AGOA ek Vizit Bush, se mem stand ki ti adopte an 1965 ki pe prevalwar ek refer sirfas. Servi Diego pu defann lintere burzwazi, ki azordi sirtu dan tekstil. Dan lepok globalizasyon kapitalist, apre sanzman striktirel ki finn inpoze par *IMF* ek *World Bank* ki finn ankuraz enn “export-led strategy” ek miz-an-plas WTO, tandans kompradorist burzwazi finn aksantye. Dan Moris se burzwazi istorik ki pe montre plis sa tandans-la, pu li “sirviv” dan kad sa nuvo faz kapitalism mondyal-la. Se dan sa kontext-la ki AGOA inn vinn tranplin inportan pu burzwazi, sirtu burzwazi istorik lokal. Burzwazi dan so komportman komprador finn fer Leta aksepte prinsip baz militer US lor Diego, vann suvrennte nasyonal, vann lalit pu Lape dan Losean Indyin. Se lintere egoist burzwazi ki pli gran obstak intern a re-inifikasyon teritwar Moris, a retur Chagos ek demantelman baz militer US lor Diego, a proze enn Losean Indyn Zonn de Pe.

An 1965, kan ti pe detas Diego, Leta ki ti ekziste li ti enn Leta pre-kolonyal, donk li pa ti lib. Kan Moris ti retir mosyon dan UN an 1990 ena dimunn ti dir ki ena nesosite preserv lanplwa dan Zonn Frans ek Lindistri Sikriyer pu zistifye retre mosyon Moris dan UN an 1990. Azordi avek sanzman

¹⁰³ Komprador, enn konsep marxist, pu explik diferans ant enn burzwazi nasyonalist ek enn burzwazi ki truv so lintere lye plis avek bann pwisans imperyalis.

¹⁰⁴ *Week-end* 29 June 1997, Diego Files (vi), par Henri Marimootoo

¹⁰⁵ *Le Mauricien* 13 November 1965

¹⁰⁶ *L’Express* 13 Novembre 1965, *Le Militant* 5 October 1976

fondamantal dan pozisyon Leta Morisyin lor baz militer ek Chagos, ki an relasyon direk avek AGOA, sa pe antrenn rediksyon lanplwa, degradasyon drwa sosyal avek privatizasyon, ek exportasyon masif kapital sosyal: an dot mo, plis lamizer dan Moris.

Klas kapitalist lokal pe antrenn nu pei ek bann zenerasyon avenir dan enn direksyon danzere kot *ni ena retur Diego/Chagos, ni Lape dan Losean Indyin, ek ni ena prosperite pu lamas dimunn*. Burzwazi konpradorist pena okenn obligasyon a suverennte pei ek byin-et lepep Moris – se so profi ek lintere imedya ki prime. Se sa realite kriyel globalizasyon kapitalist.

Annex

UN Resolution on a Zone of Peace – December 1971

General Assembly – subject: Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, Resolution 2832 (XXVI), 16 December 1971.

The General Assembly

Conscious of the determination of peoples of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean to preserve their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, and to resolve their political, economic and social problems under conditions of peace and tranquility,

Recalling the Declarations of the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Lusaka in September 1970, calling upon all States to consider and respect the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace from which great Power rivalries and competition as well as bases conceived in the context of such rivalries and competition should be excluded, and declaring that the area should also be free of nuclear weapons,

Convinced of the desirability of ensuring the maintenance of such conditions in an area by means other than military alliances as such alliances entail financial and other obligations that call for the diversion of the limited resources of these States from the more compelling and productive task of economic and social reconstruction and could further involve them in the rivalries of power blocs in a manner prejudicial to their independence and freedom of action, thereby increasing international tensions,

Concerned at recent developments that portend the extension of the arms race into the Indian Ocean area, thereby posing a serious threat to the maintenance of such conditions in the area,

Convinced that the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean would contribute towards arresting such developments, relaxing international tensions and strengthening international peace and security,

Convinced further that the establishment of a zone of peace in an extensive geographical area in one region should have a beneficial influence on the establishment of permanent universal peace based on equal rights and justice for all, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations,

- 1) *Solemnly declares* that the Indian Ocean, within limits to be determined, together with the air space above and the ocean floor subjacent thereto, is hereby designated for all time as a zone of peace;
- 2) *Calls upon* the great Powers, in conformity with this Declaration, to enter into immediate consultations with the littoral States of the Indian Ocean with a view to:
 - (a) Halting the further escalation and expansion of their military presence in the Indian Ocean;
 - (b) Eliminating from the Indian Ocean all bases, military installations, logistical supply facilities, the disposition of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction and any manifestation of great Power military presence in the Indian Ocean conceived in the context of great Power rivalry;
- 3) *Calls upon* the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, the permanent members of the Security Council and other major maritime users of the Indian Ocean, in pursuit of the objective of establishing a system of universal collective security through regional and other co-operation, to enter into consultations with a view to the implementation of this Declaration and such action as may be necessary to ensure that:
 - (a) Warships and military aircraft may not use the Indian Ocean for any threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or independence of any littoral or hinterland State

of the Indian Ocean in contravention of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations;

- (b) Subject to the foregoing and to the norms and principles of international law, the right to free and unimpeded use of the zone by the vessels of all nations is unaffected;
 - (c) Appropriate arrangements are made to give effect to any international agreement that may ultimately be reached for the maintenance of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace:
- 4) *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session on the progress that has been made with regard to the implementation of this Declaration;
- 5) *Decides* to include the item entitled "Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace" in the provisional agenda of its twenty-seventh session.

Recorded Vote:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bhutan, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, *Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syria, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Lesotho, Luxemburg, Madagascar, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peoples' Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Phillipines, Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Zaire.

Absent: Albania, Bahrain, Barbados, Botswana, Ecuador, Gabon, Gambia, **Iraq, Malawi, Maldives, Mauritius, Niger, Oman, Paraguay, Sierra Leone, United Arab Emirates.

*Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to abstain.

**Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to vote in favour."

Lalit dimunn ordiner kont baz US lor Chagos, pu reinifikasyon Repiblik Moris ek pu reparasyon par Lindsey Collen ek Ragini Kistnasamy

Sa lartik-la li donn an detay moman pli for dan lalit dimunn Chagos, sirtu fam Chagos. Li ti enn moman ki finn determinn tu listwar modern Chagos. Nu pu explike kifer.

Introdiksyon

Kan dimunn ekrir lor listwar Chagos, byen suvan zot pretann ki listwar finn arive san ki Chagosyen¹ finn azir ladan ditu, san ki dimunn *Lalit*² ek *Muvman Liberasyon Fam* finn azir ladan, san ki dimunn *Organisation Fraternelle* finn azir ladan. An-som, zot pretann ki bann lotorite finn organiz listwar par zot-mem, antre-zot-mem. Ondire zot dekrir listwar Chagos kuma enn zafer ant Amerikin, Angle ek Bolom Ramgoolam. Lerla, ep! Binod Bacha vinn fer miting Zardin Konpayni, e ep! an 1982, pa kone kifer, Bérenger al Langleter, Chagosyen gayn konpansasyon.

Sa li enn falsifikasyon listwar. Li grav. Me, pa zis sa. Li osi enn taktik, parfwa konsyan parfwa inkonsyan, pu sey gard lamas dimunn, an zeneral, dan enn rol pasif *azordi*, ubyen pu fer zot vinn pli pasif *zordi ek dime*.

Nu bizin gard antet kan nu lir liv listwar ki istoryen byen suvan depann lor Leta ek lor dimunn avek puvwar pu zot lapey, pu zot pibliye zot travay, e pu zot nominasyon, zot promosyon. Alor, zot ena tandans fer aksyon vital lamas dimunn gayn mwens linportans ki anfet li ena; kumsa zot pler zot patron.

E byen suvan, istoryen zot pa bann dimunn ki abitye, dan fason parle, ‘desann dan lari’, zot-mem, alor zot napa kone ki lefe li ena kan dimunn desann dan lari.

E byen suvan osi, zot pa bann dimunn ki ekut parol bann vye dimunn depi klas sosyal oprime, tu sinpleman akoz zot pa konn zot, alor zot napa konn listwar ni seki dimunn oprime finn temwayne zot-mem, ni seki zot kone depi zot gran dimunn.

Set diferan faz dan lalit Chagosyen

Nu kapav dir finn ena set faz dan lalit Chagosyen, kot dimunn Chagos reysi met zot prop lalit lor azanda:

1. Faz rezistans spontane

Premye faz: 1965-71: Sa ti enn lepok kan ti ena rezistans spontane kont deportasyon, byen suvan rezistans pasiv, kot dimunn ti pe refiz kit Chagos. Ti ena so pwen for avek lagrev lafen abor bato Nordvaer, e sit-inn kan dimunn ti refiz desann depi bato.

2. Faz sosyo-politik, avek *L’Organisation Fraternelle*

Pandan bann lane 1970, ti ena enn faz ki nu kapav apel “sosyo-politik”, kot Chagosyen ti mobilize pu fer tann lavwa. Li ti enn lepok kot zot ti milite ansam avek *l’Organisation Fraternelle*. Ase suvan bann lalit byen difisil, zis pu fer sor Chagosyen koni. Sa ti enn faz kle, e li finn permet faz kot ena buku manifestasyon devlope.

3. Faz manifestasyon de-mas avek *Lalit* ek *Muvman Liberasyon Fam*

Lane 1977-81, *lalit* pli spektakiler de-mas, pli politik, ansam sirtu avek *Lalit* ek *Muvman Liberasyon Fam*: Pu konpansasyon, pu ferm baz, e pu return Diego a Moris. Lefe sa faz aktivite-la kontinye pandan plizyer lane -- ziska gayn Selek Komiti, gayn konpansasyon depi guvernman Britanik, gayn Trust Fund eli.

4. Faz ‘idantiter’

Sa lepok la ti karakterize par enn labsans enn *lalit* koeran. Plizyer grup ti surse e finn ranpli enn rol pu “depolitiz” Chagosyen. Ti ena MMM, li-mem, plis KMLI3 ek lera enn fron ase flas apel FNSI⁴. Ti ena travay sosyal byen interesan pu ramas reset Chagos, e konpil dosye lor manyer ki dimunn ti pe viv. Ti osi ena travay plito benevol sa lepok la, enpe dan enn stil “donn sarite”.⁵

Pandan 10 an pa ti ena gran sanzman. Ti ena enpe birokratizasyon, kot ena kontestasyon kont *Groupe Refugiés Chagos* ki ti vinn inopiler kan zot ti kontrol Trust Fund.

Me, pandan sa lepok la, kanmem, *Comite Social Chagossien* forme e rod byen-et sosyal Chagossien ek zanfan Chagos. Lidership ti ar M. Fernand Mandarin e enn avoka, M. Hervé Lasemillante. Se CSC ki insiste ki nepli apel Chagosyen par zot ansyen apelasyon, ki finn devlop enn sinifikasyon pezoratif, setadir “Zilwa”. CSC amenn argimantasyon ki Chagosyen otoktonn dan Chagos.

5. Faz re-evey mobilizasyon Rann nu Diego

Lane 199... 8 ansam ar Komite *Rann nu Diego*, met dibut konzwentman par *Groupe Refugiés Chagos* ek *Lalit*, Chagosyen kumans enn *lalit* istorik: Pu ferm baz, pu re-inifikasyon pei, pu dekolonizasyon konplet Repiblik Moris, e pu reparasyon (Get a-la-fin liv, dan seksyon dokiman istorik, Platform *Rann nu Diego*). La, ena enn nuvo faz politizasyon karakterize par enn Renyon Bain de Dames kot *GRC* kumans re-pran nesans. Sa finn debus lor enn Forum Sant Sosyal, kot Chagosyen ansam ek manb *Lalit* ti kumans remet enn azanda pli politik lor latab.

6. Faz “legal” apre lalwa sekre 30 an fini, avek M. Mardaymootoo

Lane 1999-2002, nu gayn faz *apre* ki dokiman sekre su lalwa “30 an” vinn dan domenn publik dan *Public Records Office* an Gran Bretayn, apre tu sa bann detay orib la finn publiye par zurnalist Henri Marimootoo. Sa faz la nu truv *Groupe Refugiés Chagos* met ka lakur kont Leta Britanik ek Leta Amerikin (ek konpayni Amerikin): pu drwa de retur, e pu reparasyon ek konpansasyon.

7. Faz modern: Emerzans enn fron komen pu reparasyon, ferm baz, re-inifye Moris?

Enn platform lor 10 pwen, ti adopte dan enn reynion organize par Sahrington⁶ Mardi 24 Septam, 2002.⁷ Sa, li posib, pu vinn reprezant kumansman enn sizyem faz. Seki ti istorik sa reynion la, se li ti truv ansam dan enn sel reynion *tulede* regroupman Chagosyen⁸ plis tu bann lorganizasyon ek individi ki koni pu zot *lalit* lor Diego Garcia⁹ ansam avek enn 60-enn travayer sosyo-politik, depi tandans pro-MMM¹⁰, tandans pro-*Nuvo Lizur*¹¹, plis tandans pro-*Lalit*¹². Tu dimunn prezan finn tom dakor lor enn seri pwen, ki enn madam depi Sid Afrik ti met lor papye nyuzprinnt. Bann pwen-la ti kuver:

- Re-inifikasyon Moris, pu li inklir Chagos an-antye (kestyon “suvrennte”)
- Fermtir baz militer Diego Garcia
- Reparasyon ek konpansasyon pu Chagosyen

Desizyon ti ki manb Sahrington-Mauritius pu drafte enn dokiman ki inklir tu bann pwen, lera apel enn-de reprezantan tu lorganizasyon ki ti prezan, ratifye li, e lera al ‘kulut li lor laport Premye Minis’.O-fet, finn al delavan avek sa desizyon-la (get kopi sa rezolisyon-la a-la-fin liv, dan seksyon dokiman istorik).

Faz manifestasyon de-mas, an pli gran detay

Nu pu get an enpe plis detay enn faz inportan, faz manifestasyon de-mas, faz ansam ek *Lalit* ek *Muvman Liberasyon Fam*. Nu pe get sa faz-la dan enn fason ki montre ki manyer oto-aktivite dimunn oprime ki amenn progre. Li pa enn aksidan ki *Lalit* ek *MLF* ti ansam dan sa faz-la: sa 2 lorganizasyon-la *krwar dan* linportans oto-aktivite dimunn oprime, kuma enn bann moter listwar.

Kuma u pu deza kone, se sirtu sa faz manifestasyon lari ki finn provok sanzman dan kur listwar. Se sa oto-aktivite enn lamas Chagosyen ki finn reysi fer buz listwar par divan.

Pli gran manifestasyon lari, e so lefe lor listwar

Sa faz-la ti kilmine kan 100 – 200 fam desann dan lari dan sant Porlwi, kriye slogan ‘Rann nu Diego’, ‘Ferm baz, ale’, ‘Ki nu pe rode? Diego!’ Ti ena gran manifestasyon kumsa trwa zur a-swiv 25, 26 ek 27 Mars 1981. Ti ena pankart avek bann mem kalite slogan. Manifestasyon ti fer san inform lapolis, dapre lalwa *Public Order Act*. Manifestasyon ti fer dan kontex enn lagrev lafen ki 8 fam ti pe fer dan Zardin Konpayni, vizavi kot O-Komiser Britanik ti ena so biro dan Lasose. Trwazyem zur manifestasyon ti terminn dan enn lager fizik ant 100 a 200 fam ek plizyer duzenn RIOT, akot RIOT ti perdi e ti rant dan jip, sove.

Se sa mobilizasyon pandan 3 zur, par santenn fam, laplipar Chagosyen, ki finn amenn sanzman pli profon ki afekte lavi kotidyen dimunn Chagos zordi, ki afekte posib re-inifikasyon Moris an-antye zordi, e ki afekte posibilite ferm baz militer Diego ziska zordi. E li sirtu sa konfrontasyon ase hard ant fam Chagosyen ek fam *Lalit* kont RIOT ki finn modle lavenir lor kestyon Diego Garcia ek Chagos.

Nu pu dekrir sa trwayem zur la an detay. Ki exakteman ti arive?

Anmentan, nu pu gete kimanyer mobilizasyon finn fer *depi avan* pu ki manifestasyon reysi exprim prezizeman sa koler, sa revolt kont linzistis, sa volonte pu progre, sa refi pu sibir seki bann pli gran pwisans dan lemond, Amerikin ek Britanik, ti perpetre kont Chagosyen ant 1965 ek 1971, setadir transportasyon forse depi zot bann lil natal. Nu pu gete ki manyer tayming inportan dan mobilizasyon osi. Nu pu gete kimanyer konpreasyon tu dimunn dan manifestasyon li esansyel; samem ki amenn posibilite sanzman.

Manifestasyon trwazyem zur

Nu ti kone Kabine Minis pe zwenn. Ti enn Vandredi. Premye zur manifestasyon, enn Merkredi, pa ti sifi. Dezyem zur, so landime, enn Zedi, pa ti sifi. Alor, trwazyem zur, nu finn al dibut dan lari divan Govenemnt Haws, vizavi Larenn Viktorya. 100 a 200 fam Chagosyen ek fam dan *Lalit* ek *MLF*. Bann misye ki ti la, ti dibut par deryer dan Plas Darm. Nu finn dibut dan lari par expre.

Ver onz-er gramatin, kan Kabine Minis pe zwenn, nu finn reysi blok sirkilasyon. Nu ti pe kriye slogan. Nu ti pe dir Guvernman Travayis bizin azir. Bizin met Angle ek Amerikin deor, bizin reinifye Moris, bizin donn konpansasyon tu Chagosyen.

Enn premye konfrontasyon avek RIOT ti ena lye isi, divan Lotel di Guvernman, sa zur la.

Seki finn arive se enn sef RIOT finn donn lord pu enn 30-enn RIOT dibute an-liyn vizavi tu fam manifestan. Alor, sannkut la, RIOT ti pe donn kudme blok lari. Lerla, zom RIOT finn gayn lord depi zot siperyer. Sakenn bizin anfil so lebra ar lebra so kamarad, de kote, lerla krwaz lebra deryer zot led. (Eski kumsa zot ti pu evit akizasyon ki zot finn pas lame ar fam? Pa kone.) Lerla, zot gayn lord pu “innch” par divan, dusman dusman. Lerla, zot kumans pez kont nu bann fam manifestan. Ondire bi, se pu fer nu met aryer dusman dusman, ziska Larut Rwayal fini debleye.

Kuma enn sel fam, tu fam Chagosyen, etan zot sorti enn kiltir matri-santral kot fam mwen domine ki sosyete Moris an zeneral, zot kone ki zot bizin fer. Zot sakenn avoy lame anba, trap grenn gard, peze. Tu gard kumans kabos an de, pleyne. Dan sa moman-la, kot zot zorey enpe expoze a enn bas altitud, 4-5 gard finn gayn kut parasol lor zot zorey. Zot zorey finn kumans seyne.

Li dan sa moman-la, kot lapolis finn vinn aret 2 fam, Marie Louise Armoogum ek Merline Lamb. Plitar zot finn gayn sarz kont zot. Dan konfizyon zeneral, nu pa ti kone ti fini ena arestasyon.

Me, manifestan-la, finn kone, inn ler pu fer enn lot kiksoz, alor nu finn fer ondire nu pe disperse.

Lerla, kan nu ariv divan O-Komiser Britanik, omilye Lasose, nu tu finn asiz anba. Kuma enn sel fam. Omilye lari.

Nu ti zis akote kot ena 8 fam pe fer lagrev lafen. Parmi ti ena Virginie Besage (45 an), Noeline Selmour (41 an), Renette Isai (29 an), Louise Dorie Simon (52 an), Patricia Lamb (18 an). Tu le 8 ek zot viziter, ki ti pe konpayn zot, ti la. Zot butey Vichy vid ti osi lamem.

Lerla, enn seri jip RIOT arive, gard kumans desann dan jip, kumans rod 'mener', sipa "ringliyder", trape zet dan jip.

Isi, RIOT finn kumans enn lager, kumans trape, bate. Fam riposte. Ena zet lekor pu ki lapolis bizin trenn zot. La, nu gayn dezyem konfrontasyon ek RIOT. Sann-la dan Lari Lasose.

Lager la ti telman brit sann kut-la, ki lezot dimunn pa ti kapav res andeor lager-la. Bann lezot Chagosyen, ek mem piblik, mem ti-marsan, zot tu finn rant dan lager kont RIOT. Lager bate kontinye, e dusman-dusman zot vinn lager avoy butey Vichy vid lor RIOT pu anpes zot bat fam. Lerla anplwayed mezon ki travay dan gran konpayni lor letaz dan Cerné House, serten ki finn pliye divan misye-la depi dezane, kumans avoy lasyet misye-la lor RIOT depi lafnet lao. Tu magazin, lafarmasi, bes zot shetez. Lager kontinye.

RIOT tuzur lor misyon pu viz ringliyder, pu aret zot. Parmi ti ena 6 fam ki RIOT reysi trape, lerla 2 RIOT pran nu, balans nu dan ler, zet nu dan jip kuma bal disik, latet avan. Buf!

Bann fam arete ti apel Charlesia Alexis, Roselie Pakion, Lilette Goyaram, Philinne Frivole, Ragini Kistnasamy ek Lindsey Collen (Dernye 2 se oter sa lartik la.) Lindsey Collen finn tann tapaz inkwayab butey vid Vichy pe kraze lor twatir jip. Dan enn dezord indeskrriptib, kot lapolis pe lager antre-zot kot jip lor kestyon kisannla finn rod sove, Lindsey Collen reysi sote dan jip, tom anba. Jip demare afors RIOT su atak manifestan. Lindsey Collen, kan li rod dibut, li truve li pena savat lor so lipye, e partu ena butey kase.

Pena personn reste dan Lasose. Tu lapolis finn fonn. Tu manifestan finn fonn. Mem grevis lafen inn buze tanporeman.

Jip lapolis finn amenn deteni kot Layn Baraks, finn ferm zot pu enn wikenn an antye Plitar lapolis vinn re-aret Lindsey Collen kot so lakaz Bambous. Me, zot pa ti ena warrant, alor li ti refiz al ar zot, e finn prezante kot Layn Baraks pu arestasyon Lindi gramatin. Charlesia Alexis ti blese pandan lager ar RIOT, e so latet ti pe seyne, alor lapolis ti amenn li Lopital Sivil pu pansman ek pu pas dan laparey, avan zot return li dan kaso ansam lezot deteni, ki ferme Layn Baraks. Ansam dan selil natirelman ti ena enn Madam Linz Ble.

Avoka Kader Bayat ti byen okip tu deteni. Li ti amenn sigaret ek dilo. Li ti amenn lagazet. Li ti fer jok, riye. Deteni ti pas letan koz bann koze ansam.

Grevis lafen finn kontinye lagrev lafin dan Zardin Konpayni.

Me, sann kut-la, tu dimunn Moris finn kone kifer zot pe fer lagrev lafen. Alor balans de fors finn fini sanze. Ala linportans ki 100-200 fam finn kone bizin fer sa konfrontasyon, sa zur la pa enn lot zur, e fer li vinn koni. Parski dimunn Moris partu dan tu vilaz, tu kwen lavil, lakot partu finn kone aster *kifer* dimunn Chagos finn manifeste, kifer zot finn lager ar RIOT, kifer zot pe fer lagrev lafin. Li ti pu bann rezon kler:

- Pu regayn Diego
- Pu ferm baz militer Diego
- Pu dekolonizasyon Chagos
- Pu konpansasyon pu sa imans sufrans ki tu dimunn Chagos ti sufer e ancor pe sufer.

Ala, kimanyer aksyon marse, kan li byen devlope.

So bild-ep ver sa aksyon la

Me, kimanyer li ti anfet devlope? Kimanyer ti ena enn bild-ep?

Nu kapav dir ki bann fam ki ti deklans lagrev lafin ti ena enn vizyon istorik byen gran. Lagrev lafen finn deklanse le 16 Mars 1981 pu enn rezon byen sinp: aköz problem Chagos tuzur napa lor azanda Guvernman. Dimunn Chagos finn ankoler.

Lerla, kan lagrev lafen fini deklanse, tu lorganizasyon ki sutenir lalit pu retur Diego, ek lalit pu konpansasyon sifizan, ek lalit pu dekolonizasyon, finn kumans rann vizit grevis, dan enn fason sistematik, e finn kumans organiz pu sey fer lapres kuver lagrev lafen. Ti kumans amenn butey Vichy, kuma enn siyn sutyen pu lagrev lafen.

3 an avan, enn bild-ep inportan

Me, avan sa lagrev lafen Mars 1981, ki pu vinn istorik net kan li deklans gran manifestasyon, ti ena enn lot gran lagrev lafen.

Sa ti an 1978 dan Bain de Dames. An Septam 1978 dan Bain des Dames. 6 Fam ti fer lagrev lafen. Parmi ti ena Marie Lisette Talatte, Charlesia Alexis ek Louise Latouche.

Laba bann manb *Lalit* ek MLF ti pas lannwit ansam ek grevis. Ti ena Marie France Favory ki ti dan MLF, Rajni Lallah ek 2 oter sa lartik la, Ragini Kistnasamy ek Lindsey Collen.

Ti osi ena Ram Seegobin, enn medsen *Lalit*, ti okip zot lasante pandan lagrev lafen. Ti ena flanbo aswar. Dan bor lari dan Bain de Dames. Kuma enn sinbol sa lalit la. Ti ena ti-pankart. Pu explike kifer lagrev lafen. Bann manb Lalit ti ede par fer apel a zurnalist ki nu kone, e interes zot pu ekrir lartik. Parmi grevis ti mem ena enn fam ki ti pe donn bwar, ki ti fer lagrev lafen.

Alor, avan gran lagrev lafen 1981, ti deza ena kumansman mobilizasyon. Ti ena lexperyans.

Kontinyasyon an 1981

Kumsa, lagrev lafen 1981 pa ti zis surse dan vid. Li ti ena so listwar. So listwar finn anseyen bann Chagosyen ki li inportan vinn dan enn plas pli santral ki Bain des Dames.

Kumsa zot finn lans zot lagrev lafen 1981 dan sant Porlwi.

8 Zur finn pase.

‘Lopinyon piblik’ pa ti pe tro pran kont. Manb Lalit ek MLF pe donn sutyen ki kapav. Kuma avan. Dan sa mem muvans la.

Lerla, enn grup fam dan MLF e ki osi dan *Lalit* lor 9em zur lagrev lafen, finn formelman dan enn reynion deside pu pran enn linisyativ istorik. Sa ti enn moman krisyal dan listwar Moris. Sa ti enn moman kot enn manb, Pouba Iyasawmy, ti ena sa fler pu kone ki moman la finn vini. Lezot manb prezan finn dakor. Ki nu bizin fer? Nu bizin batir lor nu lalit dan lepase Bain de Dames. Nu bizin rant an kontak pros avek fam Chagosyen tutwit, nu bizin propoze ki nu fer kiksoz ki kapav vinn spektakiler.

Tutswit nu finn met sa plan la an aksyon. Mem-mem ler ki nu finn desid li dan enn reynion dan Lakir Imakile, nu finn marse al Zardin Konpayni. Nu 2 oter ti parmi.

Nu finn al dimann enn rankont formel avek organizater lagrev lafen. Enn grup fam ki ti pe kordinn lagrev lafen, e pa ti pe fer lagrev lafen zot mem, finn dakor pu fer sa reynion formel kan nu finn explike ki nu bizin travay ansam. Kan nu ti zwenn, mem mem moman, anplas-anplas, ansam nu finn konstate ki lagrev lafen, par li tusel, pa pe sifi. Pu bizin fer lezot kiksoz anmemtan, pu ki li reysi. Ansam nu finn gayn lide fer enn manifestasyon zekler, landime. E nu finn fer espes enn serman ki nu pu kontinye ziska nu reysi.

Seki inportan asterla, se nu finn diskrit seki vreman apel “enn program” ant nu. Nu finn diskrit ki pu marke lor sak pankart, e finn tom dakor pu bann fam *Lalit* prepar enn 50-enn pankart avek sa lalist slogan ki nu finn deside ansam lor la. Tu slogan ti lor 3 size: retur a

Diego, retur Diego a Moris, konpansayon, fermtir baz militer. E sa finn anfet form baz program de-baz tu lalit lor kestyon Chagos ki finn kontribiye pu progre, ziska zordi an 2002.

Nu finn dir nu pu fer pankart lor enn *papye* enpe epe, plito ki bristol, pu nu kapav ploy pankart, kasyet li anba nu linz. Desizyon lor sa bann taktik-la osi ti ena so linportans. Personn pa ti fer lipu pul. Nu finn tom dakor fasil.

Nu finn met randevu 11.30 a.m landime pu ki manifestasyon fer o-milye ler manze pu maximem dimunn truve e tande. Nu ti fixe plas randevu dan ti-zardin par deryer Zardin Konpayni, akoz ti ena tro buku lapolis dan paraz Zardin Konpayni par divan.

Kan nu finn zwenn, nu finn partaz pankart ploye, an katimini, ant fam prezan. Serten lapolis ti remarke ki kiksoz drol pe pase. Zot finn truv bann 'lagel' enpe tro 'militant' (kote Chagosyen ek kote *Lalit*) pe sirkile, pe tripot kiksoz.

Me, zot pa ti kone ki exakteman nu pu fer.

Lerla, enn sel ku, kan fini partaz tu pankart (e anfet finn mank pankart!), nu tu finn degaze tir pankart ki ti kasyet anba nu linz, met li anler lao nu latet, e anmemtan kumans galupe, kriye slogan for net. *Ki nu pe rode? Diego. Ki nu pe rode? Diego. Ferm baz, ale! Ferm baz, ale!*

Alor, linportans sa aksyon la, se nu pe anons piblik kifer dimunn Chagos ankoler.

Pangar zot pa kone. Kumsa piblik kapav vinn dan nu kote. Nu pe osi anons

Guvernman ki nu nepli pe kurbe kuma nu finn suvan oblize kurbe. Nu pa kontrole par lide Leta. Nu lib. Nu pe fer seki nu truve bizin fer.

Suvan kan ena bann aksyon byen vit, e byen planifye, zot pran Leta par sirpriz osi.

RIOT ti truv zot dan enn pozisyon anbarasan.

Parski nu finn fini demare avan zot kone, zot pankor gayn okenn lord. Alor, zot truv zot pe bizin galup deryer nu. RIOT napa konn travay si li ena pu galup deryer enn grup fam. Li enn imilyasyon pu li.

Alor, pandan 45 minit nu finn galup partu dan sant Porlwi, pe kriye for net, e lerla nu finn fonn dan labrus (dan enn fason parle).

Lapolis finn sulaze. *Fini*, sirman zot pe dir. *Enn dife dan kann. Fini.*

Nu ti satisfes avek nu manifestasyon sa premye zur la.

Buku dimunn finn ariv kone ki pe pase. Kumsa listwar kapav buz par divan. Dimunn finn konstata ki fam finn araze. Kan fam araze, tu dimunn kone ena problem. Dimunn finn kumans konpran ki ena enn lalit lezitim pe derule. Dimunn finn oblize rekonet *kifer* ena enn osi long lagrev lafen dan Zardin Konpayni. Kifer fam pe alonz par ter, refiz manze, zis bwar dilo Vichy? Zot nepli kapav zis get lot kote, pase, al travay. Swa mars inpe pli vit, al bazar.

Guvernman finn konsterne enn tigit.

Me, mem nu ti satisfes, nu ti kone ki sa osi, li pa sifi.

Alor, nu komite konzwen finn re-met mem randevu landime.

Ankor enn fwa, lapolis pa finn tro expek sa. Lapolis finn pran o-depurvi dezyem zur osi.

Alor, ancor enn fwa, nu finn reysi tir pankart, kumans kriye slogan for for, galup partu dan Anvil, avek lapolis pe galup deryer nu. Nu pe riye, nu pe kontan, nu pe kriye, nu pe exprim seki nu panse dan fason nu oblize exprim nu. Listwar Moris ek listwar Chagos, listwar Lamerik ek listwar Langleter, pe obliz nu exprim nu kumsa. E nu pe konn sa. Nu pe kone ki se lepep ki fer so prop destin.

La, dezyem zur, dimunn bor sime, kumans aplodi, kontan nu 'manifestasyon galupe', parfwa nu manifestasyon mem danse, parfwa nu manifestasyon mem sante anplas kriye, dan gran o-milye lizur, dan gran o-milye Porlwi.

La osi, kan fini, nu finn fer enn ti-reynion kordinasyon.

Seki nu finn reysi fer dezyem zur li bon. Piblik pe kone. Guvernman enpe pli konsterne.

Me tuzur lapres pa sufle enn mo.

Kapav zot pa finn truve.

Li bon, sa 2 zur manifestasyon la.

Me, la osi, li pa sifi. Li pa ase.

Guvernman pa finn dimann enn negosyasyon naryen. Guvernman deklara par remarke.

Alor, kumsa nu planifye 3yem zur-la. Zur Kabine Minis pe zwenn. Sa 3yem zur la, nu fini dekrir li lao. Se sa 3yem zur ki finn sanz kur listwar. Me li ti depann lor tu sa mobilizasyon avan, mobilizasyon ki nu pa ti kone kot li pu amenn nu enn zur.

Enn not lor rol lapres

Parfwa kan bann militan koz lor “azanda politik” ki “lapres” antan ki institisyon ena, bann redakter reazir avek buku koler.

Li interesan pu konn enn-de tit lagazet landime gran manifestasyon le 27 Mars, 1981. Le Mauricien 28 Mars 1981. An tit an kuler: "*Main d'oeuvre et matériaux mauriciens pour Diego Garcia?*" ek enn lot "*Les hommes d'affaires anglo-américains sont arrivés*".

L'Express 28 Mars 1981: "*Le renforcement de la base militaire de Diego: Coup d'envoi ce matin des discussions avec les hommes d'affaires américains.*"

Ka Public Order Act dan Lakur kont 8 fam

Lerla, sa mobilizasyon finn kontinye pandan enn long ka lakur. Marie Louise Armoogum, Merline Lamb, Charlesia Alexis, Roselie Pakion, Lilette Goyaram, Philinne Frivole, Ragini Kistnasamy ek Lindsey Collen.

Lakur Distrik Porlwi ti byen anime kan nu ti bizin vini pu nu ka. Ti ena lisyen lapolis, ek RIOT partu. Pa ti ena plas dan lakur pu nu sinpatizan. Par santenn ti vini.

Dan Lakur, kan lapolis finn vinn dan box, temwayne, zot finn prizonye 2 seri mansonz: zot pa ti ule admet ki zot finn bat fam, e zot pa ti ule admet ki zot finn gayn bate ar fam. E sa 2 zafer la ti byen inportan sa zur la: lapolis ti bat fam, ek fam ti bat lapolis ziska lapolis sove.

Finalman, Mazistra truv nu non-kupab.

Antretan, nu kapav dir, amezir MMM pe al ver pran puvwar, li enn lafors buku pli for *politikman* ki lidersip Chagosyen (ki ti organiz manifestasyon la), e li ti buku pli for politikman a lepok ki *Lalit* ek *MLF* (ki ti konzwentman organiz manifestasyon la). Anplis so prop lafors, MMM finn alye li ar *L'Organisation Fraternelle*, li finn kareman donn tiket manb *OF*, e li finn alye li ar Kishore Mundil dan *KMLI*. Alor kumsa ki MMM ki finn rekiper sa muvman de-mas la. Li finn aprivwaz li. Li finn amenn manifestan ki ti arete dan delegasyon pu al Lond. E se MMM ki finn dominann negosyasyon. Li finn met buku presyon lor Chagosyen pu aksepte enn konpansasyon ase minim. Li ti mem fer Chagosyen siyn enn dokiman ki ti kapav riske konpromet zot. Me, lefet ki lalit-la ti inplik lamas Chagosyen finn asire ki MMM asir enn Trust Fund eli demokratikman pu zer fon-la.

Konklizyon

Dan lavenir, kikenn pu bizin ekrir listwar sak sa set faz-la. Kan li ekrir par bann partisipan ladan, li gayn enn valer “temwen okiler” anplis.

1 Nu pe servi term Chagosyenm, mem si alepok dimunn Chagos ti apel zot mem “Zilwa” e tu dimunn ti apel zot “Zilwa”

2 Lalit de Klas, alepok

3 Komite Morisyen Losean Indyen. Ladan bann dimunn ki ti donn buku kudme ti Kishore Mundil ek Eddy Sadien.

4 Front Nationale de Soutien aux Illois. Sa ti enn fron dan lekel ti ena MMM, KMLI, Lalit de Klas, Muvman Liberasyon Fam.

5 Dimunn tuzur rapel sa “distribisyon gropwa”, parski enn fwa ti ena gran lager otur distribisyon manze.

6 Southern African Human Rights NGO Network

7 Ti fer sa seminar la hotel Labourdonnais, Caudan Waterfront. Pu Ledikasyon Pu Traveyer ti ena Lindsey Collen ek Alain Ah-Vee presan.

8 Group Refugiés Chagosse ek Comités Social Chagossien.

9 Ant ot, Kishore Mundil, Jeasn Claude Augustave, Palma Virapen, Alain Ah-Vee, Lindsey Collen.

10 Lindsey Morvan, Shyam Reeda, Jean Claude Augustave(tu nomini MMM resan).

11 Jocelyne Minerve, Ambiga Carpanen.

12 Alain Ah-Vee

Pozisyon Guvernman ek burzwazi lor Chagos

par Alain AH-Vee

Kafuyaz ki finn leve otur pozisyon ki Jagdish Koonjul, reprezentan Moris dan Nasyon Zini, finn pran lor rezolisyon Lamerik inn prepare lor Lirak, demontre ziska ki pwin guvernman MSM-MMM finn vinn enn alye inkondisyonel Lamerik. Tutswit kuma linformasyon finn sirkile deor kumkwa Moris pa pe vot ar Lamerik lor sa rezolisyon-la e ki ti raporte dan *L'Express* 26 Oktob 2002, guvernman finn apel Jagdish Koonjul Moris e finn donn li lord pu vot anfafer rezolizyon Lamerik.

Kuma MSM-MMM vinn opuvwar an 2000, Minis Gayan ti fini indike ki kalite politik etranzer san prinsip Moris pu adopte. Le 14 Novam 2000, Anil Gayan fer enn deklarasyon dan Lasanble pu explik pozisyon Moris lor size Chagos. Ala seki li ti dir: *“In the light of the changing security environment in our region Mauritius is not opposed to the USA maintaining the military base on Diego on terms which are mutually acceptable but Mauritius reserves the right to discuss with the USA the modalities for the utilisation of Diego Garcia.”* (suliyne par loter). An gro li mem pozisyon ki diferan guvernman dan lepase finn mintenir lor keस्थ्यon Chagos ek baz militer Amerikin lor Diego Garcia. Li enn pozisyon ki separ keस्थ्यon suverennte depi fermtir baz Diego e ki lerala les laport uver pu guvernman Moris kapav marsande pu bann gin ekonomik. Enn tel pozisyon li dan lintere ekonomik burzwazi e anmemtan li demontre ki guvernman MSM-MMM, parey kuma lezot guvernman avan, pena okenn prinsip politik e nonpli volonte e kuraz politik pu revandik fermtir baz Diego.

Lorganizasyon AGOA Forum Moris an Zanvye lane prosenn, e kot finn anons prezans Prezidan Bush, angran parti rezilta enn long akimilasyon konivans, konpromi e konplisite ant bann parti politik tradisyonel ek burzwazi lokal lor size Chagos a diferan lepok. Me li sirtu enn refle politik ekonomik pro-kapitalis ki sa bann parti-la finn prone.

Depi avan lindepandans

Anfet depi kumansman mem, an 1965, kan pu premye fwa enn delegasyon minis guvernman koalision PTr-IFB-CAM-PMSD ti al Lond pu diskrit lindepandans, ti deza ena zerm sa kalite konpromisyon ant bann parti tradisyonel ek burzwazi. Dan sa delegasyon-la ti ena Maurice Paturau, enn nomini Britanik, ki ti Minis Lindistri, Komers ek Kominikasyon Exteryer e anmemtan enn reprezentan burzwazi diskrit. Ki lintere Misye Paturau ti reprezante pandan negosyasyon ar reprezentan kolonyal Britanik? Li bon note ki Maurice Paturau ti resevwar meday pu so kontribisyon oservis Grand Bretayn pandan Dezyem Ger Mondyal. Dan sa rankont-la e plitar dan plizir renyon kabine Minis ver lafin 1965 ti fini ena diskrisyon lor detasman Chagos e instalasyon enn baz militer lor Diego. Bann dokiman sa lepok-la ki Leta Britanik finn deklasifye e ki zurnalis Henri Marimootoo ti pibliye dan *Week-End* an 1997, demontre klerman seki nu pe avanse. Dan enn seans Konsey Minis Moris Vandredi 23 Ziyet 1965, bann minis prezan ti pran konesans enn plan demantelman Chagos atraver enn let guverner John Shaw Rennie (*Week-End* 15 Zin 1997). Guverner Rennie rakont lorla dan enn telegram ki li adres Anthony Greenwood, Sekreter a bann koloni; li dir ki bann minis Moris ti pe marsande ar Britanik pu ki anretur Moris kapav gayn enn kota lavant diskrit lor marse amerikin. Dan enn telegram date 30 Ziyet 1965, guverner Rennie mansyone ki bolom Ramgoolam ti interese lor enn lakor pu servi Diego Garcia pa zis pu defans Commonwealth ek “lemond lib” me osi pu defans Moris. Li presize pli lwin dan sa telegram-la ki bann minis Moris ti pe marsande pu ki Moris kapav export 20,000 tonn pwason frigorifye ver Lamerik e ki Lamerik fasilite imigrasyon ver so pei. Sa bann dokiman-la demontre kimanyer PTr, IFB, CAM, PMSD finn konplis ar proze Britanik ek Amerikin pu demantelman Chagos ek instalasyon enn baz militer lor Diego. Zot tu ti deza o-kuran bann vize Britanik e Amerikin konsernan Chagos ek Diego. Sa bann dokiman-la kontredir e vinn aport enn demanti a seki Seewoosagur Ramgoolam, Veerasamy Ringadoo, Satcam Boolell, Harold Walter e Maurice Paturau ti dir kan zot ti depoze divan Selek Komiti lasanble Lezislatif lor sirkonstans eksizyon Chagos an 1982. Zot tu ti dir swadizan zot pa ti konn nanye lor plan Britanik ek Lamerik.

Apri lindependans

Apri lindependans rezim bolom Ramgoolam e a sartin moman an koalisyon avek Gaetan Duval, finn promovwar e perpetye enn politik ekonomik ki mintenir lekonomi Moris dan sistem kapitalis mondyal. Depi lepok kolonyal klas posedan Moris so lintere ti deza etrwatman lye ar lintere imperyalis. Lefet lekonomi Moris ti repoz lor kann, dite ek inportasyon preske tu bezwin ti aksantye sa lye-la. Mem si dan bann linstans internasyonal, rezim PTr alepok ti ena enn diskur anti-imperyalis, dan lapratik onivo lokal, li ti plito pe rasiir reprezantan kapital. Anmemtan ki li ti pe ankuraz devlopman lye ekonomik ar Lamerik, rezim PTr pa ti ezite pu reprim tu form protestasyon an faver abitan Chagos e pu reprim tu manifestasyon kont baz Diego. Kuma an 1981, apri enn long lagrev lafin ek manifestasyon organize par fam Chagos ek *Muvman Liberasyon Fam*, lapolis ti aret ek ferm 8 manifestan, parmi ti ena 6 fam Chagos ek 2 militan *MLF* ek *Lalit*.

Se sirtu PMSD ki ti pe azir kuma veritab azan imperyalis dan Moris. Sa ti fini kler depi byin avan lindependans Moris atraver lavwa so bann dirizan. Dan enn miting le 5 Novam 1965, Gaetan Duval dir ki li dakor *“pour une base si Maurice obtient un bon prix pour son sucre et si la Grande Bretagne nous accorde un bon ‘contingent d’emigrants”* (*Le Mauricien* 6 Nov. 1965). Dan enn konferans de pres le 12 Novam 1965, Jules Koenig deklare *“Je tiens a declarer de la facon la plus formelle que le PMSD n’est pas contre le principe de ceder les Chagos ou que cet archipel devienne un centre de communication pour faciliter la defence de l’Occident. Le PMSD en approuve le principe: il est en d’essacord sur les termes et les conditions de cette cession”* (*Le Mauricien* 13 Novam 1965). *L’Express* 13 Novam 1965 raport seki Jules Koenig finn dir dan samem konferans de pres-la: *“Nous ne sommes pas contre l’excision des iles pour les besoins militaires de l’Ouest... Il nous fallait une compensation adequate plus un quota de sucre.”* Pena pli kler ki sa pu demontre rol pro-imperyalis ek pro-burzwazi ki PMSD finn tultan reprezante.

An 1981, Gaetan Duval rebran sa mem pozisyon-la dan enn miting Champs de Mars kot li dir ki apar Amerikin, pena lot sover pu lil Moris. Fas a problem somaz, li ti pe rod enn manda pu al negosye ar Prezidan Reagan. Li deklare *“Notre seule chance est que les Americains utilisent l’ile Maurice comme un supermarche pour l’approvisionnement de la base militaire de Diego Garcia et que d’autres mauriciens soient embauche pour y travailler.”* (*L’Express* 8 Septam 1981). Dayer dan manif elektoral PMSD an 1982 li ekri: *“En ce qui concerne Diego Garcia, un gouvernement PMSD se propose de negocier avec le gouvernement americain dans le but d’augmenter le nombre d’emplois alloues aux mauriciens et pour que le ravitaillement soit assure exclusivement par l’ile Maurice pour la consommation courante et les materiaux de construction”*. PMSD ti osi propoz reuvertir lepor Mahebourg ek kreasyon enn Sant Iwazir pu marin francais e Amerikin.

MMM-PSM

An 1976, MMM ti devlop enn analiz kot li trov bann pwisans kuma Lamerik, Langleter, Lafrans kuma pei ki form parti seki li apel *“linperyalis oksidantal.”* Li ti rekonet ki pli gran danze pu Moris se danze minmiz sa *“inperyalis oksidantal”* sirtu dan Losean Indyin. Li ti mem trov Larisi kuma ena enn rol progresis e pe sutenir bann pei ki pe amenn lalit pu kas dependans vizavi inperyalis. Dayer lor terin MMM ti pe manifeste kont kolonyalis angle (manif anti-Alexandra an 1969), kont inperyalis Amerikin (manif kont lager Vietnam an 1970), manif kont prezans inperyalis franse dan Losean Indyin (divan lanbasad Lafrans an 1978). An Oktob 1978, Jean Claude de L’Estrac, alepok asistan sekreter zeneral MMM, ti mem expilse depi koloni Larenyon parski li ti koz anfaver lindependans Larenyon.*

Me apartir 1980, kan pe apros ar eleksyon zeneral, ladireksyon MMM kumans sanz so pozisyon vizavi seki li ti apel *“linperyalis Oksidantal”*. Sa mo *“inperyalis”* pu disparet depi zot vokabiler. Sa trahizon lalit anti inperyalis par MMM li etrwatman lye ar so trahizon lalit de klas. Dan enn intervyu dan *Le Mauricien* 13 Zin 1980, Paul Berenger dir *“Les buts de notre politique etrangere seraient d’abord de conserver nos acquis avec le marche commun avant tout, puis conserver aussi nos acquis vis-à-vis des Etats Unis, ensuite, essayer d’obtenir plus de ce meme pays.”* An 1982 nu pu trov kimanyer ladireksyon MMM pu sey *“obtenir plus”*. Kan MMM-PSM vinn opuvwar nu trov ladireksyon MMM byin vit trahir e vann lalit pu reinifikasyon teritwar Moris e fermtir baz Amerikin lor Diego. E rant dan sulye (ek soset) PMSD e pran rol ki PMSD ti ena vizavi imperyalis. Berenger pran larelev politik ekonomik PTr-PMSD e al tap laport FMI pu gayn plis ar samem institisyon finansye kontrole par inperyalis Amerikin, ki atraver dependans ekonomik e landetman, fors bann pei pu anfans plis dan sistem ekonomik kapitalis mondyal. Nu trov plizir dirizan MMM kuma V.Seeneyen, J.Cuttaree, A.Ganoo, P.Naiken, J.de L’Estrac, al an vizit dinformasyon dan Lamerik. An 1982 Minis Cuttaree refiz pran pozisyon kont infiltrasyon CIA dan sindika Moris atraver AALC (*Afro-American*

Labour Congress) kan *Lalit* e plizir santral sindikal ti denonse. Anmemtan nu truv raprosman MMM ar Parti Demokrat dan Lamerik: Prem Nababsing ansam ar Gaetan Duval prezan dan kongre Parti Demokrat US e MMM refiz pran pozisyon kont bonbardman Lalibi par avyon Amerikin an 1986 . Me seki kitfwa pli grav se kan De L'Estrac deklar Lafrans pei rivrin Losean Inmdyin akoz so koloni Larenyon dan enn intervyyu *Le Mauricien* 22 Ut 1982. Li vinn dir ki li "lezitim" ki Lafrans ena enn prezans militer dan sa rezyon-la. Enn tel revirman dan pozisyon MMM li otomatikman uver laport pu Lamerik ranforsi so prezans militer lor Diego Garcia.

Rezim Jugnauth

Avek rezim Jugnauth apartir 1983, politik pro-amerikin pu devlope e ranforsi a enn vites akselere. Ankor enn fwa Gaetan Duval, Vis-Premye Minis an 1983 pu ena enn rol kle dan sa ranforsisman lyin avek Lamerik. Dan enn interview lor RFI an 1983 li dir "*Je ne cherche pas a savoir a qui appartient la poule mais a qui vont profiter les oeufs. Diego Garcia a un potentiel pour embauche de la main d'oeuvre mauricienne, et un marche pour les produits mauriciens.*" Dan MSM se Anil Gayan sirtu ki pu inkarn sa laliyn ranforsisman lyin ar Lamerik. Jugnauth pu osi benefisyé travay Peter Craig-Chit Jeeseeramsing dan Lamerik ek kudme anbasadris Lamerik dan Moris, madam Penn Korth. Gubernman MSM-Ptr-PMSD pu devlop e ankuraz komers avek baz Diego, anterm ravitayman an nuritir, ek osi pu gayn kontra pu travayer Morisyin al travay Diego. Nu pu truv avyon militer Amerikin ale-vini Moris.

An Septam 1985, Gaetan Duval, alepok Vis-PM diriz enn delegasyon gubernman-sekter prive pu enn laturne linformasyon dan Lamerik. Dan Washington D.C, ti ena enn konferans patrone par *Centre for Strategic and International Studies*. Orater prinsipal dan sa konferans-la, kot buku biznessmen Amerikin ti prezan, ti Peter White, prezidan Samb Lagrikiltir e direkter Lonrho. Peter White, reprezantan burzwazi, ti fer eloz gubernman MSM-Ptr-PMSD e ti rasir Lamerik ki gubernman Moris dan so kan: "*We have a government at the moment, which I think could be best termed as entirely pragmatic, and the orientation is towards the West.*" (*L'Express* 17 Zanvye 1985)

Anmentan Jugnauth pu kareman akseler prosesis integrasyon lekonomi Moris dan sistem globalizasyon kapitalis, atraver anklans bann prosedir pu amenn privatizasyon plizir sekter kuma Telecom, lepor, CEB.

Apartir 1991, MMM ek MSM pu kontiyn mem politik vizavi Lamerik. Pandan enn so vizit Lamerik Jugnauth pu afirme ki li dakor ar prezans militer Amerikin lor Diego, ki kumkwa enn tel baz kontribye pu amenn stabilite dan Losean Indyin. An esanz li dimann Lamerik permisyon pu instal enn '*Cold Storage*' pu pwason lor lezot lil Chagos, plis fasilite pu disik ek textil morisyin rant lor marse Amerikin.

MMM-Ptr

An 1995, kan MMM revinn opuvwar, sannkula avek Parti Travayis, finn ena konsolidasyon lyin ekonomik ar Lamerik. Anfet samem lepok ki bann demars reprezantan Moris dan Lamerik Peter Graig, Chit Jeeseeramsing ek reprezantan patron Maurice Vigier de la Tour finn ede pu fer vot lalwa AGOA prezante par Prezidan Clinton. Nu pa bliye osi premye vizit enn Sekreter Deta Lamerik lor later Moris, setadir madam Madeleine Albright.

Lepok Zordi

Depi lane 2000 MSM-MMM-PMSD pe montre ki li kareman dan kan Lamerik. Minis Gayan finn mem al ziska zistifye lamor popilasyon sivil dan bonbardman Afganistan par Lamerik. Akoz samem prezidan Bush finn swazir pu fer Forum AGOA 2003 andeor Lamerik, fer li isi dan Moris. Zordi li bizin baz Diego pu asir so minmiz dan rezyon Golf, Losean Indyin e par extansyon lor Lafrik kot kapitalis Amerikin ena plan pu etann so linfliyans ekonomik. Anfet bann diferan rezim politik Moris depi lindependans finn kontribye buku dan sa ranforsisman pozisyon Lamerik par zot politik san prinsip e marsandaz lor Chagos e baz.

Diego

An Zanvyé 2003, li posib ki Jugnauth ek Berenger pu bann premye dirizan Moris pu akeyir enn Prezidan Leta Zini lor later Repiblik Moris. Lor samem later, ki enn but ladan, Chagos, inperyalis angle finn detase ilegalman, e depi lor enn but ladan, Diego Garcia, inperyalis Amerikin so avyon B-52 pe kontiyn dekolé, e finn mem zet bom lor enn vilaz Afganistan anplin enn seremoni maryaz. Depi 1965, parfwa pu garanti lavant disik, parfwa pu pwason frigorifye, u lavant triko Lamerik, diferan rezim Moris finn marsand e konpromet integrite teritwar Moris ar inperyalis Lamerik. Kuma enn lafis *Lalit* ti tire e kole an Novam 2001, dir: “SSR ti vann Diego ar Angle, Jugnauth ek Berenger pe vann Diego ar Amerikin”. Avek zot politik marsande ek vander lor Chagos ek baz Diego, bann parti politik tradisyonel ek burzwazi Moris finn konplis ar lozik de ger politik inperyalis Amerikin.

Apré Zizman Lakur Sityasyon Chagosyen Zordi

par Ragini Kistnasamy & Lindsey Collen

Apré ki finn rann Zizman lafin lane 2000 dan Lakur Siprem an Angleter, e finn dir ki Chagosyen gayn drwa return Chagos, ki sityasyon zordi? Eski zot efektivman finn kapav returne? Repons se ki Guvernman Britanik finn aksepte Zizman. Li finn dir sa. Me, selman li pe lev enn seri problem pu anpes Chagosyen al Diego Garcia. Setadir, li pe dir ki zot kapav al selman lezot lil dan Chagos, napa Diego Garcia. Lerla, avek rezon, *Grup Refizye Chagos* finn refiz ale.

Kabine Britanik so interpretasyon Zizman-la

Li interesan get bann Kestyon Parlmanter dan Langleter. Ala seki Minis dir lor kestyon ki manyer Guvernman ena lintansyon aplik Zizman Lakur Siprem:

“13 Nov 2000: Chagos Islands and Diego Garcia”¹

“Dr. Julian Lewis [Parlmanter] : To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs if he will make a statement about the return of displaced islanders to Diego Garcia.²

“Mr. Battle [Minis]: We have decided to accept the ruling of the Court. The Ilois are now able to return to the outer islands of the British Indian Ocean Territory.

“Our first priority is to press ahead with the technical work we have in hand to assess the feasibility of settlement on those islands. In the meantime we will be open to discussion with the Ilois community about the practicalities of any return. We will also be consulting the Governments of the United States and Mauritius about the implications of the judgment.

“Dr. Julian Lewis: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs what his assessment is of the security implications of the return of displaced islanders to Diego Garcia.³

“Mr. Battle: The Ilois are now free to return to the outer islands of the British Indian Ocean Territory but access to Diego Garcia will continue to be controlled strictly and will be by permit only. [Nu ki finn suliyne]

“We will be discussing the security implications of the court case on the US Naval Support Facility on Diego Garcia with the US authorities.”

Li ase soka, dan lepok modern kan nu lir sa kalite repons a enn kestyon parlmanter pu rekonet ziska ki pwen ena kontrol militer lor nu lavi. E fini gayn plis ki 30 an depi nu Lindependans. Ondire kan sa bann Minis laba koze, zot pa truv dimunn isi kuma dimunn avek drwa.

Lasistans a Chagosyen

Ena enn lot kestyon parlmanter interesan. Li konsern plito “lasistans” ki Guvernman Gran Bretayn ena lintansyon donn dimunn ki li finn deplase par fors:

“13 Nov 2000⁴: Mr. Llew Smith [Parlmanter]: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs if he will make a statement on the assistance his Department intends to give to the displaced peoples of the Chagos Islands in British Indian Ocean Territory to return home.⁵

“Mr. Battle [Minis]: Our first priority is to continue the work we have begun to assess the physical, financial, social, environmental and economic feasibility of settlement on the outer islands of the territory. Once we have the results of this feasibility study, we will be in a position to consider what further assistance might be appropriate.”

Kestyon Parlmanter lor Konpansasyon

Isi nu pe bibliye enn lot kestyon parlmanter lor ki konpansasyon finn ena, e ki kantite konpansasyon Lamerik ena lintansyon done.

“30 Nov 2000: Mr. Dalyell [Parlmanter]: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs what recent assessment Her Majesty's Government have made of the distribution of £4 million given to the Mauritius Government in 1982.⁶

“Mr. Battle: Under a 1982 Agreement between HMG and the Government of Mauritius, the £4 million paid by HMG was placed in a Trust Fund for the benefit of the Ilois. Power over the

distribution of the funds rested with the Fund's Board of Trustees, made up of representatives of the Government of Mauritius and Ilois.

“No recent assessment has been made of how the board distributed those funds.

“**Mr. Dalyell:** To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs what offer has been made by the US Government on compensation to the Ilois.⁷

“**Mr. Battle:** None that we are aware of but this is a matter for the US Government.

“**Mr. Dalyell:** To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs when Her Majesty's Government will complete the feasibility study of the return of the Ilois to the island of Diego Garcia.⁸

“**Mr. Battle:** The feasibility study covers the outer islands, not Diego Garcia. It is too early to specify when the study will be completed. But the terms of reference for the studies, drawn up by independent consultants, make clear that it will not be in less than a year.”

Drwa de Retur dan lapratik

Sa parlamanter Britanik, Mr. Dalyell finn persiste pu dimande sipa Minis pu dir ki li ena antet anterm later pu rann bann Chagosyen ki finn deplase.

“**30 Nov 2000⁹: Mr. Dalyell:** To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs what plans Her Majesty's Government have to restore land to former inhabitants, under Clause 4 of the British Indian Ocean Territory Ordinance (2000).¹⁰

“**Mr. Battle [Minis]:** In line with the recent court judgment, section 4 of the BIOT Immigration Ordinance 2000 allows the Ilois to visit and remain on the islands of the Territory, excludingⁱ Diego Garcia where access will continue to be controlled strictly and will be by permit only. Studies are in hand on the feasibility of resettlement of the outer islands of the territory.”

Pli resaman, finn ena enn de lezot kestyon parlamanter:

“**Jeremy Corbyn [Parlmanter ki finn okip Chagos avek buku devwe]:** To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs what arrangements are being considered by BIOT officials for the Ilois people to visit the Chagos Islands, including Diego Garcia; and if he will make a statement.¹²

“**Mike O'Brien:** A planned trip in October 02 to enable a group of Chagossians to visit the outer islands of the Chagos Archipelago could not go ahead due to the withdrawal of the vessel by the shipping company. We are ready to consider reinstating the voyage next year once the cyclone season (Nov–April) is over.”

Lerla, le 22 Oktob 2002, ena ankor enn kestyon-repons parlamanter:

“**Mr. Rosindell [parlmanter]:** To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs what steps the Government have taken in response to the High Court judgment in 2000 upholding the special military status of Diego Garcia. [75105]

“**Mike O'Brien [Minis]:** Following the High Court judgment, the BIOT Immigration Ordinance 1971 was replaced by the Immigration (Amendment) Ordinance 2000 which exempts Chagossians from the requirement to obtain a permit to return and reside in any part of the Territory except (for defence reasons) Diego Garcia. All other persons still require a permit to enter any part of the Territory.” Alor, asterla, Chagosyen ena pu lager kont enn “rezon defans”.

Lintansyon Amerikin, ek plas travay pu Chagosyen lor baz militer

“**Mr. Dalyell:** To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs what discussions Her Majesty's Government have had with the US Administration over the return of the Ilois to Diego Garcia; and if he will make a statement on their employment prospects.¹³

“**Mr. Battle:** The stated hope of Ilois representatives to return to live on Diego Garcia has been discussed with US officials. While there are no plans for them to do so, there are no impediments in BIOT law or policy preventing Ilois from being employed by the contractors on Diego Garcia.

“**Mr. Dalyell:** To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs what air access and port facilities are to be made available on Diego Garcia to the Ilois; and at what cost.¹⁴

“**Mr. Battle:** Our discussions with the Americans in the light of the court judgment indicate that these facilities will not be made available as a matter of course.”

Sitwayennte Britanik e retur dan lapratik

“**Mr. Dalyell:** To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs if Her Majesty's Government are planning to offer British citizenship to the Ilois on the same basis as other British Dependent Territory citizens.¹⁵

“Mr. Battle: This matter is being reviewed in the light of the recent court judgment.

“Mr. Dalyell: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs what plans Her Majesty's Government have to facilitate the return of the people of the Ilois to their homeland.¹⁶

“Mr. Battle: The purpose of the feasibility study is to investigate to what extent the outer islands can be re-inhabited. Any further work will be subsequent to the outcome of this study.

“Mr. Dalyell: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs if he will establish a committee of inquiry to determine levels of compensation to be paid to the Ilois.¹⁷

“Mr. Battle: HMG have paid over £4.5 million for the direct benefit of the Ilois. There is no intention to make any further similar payments. But HMG are undertaking a comprehensive feasibility study, the results of which will give us a better idea of what is possible and what will need to be provided by way of physical and social infrastructure. The costs in terms of public funding will need to be considered at that point.”

Treyning

“30 Nov 2000¹⁸: Mr. Dalyell: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs what training and educational programmes Her Majesty's Government will finance for the Ilois.¹⁹

“Mr. Battle: The feasibility studies will consider what development activities could sustain a new civilian population in BIOT, and identify current skills among the Ilois population who wish to return to the territory. Only when these studies are complete will we be able to assess what is possible.

“Mr. Dalyell: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs what plans Her Majesty's Government have to facilitate the development of improved economic conditions for the Ilois; and what is the time-frame.²⁰

“Mr. Battle: The remit of the feasibility studies include economic, financial and social development issues.”

Pozisyon Britanik avan Zizman lor drwa de retur

Isi nu pe reprodir an antye seki Minis zafer etranze Britanik finn dir *avan* Zizman Lakur Siprem. Li pa zis pu rezon istorik ki nu pe pibliye li, me osi pu konn “mind-set” bann Britanik opuvwar.

“Memorandum submitted by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office on British Indian Ocean Territory (BIOT)²¹

“1. The Committee is aware that the issue of the return of the Ilois to BIOT is currently before the Courts. This Memorandum will, therefore, outline the present Government's position on access to the islands of BIOT, as the law stands, and in the light of the circumstances on the islands created by decision taken by previous Governments. The position may require to be reviewed in the light of whatever judgement is given by the High Court. The Committee may also wish to see the answer which the Minister of State (Mr Battle) gave to a Parliamentary Question by Iain Coleman MP, on 18 July.²²

“2. The access of the Ilois to the territory of BIOT is determined by the machinery of the Immigration Ordinance 1971. It is the validity of this Ordinance that is the central issue in the current litigation before the High Court. Judgement has been reserved and is not expected to be given before early October.

“3. The Government's position on the issue of the return of the Ilois to the islands has two elements: in respect of short-term visits, and about long-term, permanent, settlement.

“4. Under the 1971 Ordinance all persons who wish to enter the territory must first obtain a permit from the BIOT immigration authorities. In general, permits are granted to persons the purpose of whose visits is in some way connected with the administration of the territory or the operation of the US defence facility on Diego Garcia. Permits for visits for other purposes may be (and have been) granted for people to carry out scientific work, or for medical, compassionate or other similar grounds. As an example of this policy, permission was given in 1995 for a group of Ilois to enter the territory to see the condition of the former habitations and to visit the graves of their parents and relatives. For reasons of their own the Ilois concerned did not make use of this permission.

“5. Requests for long-term or permanent settlement raise more difficult issues. These relate to the Treaty obligations to the US entered into first in 1966. Secondly they arise from the absence of any human settlement activity on the islands for 30 years and the withdrawal of the commercial copra plantation, which was the sole source of employment.

“6. Under the relevant treaties the territory is to be made available for the defence purposes of the UK and USA for “an indefinitely long period”, initially for 50 years from the first treaty. If and when the territory were no longer required for defence purposes as envisaged in the UK/US treaties, the UK

is committed to cede sovereignty over the islands to the Government of Mauritius, who therefore may also take a view on the permanent settlement of the islands, the cost of supporting which would pass to them.

“7. The Government is taking independent expert advice on the feasibility of any eventual resettlement of the Ilois in the outer islands of the territory (that is islands other than Diego Garcia itself, where such resettlement would be impractical and inconsistent with the existing defence facilities). A study was commissioned and the report²³ on its first phase has been received and has been laid before Parliament. The Committee will see that, among the factors which need to be taken into account are, first, that the outer islands, which have been uninhabited for 30 years, lack all basic facilities and infrastructure; and, second, the territory's status as an area which, because of its remoteness, inaccessibility and present uninhabited state, constitutes a virtually pristine environment. The impact of any settlement on this environment needs careful consideration. As the Committee will see the consultants have identified more work that is necessary before a full assessment could be made of the feasibility, environmental impact and cost of any possible resettlement.

“8. Our position on the future of the territory will be determined by our strategic and other interests and our treaty commitments to the USA.”

Sa dernye fraz la donn enn lide dan ki kalite lemond nu pe viv. Saki for gayn drwa dir bann zafer dominer kumsi-ryen-ete.

Ka Domaz pu Reparasyon ek Konpansasyon, dan Lakur UK ek USA

Ena de ka lakur byen inportan ki pe deza derule zordi. An Novam 2002 dan Lond, ti ena kumansman enn ka inportan kot ziz pe ekut temwayaz bann Chagosyen, dan enn ka pu reparasyon ek konpansasyon.

An Desam lane dernye enn lot plent ti loze kot 4,500 Chagosyen pe reklam \$2 sakenn pu tortir, zenosid, diskriminasyon rasyal, tretman degradan, e lefet ki dimunn finn, par expre, fer zot sufer detres emosyonel.²⁴

Konklizyon

Alor, 30-40 an apre zot aksyon, Leta Britanik ek Leta Zini pe bizin explike divan bann tribinal ki zot finn fer.

1 UK Parliament <http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/> [13 Nov 2000: Column: 510W]

2 [137915]

3 [137907]

4 13 Nov 2000: Column: 511W

5 [137874]

6 [141065]

7 [141052]

8 [141053]

9 30 Nov 2000: Column : 837W

10 [141058]

11 Remarke ki Minis-la koz dan enn fason ki suzantand ki Zizman permet li exklir zot depi Diego Garcia, kan an fet se Guvernman ki pe exklir zot depi Diego Garcia.

12 [74655]

13 [141059]

14 [141056]

15 [141054]

16 [141055]

17 [141064]

18 30 Nov 2000 : Column : 838W

19 [141066]

20 [141057]

21 (31 July 2000)

22 <http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm200001/cmselect/cmcaff/78/7826/htm//note35>

²³ <http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm200001/cmselect/cmcaff/78/7826/htm//note36>

²⁴ Get nu lartik dan sa liv-la “The US damages case”

What's in a Name?

The Story of a Psychosocial Pathology with Lexical Implications

What exactly is “Mauritius”?

By Lindsey Collen

In practice even in the way we talk, there is still, until today 34 years after Independence, a lot of confusion as to what “Mauritius” is. This can only reflect persistent political problems as to what Mauritius is, on the one hand, and a serious degree of “internalized colonization” on the other.

Is the country “an” island, in the singular?

Often we, Mauritians – no doubt sufficiently ‘colonized’ to go on falling into the trap – still call the whole country “Ile Maurice”. The definition of an “island” is however, well known. It is “A piece of land completely surrounded by water.”¹

We often even hear so-called intellectuals or even top academics blathering on about “Mauritius is *an island* with a good education system ...” Or “Mauritius being *a small island* has special problems...” No matter that the speakers expose the fact that they have no internal representation *as a polity* of the country they live in. No matter that the speakers are “writing off” as non-Mauritian all Rodriguans and all people on Agalega and St Brandon. No matter that the speakers are every day putting a rubber stamp on the violent “forcible removals” of thousands of Mauritians from one part of Mauritius, Chagos, to another, the main island of Mauritius to make way for the military base on Diego Garcia.

People who use the words “an” and “a”, in the context of Mauritius being “an island”, or even, obsequiously, being “a” *small island*, know very well that words “an” and “a” denote something in the singular. They know very well that “the State” consists of islands in the plural. They are familiar with the lexical item “archipelago”, which would be less inaccurate².

They are often well enough educated to know that Mauritius is a state consisting of many islands and many archipelagoes.

Yet, even government Ministers, even the most senior Ministers, persist in referring to *the whole country* or “*the State*” as “Lil Moris” in Kreol, as “L’ile Maurice” in French, and as “the Island of Mauritius” in English.

Fallacious expressions

We regularly have to listen to well-educated people making statements that are highly improbable to say the least, and scientifically fallacious to be more accurate, like: “Larsipel Chagos li dan Lil Moris” (“*The Chagos Archipelago is in the Island of Mauritius.*”) These are the kind of statements that Frantz Fanon rightly considered symptoms of the psychopathology produced by colonization.

The law of the land

This abject use of a misnomer persists despite, for example, Rodrigues Island having two Members of the National Assembly elected to the Mauritian parliament.

It has continued even after the country became a Republic in 1991 and clearly put a definition of Mauritius into the Constitution. ““Mauritius” includes (a) the islands of Mauritius, Rodrigues, Agalega, Tromelin, Cargados Carajos and the Chagos Archipelago, including Diego Garcia and any other island comprised in the State of Mauritius.”³”

But even before this, there was legislation that already said, inter alia, “The Principal Assistant Secretary shall not at any time license the use of more than - 8 large nets, 8 canard

nets and 8 gill nets for Cargados Carajos Archipelago, Agalega, Tromelin and the Chagos Archipelago and any other area where Mauritius has fishing rights."⁴

The sneaky definition at Independence

But, prior to that, at the time of Independence, the Constitution left by the British was very sneaky. Perhaps this is the document that exposes that it was not pure coincidence that there was confusion about what Mauritius exactly is.

We quote from the 1968 Constitution: "In this Constitution, unless the context otherwise requires - ... "Mauritius" means the territories which immediately before the 12th March 1968 constituted the colony of Mauritius."⁵

Well, the drafting "*territories which ... before the 12th March 1968 constituted the colony of Mauritius*" is not exactly a clear, good, public declaration of what a newly born state comprises, nor of where its boundaries are. It is outrageous.

And it is not a drafting error either. It is designed, amongst other things, to hide the 1965 excision of Diego Garcia and the whole of the Chagos Archipelago.

And as for the word "immediately" in the phrase "immediately before the 12th March", this word actually exposes the illegality of the definition, and this in the supreme law of the land. It is against the UN Charter to dismember a state as a condition of Independence.

But the important point that we need to examine in ourselves is why should we go along with all this?

Why until now?

Not new

The problem is not new though. So, there must be other factors. Perhaps we can begin to expose some of them.

There was a gradual change in the way the British authorities, for example, in colonial times referred to their Indian Ocean multi-insular colony. These changes reflected the colonial powers' needs.

First the colony was invariably referred to as "*The Mauritius*"⁶, short for "The Mauritius Islands", much like The Seychelles is short for The Seychelles Islands, and this terminology was preferred throughout most of the British colonial times, from the very beginning in 1810 to as late as the 1950's. And it was always very clear which islands were part of the whole in both cases, that of The Mauritius and that of The Seychelles.

Then we start getting the ascendancy of another term, simply "*Mauritius*", without the article. This often clearly meant, through gross manipulation, that the colony was "an island". The word "an" implies a singular, that is to say "only one Island".

How our language masks frauds and crimes

This conscious or unconscious manipulation of the very name of the place was one of the things that conveniently helped to throw a cloak of confusion over the geography. This would, in turn, contribute to permitting the British State to enact all sorts of political frauds against "The Mauritius" as a whole, and to perpetrate inhumane crimes against the people of the outer islands. It would also permit the Mauritian political elites, one after the other, to connive with the British and US leaders so as to get trade advantages in exchange for keeping quiet about the crimes.

The crimes are of different kinds.

There was the denial of the right to vote to all the inhabitants of the Rodrigues Island until as late as 1967⁷, and the denial of the right to vote to all Agalega Inhabitants until the year 2000.

Then there has been the "Bantustan-like" policy of ongoing discrimination against civil servants from Rodrigues Island, recruited into the Rodrigues Establishment (which exists in Edith Cavell St) and then not allowed the same free movement and transfers as their colleagues of the Mauritius Island.⁸ This confused situation is even worse now with the new hurriedly implemented "decentralization", which says that civil servants of the Mauritian State are supposed now, inexplicably and absurdly, to fall under the Regional Assembly.

The use of the singular also exposed the country, Mauritius, to the threat of dismemberment by a “Mayotte”-type operation by the French State. Around Independence and on a few occasions after Independence, there were threats by the right wing PMSD and Gaetan Duval to separate Rodrigues from Mauritius, so as to make Rodrigues a French colony, on the lines of Reunion Island. There are still people who refer nostalgically to this lost possibility, today saying that Mauritius could be “in Europe”. That would be another of those psycho-pathological geographies of the mind, one in which Reunion Island and Mayotte find themselves, whereby they are ‘part of Europe’.

Then, as another sign of our language covering up all kinds of ills, there was the notorious illegal detachment in the run-up to 1968 Independence, of the entire 65-island Chagos Archipelago that formed an integral part of “The Mauritius”, as part of the conspiracy with the United States Government to set up a massive military base on Diego Garcia, one of the Islands. This involved the forcible removal of thousands of Mauritians from one island to other islands. This plot has now been thoroughly exposed, even at an international level, specially since with the end of the 30-years-secrecy laws in Britain allowing the Bancourt Court Case in the British Courts in 1999-2000, and this case, in turn, making public the atrocities committed by the British State.

Scientific Precision

It is worth mentioning that during the course of our research we noted that scientists tend still to refer to Mauritius as “The Mauritius Islands”. We are putting the examples we have found into footnotes, which are worth reading.⁹

It is important that we, ordinary people, tighten up our language in the same way that scientists are obliged to. We need to describe Mauritius accurately in our every-day speech. This is not to say that we need a “police of language”, but that we learn to spot where there is manipulation in the language that we “inherit” so that we “reproduce” our language better when we use it.

8 a) *The Final Empire: The Collapse of Civilization and the Seed of the Future* by WM H. Kotke, Arrow Point Press: "The now extinct dodo bird of the Mauritius Islands in the Indian Ocean had a unique relationship with the Calvaria tree. The tree fed the dodo and the dodo transported seeds for the tree. The heavily coated seeds of the Calvaria tree had to pass through the abrasive digestive system of the Dodo in order to germinate. Now that the dodo is gone the Calvaria trees are dying out. None have germinated for three hundred years since the last dodo died.³ It is probable that this tree has vegetation, insects or other animals that lived in association with it or the microclimate that it created. Those connections are being severed also..."

b) The Organization for Bat Conservation “implements a variety of conservation programs geared directly toward saving bats. One such effort is to conduct seminars to help public and private land owners protect and/or provide suitable roosting habitat for bats. Another project is working with the Rodrigues fruit bats on the Mauritius Islands.”

c) Even the right-wing Heritage Foundation when talking about economics “scientifically” says: "Economic growth, in all cases with the exception of city-states such as Hong Kong, Singapore, and the Mauritius Islands, has been driven first by high rates of increase in agricultural production."

d) Follow-on Discoveries from the 1999 Expedition: "... two students were instrumental in helping with work in the quarry. ... Anwar Janoo was a post-doctoral fellow in Ornithology at the American Museum of Natural History. He hails from the Mauritius Islands in the Indian Ocean east of Madagascar".

e) India has executed double taxation avoidance agreements with many countries, including the UK, the USA, Cyprus, Mauritius Islands, etc. Favorable tax treatment is available under these treaties. It is quite common for American companies to route investments through the Mauritius Islands in order to avail of reduced withholding taxes..." Source: <http://www/majmudarindia.com/framesinvest.htm>

f) Birth of the Postal Stamp: “to adopt the glued postage stamp...the Mauritius Islands in 1847..." <http://www.correosecuador.com/paginasingles/acta.htm>

g) “In 1602, the ... Oost-Indische Compagnie is founded by the merchant cities of Holland and Zeeland ... the company obtains the monopoly of import of all Indonesian spices (nutmeg, pepper and clove), Chinese and Japanese vases, Indian fabrics. South Africa, the Mauritius islands, Ceylon and Indonesia are colonized. Source: http://www.jack-travel.com/Amsterdam/amsterdam_history3.htm

-
- 1 The Oxford English Dictionary.
 - 2 Though not accurate. Mauritius consists of islands and archipelagoes.
 - 3 **1991 Amendment** : “Chapter XI Miscellaneous Section 111 Interpretation
 - 4 Fisheries Act, 1980 Section 3.
 - 5 Schedule to the Mauritius Independence Order 1968 [GN 54 of 1968. The Order was complimented in the UK by the Mauritius Independence Act 1968]. Chapter XI Miscellaneous Section 111 Interpretation (1).
 - 6 Notice the title of the 1940 letter to the Secretary of State for the Colonies : “ A Letter to the Rt Hon Lord John Russell, Secretary of State for the Colonies upon the Policy of Permitting Emigration from the Continent of India to Mauritius”
 - 7 When this was subject of a Supreme Court case, it turned out that the Colonial authorities were considering setting up a base, but did not yet know where exactly, so they did not want the inhabitants of the outer islands to have the right to vote.
 - 8 This was the subject matter of an important Constitutional Case brought by the Rodrigue Government Employees Association, and by Alain Tolbize and Merline Gontran, its Secretary and President. The case dragged on in the Supreme Court for the most part of the 1990’s, and was unfortunately finally lost. The judgement handed down was very poorly argued indeed.

What it's like

DIEGO GARCIA UNDER OCCUPATION

By Anonymous Contributors

Over the years, workers coming back to Mauritius from contracts as workers for the Companies that run the base at Diego Garcia, have given Lalit all kinds of information.

We are collecting it here. As it has been collected over a number of years, we are not sure if all the information is still accurate. But it gives a fair picture, we believe.

Population on Diego Garcia

Diego Garcia, while under its present military occupation, has a number of "population groups" which do not fraternize much with one another. There are some 3,500 Americans military personnel. There are strictly regimented by social class, and also to some extent divided by sex (there are many women in the military now) and also by race. There are 1,600 civilians, including American civilians, i.e. Company (BOSC) employees, there are BIOT staff who are British, and there are 1,250 Filipino and 125 Mauritian workers employed by the Company (BOSC). Mauritians and Filipinos live very separate lives.

Social Life

There are three US Clubs, strictly divided along "class" lines. The Officers Club, to which non-officers are not allowed, the Chief Petty Officers Club from which more junior military are excluded, and the "61 club". Those in the "61 club" are not allowed to go to either of the two "upper clubs" and the Chief Petty Officers Club members are not allowed into Officers Club. An officer is allowed to go to a club of the lower classes, but he has to be "discreet", a word which is believed to mean "sober". The 61 Club is allowed to receive as guests of its member's civilians, some Filipinos and Mauritians.

The US military personnel leave in "Downtown" Diego Garcia (Americans tend to call Diego Garcia "DG".)

There is a British Club, which opens its doors to everyone. It has an open-air "pub". It is a bit "devergonde" but not violent.

There is a club called the Tilman Club, which Mauritians and Filipinos belong to. It has its bye-laws and the committee consists of 7 Filipinos and 4 Mauritians (plus, so that they can presumably be checked on) an advisor who has to be a US citizen and a BOSC representative. When there is a new election, there is a campaign, including leaflets, posters and agents.

There is a sports marina in the North of Diego Garcia, and fishing is allowed in the lagoon until 6.00pm. The lagoon is very rich in fish.

There are two TV channels to watch.

The Mauritians and Filipinos live in the three barracks: Splendid Ville, Palms Ville and Sea Breeze village. There is a state organization called Moral Welfare Recreation, which gets a budget from the Department of Defense and which is in charge of social life on Diego.

Marriage

Marriages are conducted under a British regime, after the publication of banns one week earlier. If there is a military personnel involved, there is a whole lot of procedure involved, and permission has to be gained from very senior military personnel. Mauritian workers have been known to marry US military women.

Work

Each Mauritian has to get two other people to sign a Rs 25,000 security bond each, in order for the person to get work on Diego Garcia. It takes about a month to process a work permit. If you are not selected you still have to pay the Rs 2,000 for reservation of a ticket and Rs 900 as medical costs. A work contract is for one year, and is renewable. Each worker gets 45 days' leave (for 15 days' pay). One is paid travelling costs from the "point of hire" to the airport.

The Mauritians on Diego Garcia work an 8-hour day. Unskilled workers earn around \$ 220 and bricklayers about \$ 350 per month. Of this, 50% has to come to Mauritius, and up to 90% can be sent to Mauritius, while 10-50% can be put in the bank on Diego, Panama. This is then for personal use.

There are about 125 Mauritian on Diego Garcia. When a Mauritian goes to Diego Garcia, they go all the way eastwards to Singapore first, then catch a direct flight back to Diego Garcia. They do work ranging from being deckhands in the port and captains of small craft, to electricians, building workers, "suder", cleaners and janitors, labourers, and nurses.

Control

The Community living on Diego Garcia is controlled by a sort of "triumvirate", under a US Admiral. The triumvirate consists of

1. The Commanding Officer (CO) of the USA Armed Forces, which is completely separate from the UK forces. A recent CO is described by one informant as "black", brought in in order to prevent future "fraternizing" with Mauritians and Filipinos. The aim of the CO is to run the base itself.
2. The British Representative is in charge of BIOT Police, law and order, internal security, the Courts, work permits, entry permits. They provide legal assistance for British Nave personel only. In 1998 for example a new British Representative was considered to be pro-Mauritian. He held cocktail parties. The British claim to control the ground, itself, but not any of the amenities, which from roads and vehicles to toilet paper are Americans. Vehicles, strangely, drive on the right side of the road as in the US, not on th eleft as in Britain. In, for example, a wounds and blows case, trial is in the UK if the victim is British (there was a famous example). But the trial is in Diego Garcia if both victim and accused are non-British (i.e. Mauritian or Filipino).
3. The Base Operating Service Contractor, which is a multinational corporation which gets a contract for a seven year period to provide services for Diego Garcia. The boss of this BOSC is technically a civillian, but is in fact often a retired Commanding Officer or Captain. Companies that get these contract include BJS International, a US-UK multinational corporation Halliburton. Before teh allocation of a new contract, there is intense lobbying. There is a lot of overlap between top military personnel and top BOSC staff. Note that all managerial posts in BOSC are held by US citizens. No Filipinos have the right to be nominated to these high-up posts.

Military

The Diego Garcia base is kept on 24-hour-a-day alert. Everything is kept ready for immediate intervention, especially in relation to the Gulf region. There is the British Navy, which also does the administrative work, the US Marines and Army and the Air Force. Supplies come directly from the US, or from Singapore.

Diego Garcia is now in the Pacific Division. There were some problems with the US Bahrain base. The military air craft in Diego Garcia come from places like Guam, Yokota in Japan, Hawaii and Florida in the US.

The other Chagos Islands, Peros Banos and Salomon, are watched over by the Royal Marines. There don't seem to be inhabitants there. There are said to be donkeys left on the islands. Informants had not seen sailboats on the islands.

False Assertions about the “Impossibility” of Getting the Diego Garcia Based Closed

By Lindsey Collen & Ragini Kistnasamy

When the Inuit¹ people began their law suit against the US for damages for forcibly removing them to make way for a military base, they did not know that the base itself would be closed down and the area returned to them. This decision last month came as a victory to all the people involved.

But more generally, people believe, or maybe pretend to believe, that the United States government is somehow not subject to political pressure, when this is clearly not the case. Often people who run out of right-wing arguments, end up saying that it’s “inevitable” that the base at Diego Garcia remains there forever, because no-one could ever make the US close down a base.

Whereas in fact, about 26% of its total “base facilities” have been closed in the past 15 years, under pressure, mainly, to spend less on bases.

Here are quotations from an article on the matter by a US expert²:

“Approximately 13 years ago, in December 1988, the first US ‘military base closure commission’ (BRAC) recommended the closing and realignment of 145 U.S. domestic bases and facilities. This action was the consequence of the Department of Defense’s broad reevaluation of its mission in conjunction with the weakening and ultimate collapse of the Soviet Union. There was little need, according to the Pentagon, to continue to retain the vast Cold War-era infrastructure. Funds saved from closing down underutilized bases, DOD further noted, could be used to enhance development of new weapons and improved readiness (sic).

The 1988 round of infrastructure reductions was followed by three additional rounds in 1991, 1993, and 1995. ... Since then, no further rounds of base closures and realignments have been authorized by Congress, despite repeated requests from the Department of Defense in recent years for two additional rounds. The reasons for congressional resistance are two-fold. First, there is concern over a likely backlash from constituents living in or near military installations. Second, many Members of Congress remain wary about a repetition of the perceived political intrusion by the Clinton Administration that occurred in regard to the 1995 recommendations to close two air force bases.

“The closing of all 451 BRAC installations (major, minor and “other”) from the four rounds is expected to be completed by the end of Financial Year 2001, as originally scheduled. The disposing of all the closed property, however is expected to take many more years. “ This includes the closure already completed up to 2001 or 95 ‘major bases’.

“The Pentagon’s current estimate of the percentage reduction in base structure as a result of the first four rounds is 21% [within the US]. If the U.S. overseas bases closed are added to those of the domestic base structure, the comparable figure would be an overall reduction of about 26%.”

So much for the impotent cries of the reactionaries that it is “impossible” to get the US to close down the Diego Garcia base. What we have to do is to make the political price of keeping it open become too high. The Bush regime may now of course add its “war on terror” to try to justify keeping more bases open, but that does not in any way diminish the general point that the US closes bases under pressure to close them.

¹ An Eskimo people

² Military Base Closures: Where Do We Stand? David E. Lockwood, Specialist in U.S. Foreign Policy and National Defense, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division (updated to 7th March, 2001), National Library for the Environment.

Lalwa “Official Secrets” dan Rwayom Ini Manyer ki Pese Britanik lor Diego Garcia ti kasyet

By Lindsey Collen & Ragini Kistnasamy

Dosye Diego Garcia finn tuzur anvlope dan “sekre deta”. Guvernman Britanik finn kasyet buku so pese deryer so fermtir bann dosye ki sipozeman “piblik”. Pandan 30 an, nu dan Moris, nu pa ti pe kapav reyni tu prev ki nu ti pe rode lor seki finn arive an term zeopolitik. Kan nu ti pe amenn lalit pu ferm baz Diego ek pu re-inifye pei an antye, nu finn suvan tap ar sa problem inportan: buku rikord, prev, dokiman kle Guvernman Britanik, zot ti su sele: zot sekre deta. Dimunn konserne pena drwa kone.

Dan Moris ena buku dimunn ki pa kone, e lezot pa ule krwar, ki bann dokiman ofisyel ki konsern nu Lindepandans ti pe gard sekre dan arshiv Britanik. Purtan li vre. Ena mem buku Angle ki pu etone pu kone ki dosye Diego Garcia ti “ferme” net dan zot swadizan “Public Records Office.”

Ala seki dan “Public Records Office” dan Gran Bretayn dir lor so sayt internet lor dokiman ki ferme¹: “Documents created by Government Departments are usually closed for thirty years. Most are released on the 1st January 30 years after the date of the last document on the file. Occasionally records may be closed for longer than 30 years, these are known as *extended closures* and are usually released after either 50 or 75 years.

“The last New Year's Opening took place on the 1st January 2002 when over 34,000 files from 1971, 1951 and 1926 were released to the public.”

Lartik dan *The Guardian* lor “sekre deta”

Ena enn lartik analiz interesan dan *The Guardian* lor size “Closure”² ki byen interesan. Li vo lapenn nu sit li an gran. Li dir:

“The term ‘public records’ is a misnomer. The PRO³ officially defines them as ‘administrative and departmental records of the Crown’. Whitehall⁴ can withhold files on the grounds that they contain ‘exceptionally sensitive’ material relating to national security, defence, international relations, or contain information supplied in confidence whose disclosure would constitute a ‘breach of good faith’.

“Papers can be withheld if their disclosure would cause ‘substantial distress’ to individuals or their descendants. This, according to officials, is why papers on the 1936 abdication crisis, and also on the royal family's relations with pre-second world war right-wing opinion, will not be released at least until after the death of the Queen Mother.

The PRO itself admits these obstacles to disclosure are, in its words, ‘so wide’ that few people bother to appeal against them. But there is more. Under section 3 (4) of the Public Records Acts, Whitehall departments can hold on to documents indefinitely for ‘administrative purposes’ or ‘for any other special reason’ subject to the approval, never knowingly withheld, of the lord chancellor – the minister officially responsible for the nation's archives.

“Absolute discretion is the name of the game. Despite official rules that once a file has been shown to one person, it should be available to all, Whitehall, and notably security and intelligence agencies, gives privileged access to documents to approved writers. And despite strict rules covering the preservation of documents, some have been destroyed.

“Sir Edward Heath, chief whip at the time, revealed in his memoirs two years ago that Sir Anthony Eden ordered the destruction of his copy of the secret plan to invade Egypt agreed with France and Israel during the 1956 Suez crisis. This writer has been told by a cabinet office source that papers on the 1985 Westland crisis have also been destroyed.” Sa lartik la donn nu enn lide komye konspirasyon Leta burzwa abitye fer. Pli Parlman perdi puvwaw vizavi Kabine Minis, pli sa vinn grav, ki li dan Gran Bretayn, ki li dan Moris.

Ena enn lot lartik dan *The Guardian* ki interesan site⁵: “Section 3 (4) of the public records act baldly states: ‘Any records may be retained . . . if, in the opinion of the person responsible for them, they are required for administrative purposes or ought to be retained for any other special reason.’” Sa li pu 30 an. Me, tuzur, zot resit sa kloz: “The rules also enable records to be suppressed beyond the

normal 30 years if they cause 'substantial distress' to 'persons affected by disclosure or their descendants'."

Lartik la kontinye donn lexanp zafer ki ti res sekre ziska zordi: "Such broad-brush regulations have enabled the Whitehall establishment and its friends to hide a multitude of sins. Closed papers include those relating to Rudolf Hess, Hitler's former deputy, who flew to Britain in May 1941 in an apparent attempt to reach a peace agreement between Britain and Germany; Sir Roger Casement, who was hanged in 1916 for seeking German help for Irish independence; Britain's claims to Gibraltar and the Falklands; and the activities of the security and intelligence agencies."

Dokiman nepli sekre lor Diego Garcia

Ala enn lalist serten dokiman ki konsern dosye Diego Garcia ki finn vinn publik an 2001 ek 2002.

Public Record Office: April 2001 - Recent Releases at the Public Record Office⁶

PRO reference	Date	Description
FCO 32/718	1970	Request by United States for refueling and communications in Diego Garcia
FCO 32/719	1970	Memorandum of the understanding concerning facilities on Diego Garcia
FCO 32/721	1970	Indian attitude to use of Diego Garcia
FCO 32/722	1970	Strategic military requirements in the Indian Ocean regarding Gan and Diego Garcia

Public Record Office: February 2002 - Recent Releases at the Public Record Office⁷

PRO reference	Date	Description
FCO 31/640	1970	United States defence facilities on Diego Garcia
FCO 46/344	1968-1969	Proposed United States Naval facilities at Diego Garcia
FCO 46/345	1968-1969	Proposed United States Naval facilities at Diego Garcia
FCO 46/346	1968-1969	Proposed United States Naval facilities at Diego Garcia

Henri Marimootoo so travay resers pu Diego Files

Alor kan lalwa 30-an finn vinn an viger, lerala ki zurnalist Week-End, Henri Marimootoo, finn fer so travay extraordinier pu fer tu dimunn kone. Li finn fer enn seri lartik su tit "Diego Files".

Komye tuzur sekre

Nu pa kone komye dosye ziska ler pankor vinn dan domenn publik.

1 Apel sa "closure". Dokiman ki ferme.

2 Source : The Guardian :

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,3604,417954,00.html>

3 Public Records Office

4 Guvernman Britanik, setadir so kabine.

⁵ Source: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/freedom/Story/0,2763,191125,00.html>

⁶ Source: <http://www.pro.gov.uk/releases/april2001/list.htm>

⁷ Source: <http://www.pro.gov.uk/releases/feb2002/list.htm>

INFO

Par Rada kistnasamy

Mini Zizman

Dan Ka kont US, DCDM ek lezot

An Desam 2001, trwa reprezantan Chagosien ansam avek *Grup Refizye Chagos* ek *Komite Sosyal Chagosien* (Seychelles) finn loz enn ka kont Governman US, reprezante, an ot, par trwa ansyin Sekreter Deta ek Vis Prezidan Dick Cheney. (Get lartik lor *US Damages Case*) Ka la finn osi loze kont miltinasyonal Halliburton, Aterne Zeneral US ek De Chazal du Mee, konpayni Morisyen an tan ki azan ki ti pe fer rekritman lor nom konpayni notwar, *Arthur Andersen Worldwide*. Bann abitan Chagos pe purswiv pu konpansasyon apre tretman inimin ki zot finn sibir kan finn derasinn zot depi Chagos.

Dan so plint, *premye* reprezantan, Olivier Bancoult finn dir ki an 1967 finn anpes so fami return Peros Banhos apre ki zot ti vini pu tretman medikal dan Moris.

Dezyem reprezantan, Therese Mein finn dir ki dimunn ki ti pe azir lor nom governman Leta Zini ek Britanik, finn deport zot depi Diego Garcia pu al Peros Banhos, enn lot lil Chagos, e plitar al Seychelles. Li dir ki swit de sa, li finn fer enn pert.

Trwazyem reprezantan, France Charlot finn dir ki li finn ne dan Moris depi *premye* zenerasyon Chagosien ki sorti lil Salomon. Li dir ki li ek so fami finn viv dan bann kondisyon lamizer extrem kot zot finn sibir opresyon sosyal, kiltirel ek ekonomik.

Sa trwa reprezantan la finn dir ki tusala finn arive swit a diyl sekre ek manipilasyon grotesk ki guverman Leta Zini ek Britanik ti fer pu derasinn tu abitan sa bann lil la pandan peryod 1965 a 1971. Sa finn fer avek konplisite zot azan e zordi zot pe ankor sibir diskriminasyon.

Dan enn zizman ki finn rande le 30 Septam 2002 Lakur Distrik (Columbia) dan US, Ziz Ricardo Urbina, finn rezet ka kont De Chazal Du Mee pu bann rezon teknik.

Me, M. Robin Mardemootoo, avwe ki reprezant zintere Chagossien, dir ki se aster ki tu pu kumanse aköz zizman la zis lor teknikalite, li pa lor fon ka la (*dixit Week End 6 Oktob 2002*).

BUSH EK KONPAYNI PETROL RESPONSAB SABOTAZ PROTOKOL KYOTO

Nu gayn difikilte konpran kifer Governman Moris pe resevwar Prezidan Amerikin Moris. Pa zis li pe okip Diego Garcia ilegalman, pe servi nu later pu tuy popilasyon sivil, pa zis li pe kontaminann Losean Indyen ek so zarm nikleer lor Diego, me so aksyon lor kestyon Protokol Kyoto telman enn menas pu sirvi limanite ki ti bizin evit invit li isi.

Administrasyon Bush ek bann konpayni petrol dan Leta Zini finn amenn bann lobi byin for pu sabot protokol Kyoto. Dapre protokol Kyoto ki ti adopte an Zapon an 1997, 39 pei pli indistrialzye bizin redwir emision zot gaz (ki azut dan lefe de-ser) pu fer li vinn 5.2% anba nivo ki ti egziste an 1990.

Leta Zini tusel ti bizin diminye sa bann polisyon indistriyel par 7% aköz zot responsab pu emet plis ki 25% gaz karbonik dan lemond. Sa gaz ena kom lefe pu kree kondisyon pu ki tanperatir later ogmante dan prosenn deseni. So konsekans seki pu ena inondasyon, lasesres ek lezot bulversman klimatik ki pu amenn destriksyon lanatir, lagrikiltir e ki menas sirvi limanite mem. Dapre bann syantis sa bann gaz la deza enn nivo inakseptab e ki bizin pran bann mezir tutswit pu limit dega.

Pu administrasyon Bush, profi pu bann miltinasyonal vinn avan sekirite nu bul later. Dayer bann miltinasyonal kuma Exxon Mobil ki ena gro lintere dan explwatasyon resurs petrol dan lemond finn finans Parti Repiblikin ek Prezidan Bush masivman. Zot finn finans

ziska 1.2 milyon dolar (36 milyon rupi) pu dernye kanpayn elektoral. Apre viktwar Bush, sa konpayni al ziska dikte ki politik enerzetik Leta Zini bizin ena. Konpayni Exxon Mobil finn mem finans kanpayn pu diskredit protokol Kyoto akoz sa protokol la reprezant enn menas direk pu zot profi.

Kan Leta Zini desid pu retire depi protokol Kyoto, zot pe anfet sabot prosesis pu ofer plis sekirite a tu form lavi ki ena lor nu planet zordi e seki pu egziste dimin. Antye lemond ena lavwa pe leve pu kondann prezidan Bush pu so iresponsabilite dan kontiyn protez bann gro lintere petrol ki pe amenn plis destriksyon pu nu planet.

Bush inplike

Skandal Enron

Skandal Enron lane dernyer finn vinn devwal a ki pwin George W. Bush protez sekter prive. Li rul pei-la dan lintere gro konpayni. Mem Diego Garcia, li enn baz militer ki anfet rule par enn seri gro konpayni, ki enn-dan-lot avek Leta.

Enron parey.

Enron ti donn gro finansman pu so eleksyon kom Prezidan Lamerik. Konpayni Enron, ki ti tir gro benefis dan spekilasyon lor marse elektrisite e ki ti parmi 16 pli gran konpayni dan lemond, finn ekrule dan skandal-di-syek.

Sa konpayni la pa finn pey okenn tax pandan dernye 4 a 5 an. Zot finn benefisyse direktman kan Guvernman Bush dereglemant ek liberaliz marse pu prodiksyon lenerzi, swit a zot lobi. Sa finn fer avek konivans dirizan Republikin dan *La Maison Blanche*. Dayer Ken Lay prezidan Enron form parti serk ferme Prezidan Bush.

Zot osi ena akse fasil a biro Vis Prezidan USA, Dick Cheney ki finn elabor plan enerzetik pu satisfer konpayni Enron. (Dick Cheney parmi dimunn ki Chagosyen pe purswiv dan zot ka konpansasyon pu, ant ot, tortir ek zenosid.) Sa bann mezir la finn raport gro pu konpayni Enron ki finn azir an konplisite avek Andersen enn konpayni kontabilite ki finn konplis pu manipil bann sif pu montre profi fiktif. Samem konpayni Andersen finn inplike dan fer diskriminasyon kont Chagosyen dan rekritman pu konpayni prive ki rul baz Diego. Andersen pe purswiv atraver zot azan lokal, De Chazal Du Mee.

Dan Moris sa skandal la finn osi afekte sekter *offshore* kot Enron finn anreszistre 43 konpayni. Sa 43 konpayni form parti konpayni *offshore* ki Enron finn anrezistre antye lemond, dan pei kot pena okenn kontrol lor kont ek kot ena zero tax lor bann tranzaksyon.

Kan finalman finn dekuver lapert anplas profi dan Enron, plizyer milye dimunn finn perdi travay. Plizyer milyon dolar ki travayer finn kontribiye dan plan pansyon finn anvole.

Sa skandal Enron finn vinn devwal kuma lamone sal finn servi pu met enn klas dirizan koronpi o-puvwar dan USA. Sa skandal politiko-finansye finn vinn expoz kriyote sistem liberalism ekonomik ki pe fer spekilasyon lor bann sekter esansyel kuma lenerzi e ki fer dimunn mizer ek klas travayer sarye tu fardo move zesyon.

Kan Guvernman Moris invit enn Prezidan Bush ki inplike dan finansman lus kumsa, sirman li kasyet lefet ki zot-mem ti eli ar kas depi Rogers ek Air Mauritius.

(Surs: *World Socialist Web Site, polarisinstitute.org*)

DESAM 2001, DAN LOSEAN INDYIN

KRASH BOMBARDYE B-1

Lane dernyer avyon deger B-1 ki ti dekolé depi baz Diego Garcia pu lans bann atak lor Afganistan finn kraze dan losean Indyin. B-1 se enn bombardye ki ena kapasite sarye 40 tonn bomb e kapav ekipe pu sarye zarm nikliyer. Sa bombardye la kut 200 milyon dolar. So kat manb lekipaz finn resi ezekte avan krash.

Sa aksidan la montre danze grav, ki kapav katastrofik, pu tu lepep sa rezyon lemond la. Li enn rezon anplis pu ferm baz Diego.

Lintere ekonomik deryer

Bush so kabine sekreter deta

Depi ki Bush opuvwar, Lamerik pe amenn enn politik iltra-militaris e pe instal limem kuma enn veritab pwisans inperyalis dan lemond. Kan nu get de pre sa lekip ki form parti Bush so guvernman nu kapav konpran kot bann *lobby* pro-inperyalis sorti. Ala enn lalis dimunn dan kabine Bush e zot koneksyon ar gro konpayni kapitalis. *Ann Veneman*, Sekreter Deta (minis) Lagrikiltir: Li ti syez lor bord Calgene Inc. premye konpayni pu introdri tomat zenetikman modifye lor marse Amerikin. Li enn dimunn pros ar miltinasyonal Monsanto e Pharmacia.

John Ashcroft, Sekreter Deta Lazistis: Li pros ar konpayni AT&T, Microsoft, Enterprise.

Donald Rumsfeld, Sekreter Deta Ladefans: li ena koneksyon ar konpayni Pharmacia, Motorola, Lear Corporation

Spenser Abraham, Sekreter Deta Lenerzi: li ena koneksyon ar konpayni General Motors, Ford, Lear Corporation

Thommy Thompson, Sekreter Deta Lasante e Servis Imin: ena koneksyon ar konpayni Philip Morris Inc. (gro konpayni dan prodiksyon taba).

Gale Norton, Sekreter Deta Zafer Interyer: ena koneksyon ar konpayni BP, Amoco Ford, NL Industries Inc.

Elaine Chao, Sekreter Deta Travay: Li ti syez lor bord 5 konpayni ki inklir Dole Food, Clorox, Cr Bard & HCA; li ti osi dan bord lekzekitif Bank of America.

Colin Powell, Sef Sekreter Deta: Ena koneksyon ar konpayni America Online, Gulfstream.

Norman Mineta, Sekreter Deta Transpor: ena koneksyon ar Lockheed Martin (gro konpayni prodikter zarm), Boeing.

Paul O'Neill, Sekreter Deta Trezor: ena koneksyon ar ALCOA (pli gran konpayni prodikter aliminyom dan lemond), Intrernational Paper, Lucent Technologies.

Anthony Principi, Sekreter Deta Zafer veteran: ena lyan ar konpayni Lockheed Martin, Microsoft. Li ti deza chermenn Federal Network, enn konpayni telekominikasyon.

Andrew Card, Sef Staf Mezon Blans: ena koneksyon ar konpayni General Motors

Mitch Daniels, direkter biro Manejmnet ek Bidze: lye ar Eli Lilly (konpayni farmasetik)

Condoleezza Rice: konseye nasyonal pu sekirite: ena koneksyon ar konpayni Chevron, Charles Schwab, TransAmerica.

Baz militer Diego

Permisyon US depi UK

Omilye preparasyon diplomatik ki Prezidan Bush ti pe antre pran pu so dernye ofansiv militer kont Irak, ti ena enn item “propagann” lor BBC radyo. Ti dir kuma gran tit dan nuvel: “Guvernman Amerikin finn dimann guvernman Britanik permisyon pu servi baz militer Diego Garcia pu bann B-3.” Sa enn nuvo zafer pu met buku lanfaz lor “permisyon”. Li paret ki Guvernman Amerikin pe rod gayn prev dan kad ka domaz dan Lakur Amerikin, lor kisannla responsab sa bann deplasman forse ki Chagosyen finn sufer, ki *pa li sa, Gran Bretayn sa!* Anmemtan, li pe menas guvernman Larabi Seodit, ki li pa tro bizin servi baz laba: li deza ena enn baz depi lekel li kapav atak Bagdad.

Me, normalman, nu pa sir ki ena “permisyon” pu bann desizyon militer. Get seki ena dan sa *Press Release* depi *Armed Forces* Amerikin an 1997¹: “KC-10’s to support B-52s to Diego Garcia: Five additional Air Force tanker aircraft will deploy to Diego Garcia along with the four tankers announced Tuesday. All nine aircraft now deploying to Diego Garcia are KC-10 Extenders from the 60th Air Mobility Wing, Travis Air Force Base, California. They will fly in support of the six B-52s deploying to Diego Garcia from the 2nd Bomb Wing, Barksdale Air Force Base, La., which were announced Tuesday. Upon further review of the operational requirements for the B-52s and the distances involved, it was determined that these additional tanker assets were required.” Zot pa ti anonse ki zot finn rod permisyon ar Leta Britanik.

Resers par Leta Zini

E dan Parlman UK, 22 Novam 2000 ti ena 2 lezot lexanp, kot Lamerik anfet dimann permisyon. Enn Parlmanter, M. Fabricant, ki finn dimann Minis lor kestyon “resers” ki US finn fer Diego. Sa li sirman aköz dapre zot Trete, zot sipoze napa gat lanvironnman Chagos.

“Mr. Fabricant [parlmanter]: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, pursuant to his answer of 15 November 2000, *Official Report*, column 686W, on Diego Garcia, if he will list the research programmes on Diego Garcia being undertaken by the US authorities for which they have sought UK approval over the last five years.²

“Mr. Battle [Minis]: Two research programmes have been undertaken by the US authorities in the last five years. They were:

- (1) Environmental Impact Assessment of ship husbandry activities at Diego Garcia (undertaken as request of BIOT Government)
 - (2) Cable survivability testing: to determine the susceptibility and depth variability of underwater cables to the bite threat from reef fish.
- UK approval was sought for both.”

Sekre Deta

Pli ridikil se kan u gayn repons a kestyon parlmanter kot li dir pa kapav dir. Tu resaman, 16 Oktob, 2002, ti ena enn repons kumsa a enn kestyon poze par depite Jeremy Corbyn.

“Jeremy Corbyn: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs what applications he has received from the USA to construct new aircraft hangars on Diego Garcia; and if he will make a statement.³

“Mike O'Brien: The issue of possible upgrades to facilities at Diego Garcia has been discussed at annual talks between the UK and US governments. The details of these governmental talks are confidential and exempt under section 1a of *The Code of practice on Access to Government Information*, ‘Information whose disclosure would harm national security or defence’.”

Sa vedir, kan nu byen gete, kontrol demokratik lor seki pase Diego Garcia li zero: Ni, nu Morisyen, ni bann Britanik, ni bann Amerikin pa pe kapav exiz enn repons kler. E antretan pe servi sa baz-la pu loperasyon kont popilasyon sivil dan Afganistan ek Irak.

1 19 November, 1997

2 [139616]

3 [74654]

Top US Politicians accused of genocide and torture

The US Damages Case

In an important case for reparations and compensation for their forcible eviction from their islands, inhabitants of Diego Garcia and Chagos are suing the US Government, as well as notorious individuals like Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld and Robert McNamara, and US companies for their responsibility in genocide, torture and knowingly inflicting degrading treatment on people.¹ And the suffering continues, so that the present under-Secretary for Political and Military Affairs, Eric Newsome, is being sued for refusing to let Chagos people return, even after the UK Court Judgment in November, 2000.

Each of the 4,500 Chagos inhabitants is suing for two million dollars.

The case, lodged in December, 2001, has already come before Judge Ricardo Urbina in the federal courts in Washington DC. (See Rada Kistnasamy's article *Mini Zizman dan Ka kont US, DCDM ek lezot*).

The case shows us, in clear focus, how the "industrial-military-State complex" works in the USA, and how peoples' profit-making jobs are inter-connected with their roles as politicians, as Secretary of State or Under Secretary of State.

Dick Cheney, present Vice President of the USA, is sued for a double responsibility: he was both part of the US administration in the early 1970s and also the General Manager of Halliburton, as well as now being Vice-President. He is being sued for "guilty knowledge" of all the facts.

Lawrence Eagleburger is also being sued for a similar double responsibility in the multinational profit-making business, on the board of Halliburton, and in the State apparatus, as Under Secretary of State.

Directly in the firing line, and with a double role, is a woman called Anne Armstrong. She was the US ambassador to the UK and signed some of the deal, herself. She has also been part of the Halliburton management team. She is being sued for her role in the suffering of these 4,500 people.

Donald Rumsfeld, George W. Bush's right hand man in warmongering right now, is being sued for his orchestration of the depopulation at the time, and for his role in knowingly breaking up families.

The ex-Secretary for Defense, Robert McNamara, ex-Secretary for Defence 1961-1968, in his role as supreme Commander of the US Forces, is being sued because he knowingly and against payment by the UK to Britain, inflicted the painful treatment on the people of Chagos. He committed these acts during the illegal US barter of Polaris missiles for UK-"owned" uninhabited islands.

His two successors under Nixon and then Ford, were Melvin R. Laird and James Schlesinger who are both being sued for their implication in the deportations. Other military men, Admiral James S. Holloway, and George T. Churchill are also being sued, together with other Secretaries of State.

The notorious company Arthur Anderson is being sued through its agent, De Chazal du Mee. This company is thus under attack for fraud and also for its past human rights abuses.

The reign of companies is reaching a ludicrous summit when a company like De Chazal du Mee runs a university and is being sued for serious human rights abuses at the same time. Similarly, in the Chagos inhabitants' "plaint", they draw attention to the fact that Halliburton have themselves been running a campaign against human rights abuses in Myanmar, when they stand accused of perpetrating them in Chagos and Diego Garcia.

The plaintiffs in the case are Olivier Bancoult, Marie Isabelle France-Charlot, Therese Mein, the Chagos Refugees Group, and the Seychelles Comite Social Chagossien.

UN Charter and Resolutions, OAU and Non-aligned Movement

Constitutional and International History

By Lindsey Collen & Ragini Kistnasamy

Diego Garcia and the whole of Chagos Archipelago was split off from the rest of Mauritius as a condition for Independence¹ in 1965. This kind of “condition” is illegal. It is against the United Nations Charter.² This has been repeatedly brought out in UN General Assembly resolutions.

The Chagos was subsequently lumped together with some islands split off from the Seychelles and made into a brand new “colony” of some sort called the British Indian Ocean Territories (BIOT) in 1965.³ The British authorities then “depopulated” the Islands by forcibly removing all the inhabitants. They did this in secret in order to avoid UN scrutiny⁴. The UN Charter has very specific powers over such “territories”⁵. Then the scene was set for the United States of America armed forces to install one of the most important military bases on the planet on Diego Garcia, one of the 65 Chagos Islands. It is from this base that B-52’s take off in order to bomb civilian populations in Afghanistan and Iraq.

UN General Assembly resolutions

The splitting off of Diego Garcia and Chagos from Mauritius having been against international law, Chagos is still part of Mauritius Islands.⁶

A United Nations General Assembly resolution⁷ expressly disallows conditions on Independence (Article 4), insists on respect for territorial integrity (Article 5) and confirms “*Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations*” (Article 6). Another UN resolution confirms this.⁸

There has been a lot of debate as to the degree of complicity of Dr Seewoosagur Ramgoolam, the Chief Minister prior to Independence. This debate, though very interesting for exposing the opportunist politics of the man and of the Labour Party taken over by his clique, and also for highlighting the harm done by the anti-Independence extreme right Gaetan Duval PMSD movement⁹, is irrelevant to the constitutional status of Chagos.

Chagos along with the whole of the rest of Mauritius was ceded to Britain by France in 1814 after the 1810 capitulation during the Napoleonic Wars.¹⁰ All these islands together made up the colony known as “The Mauritius” Britain then granted Independence to Mauritius in 1968, and this Independence should, of course, have included the whole of the country. But Britain, as colonizer, had illegally clawed back the 65 islands of Chagos, so that it could rent them to the US armed forces.

Note that the British authorities repeatedly make the outrageously guilty-sounding statement that Britain will cede Mauritius her sovereignty over Diego Garcia when the island is no longer needed for defense. This is a formula which is well nigh un-grammatical it is so sneaky. In July 2000 the Foreign and Commonwealth Office announces: “If and when the territory were (sic) no longer required for defence purposes as envisaged in the UK/US treaties (sic), the UK is committed to cede sovereignty over the islands to the Government of Mauritius”. How very sweet of Britain, one may say.

Here is a recent parliamentary question and answer in the UK on 16th October, 2002: **“Mr. Rosindell [Member of Parliament]:** To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs (1) what the Government’s policy is on the future status of the British

Indian Ocean Territory;¹¹ (2) what options are being considered by the Government after the expiration of the agreement granting the United States joint military use of Diego Garcia.¹²

“Mike O'Brien [Minister]: The British Government has a treaty commitment to allow the US to use BIOT until at least 2016, and then for a further 20 years unless prior notice is given. We have told the Government of Mauritius that the Chagos Islands will be ceded to Mauritius when they are no longer required for defence purposes, subject to the requirements of international law.” Now, they make out it is a pure favour; the words “cede sovereignty” (which imply the meaning of “concede that they were in the wrong”) have been replaced by “cede” the islands, themselves.

Meanwhile, Britain rents the stolen Islands to the United States Armed Forces, which are in turn, the receivers of the stolen goods.

In order to get away with this for so long, they had recourse to the 30-year secrecy laws, for holding on to the relevant documents¹³. This effectively hid from the public eye the way in which over 2,000 people were forcibly removed from the Chagos, and thus allowed continued UK/US control over the stolen islands.

And today the illegal occupation continues quite openly. It is against UN resolutions, OAU resolutions, Non-Aligned Movement resolutions.

UN Resolutions, including on Indian Ocean Zone of Peace

The United Nations General Assembly has also voted more specific resolutions against the UK and USA. On 16th December, 1965 in Resolution 2066, and of equal importance the Resolution 2832 for an Indian Ocean Zone of Peace.¹⁴

Ecosoc Committee report on Mauritius¹⁵

At its 1995 session on “Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social & Cultural Rights”, when Mauritius was being reviewed, the UN Committee reported on its August 1994 meeting. In its “Concluding Observations”, the Committee drew attention to Article 1, and asked “In what manner has the right to self-determination been implemented?” It summarized the Constitutional history of Mauritius¹⁶, before saying reminding the international community of something important:

“For record purposes, it should also be noted that in United Nations General Assembly resolution 2066 (XX), adopted on 16 December 1965, the administering Power was, *inter alia*, invited to take no action that would dismember the Territory of Mauritius and violate its territorial integrity. Mauritius has consistently claimed its sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago.

“Mauritius has since some time now established an ongoing and meaningful dialogue with the United Kingdom on the issue of Diego Garcia which, it is hoped, will lead to an early and satisfactory settlement of the matter. A number of confidence-building measures have been undertaken in this respect, amongst which was the establishment of the British-Mauritian Fisheries Commission, which aims at promoting, facilitating and coordinating conservation and scientific research in Chagos waters. It also underscores the commitment of both sides to keep the inland and marine environment of the Chagos Archipelago in pristine condition when it is handed back to Mauritius. Another confidence-building measure was the visit to Diego Garcia in May 1994 by a delegation led by the Minister of External Affairs of Mauritius.”

These comments show that the UN is, rightly, mindful of its own General Assembly Resolutions, but not much more. The Ecosoc Committee does not have the same teeth as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights Committee, which has an enforcement treaty.¹⁷

OAU Resolutions

The Organisation of African Unity Charter is also clear on the issue of territorial integrity¹⁸. There have been many resolutions at the OAU Heads of State Summits (note that the OAU is now replaced by the African Union, which has maintained all the OAU resolutions, but which is also “engaged” in what is called the NEPAD¹⁹ process, which involves massive concessions to the imperialist powers). A unanimous resolution was taken at the Heads of State

Conference at Freetown, Sierra Leone, 1-4th July, 1980 to demand dismantling of the Diego Garcia base, and the retrocession of Chagos to Mauritius.

Non-Aligned Movement

The 7th Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement, when it met in Delhi on 12th March, 1983, voted a resolution for the dismantling of the base and for the retrocession of Diego Garcia and Chagos to Mauritius.

Conclusion and question of International Court

All of the resolutions still stand. Now added to them is the judgement in the Bancourt Supreme Court case in the UK. What is interesting is the persistent refusal of any Mauritian Government to take the case to The UN International Court of Justice at The Hague²⁰. The Mauritian Government could either take Britain directly to Court, or get the General Assembly to request an opinion from the ICJ. The argument successive Governments use (while they openly make trade deals for Mauritian businessmen for textile entry into the US or UK markets *in exchange for their inaction*) is that “Britain won’t agree to come”. This only makes it a win-win situation for Mauritius. Either Britain does come, and Mauritius wins a formal Court judgment in its favour. Or Britain does not come, and this, in itself, i.e. forcing Britain to refuse to come, would be something of a victory.

¹ Independence subsequently granted in 1968

² “4. All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.” This is interpreted by UN Resolution of 1960, 1514(XV).

³ The Seychelles has subsequently sought and won the return of those of its islands, Aldabra, Farquhar and Desroches that were illegally split off. They are now once again part of the Seychelles.

⁴ See article *How Diego Garcia was stolen and depopulated*

⁵ **UNITED NATIONS CHARTER, CHAPTER IX, Declaration Regarding non-self-governing Territories**
Article 73

Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present Charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and, to this end:

a. to ensure, with due respect for the culture of the peoples concerned, their political, economic, social, and educational advancement, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses;

b. to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement;

c. to further international peace and security;

d. to promote constructive measures of development, to encourage research, and to co-operate with one another and, when and where appropriate, with specialized international bodies with a view to the practical achievement of the social, economic, and scientific purposes set forth in this Article; and

e. to transmit regularly to the Secretary-General for information purposes, subject to such limitation as security and constitutional considerations may require, statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social, and educational conditions in the territories for which they are respectively responsible other than those territories to which Chapter XII and XIII apply.

Article 74

Members of the United Nations also agree that their policy in respect of the territories to which this Chapter applies, no less than in respect of their metropolitan areas, must be based on the general principle of good-neighborliness, due account being taken of the interests and well-being of the rest of the world, in social, economic, and commercial matters.

CHAPTER XII

INTERNATIONAL TRUSTEESHIP SYSTEM

Article 75

The United Nations shall establish under its authority an international trusteeship system for the administration and supervision of such territories as may be placed thereunder by subsequent individual agreements. These territories are hereinafter referred to as trust territories.

Article 76

The basic objectives of the trusteeship system, in accordance with the Purposes of the United Nations laid down in Article 1 of the present Charter, shall be:

- a. to further international peace and security;
- b. to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, and as may be provided by the terms of each trusteeship agreement;
- c. to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, and to encourage recognition of the interdependence of the peoples of the world; and
- d. to ensure equal treatment in social, economic, and commercial matters for all Members of the United Nations and their nationals and also equal treatment for the latter in the administration of justice without prejudice to the attainment of the foregoing objectives and subject to the provisions of Article 80.

Article 77

1. The trusteeship system shall apply to such territories in the following categories as may be placed thereunder by means of trusteeship agreements:

- a. territories now held under mandate;
- b. territories which may be detached from enemy states as a result of the Second World War; and
- c. territories voluntarily placed under the system by states responsible for their administration.

2. It will be a matter for subsequent agreement as to which territories in the foregoing categories will be brought under the trusteeship system and upon what terms.

Article 78

The trusteeship system shall not apply to territories which have become Members of the United Nations, relationship among which shall be based on respect for the principle of sovereign equality.

Article 79

The terms of trusteeship for each territory to be placed under the trusteeship system, including any alteration or amendment, shall be agreed upon by the states directly concerned, including the mandatory power in the case of territories held under mandate by a Member of the United Nations, and shall be approved as provided for in Articles 83 and 85.

Article 80

1. Except as may be agreed upon in individual trusteeship agreements, made under Articles 77, 79, and 81, placing each territory under the trusteeship system, and until such agreements have been concluded, nothing in this Chapter shall be construed in or of itself to alter in any manner the rights whatsoever of any states or any peoples or the terms of existing international instruments to which Members of the United Nations may respectively be parties.

2. Paragraph 1 of this Article shall not be interpreted as giving grounds for delay or postponement of the negotiation and conclusion of agreements for placing mandated and other territories under the trusteeship system as provided for in Article 77.

Article 81

The trusteeship agreement shall in each case include the terms under which the trust territory will be administered and designate the authority which will exercise the administration of the trust territory. Such authority, hereinafter called the administering authority, may be one or more states or the Organization itself.

Article 82

There may be designated, in any trusteeship agreement, a strategic area or areas which may include part or all of the trust territory to which the agreement applies, without prejudice to any special agreement or agreements made under Article 43.

Article 83

1. All functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the Security Council.

2. The basic objectives set forth in Article 76 shall be applicable to the people of each strategic area.

3. The Security Council shall, subject to the provisions of the trusteeship agreements and without prejudice to security considerations, avail itself of the assistance of the Trusteeship Council to perform those functions of the United Nations under the trusteeship system relating to political, economic, social, and educational matters in the strategic areas.

Article 84

It shall be the duty of the administering authority to ensure that the trust territory shall play its part in the maintenance of international peace and security. To this end the administering authority may make use of volunteer forces, facilities, and assistance from the trust territory in carrying out the obligations towards the Security Council undertaken in this regard by the administering authority, as well as for local defense and the maintenance of law and order within the trust territory.

Article 85

1. The functions of the United Nations with regard to trusteeship agreements for all areas not designated as strategic, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the General Assembly.

2. The Trusteeship Council, operating under the authority of the General Assembly, shall assist the General Assembly in carrying out these functions.

Article 86

1. The Trusteeship Council shall consist of the following Members of the United Nations:
 - a. those Members administering trust territories;
 - b. such of those Members mentioned by name in Article 23 as are not administering trust territories; and
 - c. as many other Members elected for three-year terms by the General Assembly as may be necessary to ensure that the total number of members of the Trusteeship Council is equally divided between those Members of the United Nations which administer trust territories and those which do not.
2. Each member of the Trusteeship Council shall designate one specially qualified person to represent it therein.

Article 87

- The General Assembly and, under its authority, the Trusteeship Council, in carrying out their functions, may:
- a. consider reports submitted by the administering authority;
 - b. accept petitions and examine them in consultation with the administering authority;
 - c. provide for periodic visits to the respective trust territories at times agreed upon with the administering authority; and
 - d. take these and other actions in conformity with the terms of the trusteeship agreements.

Article 88

The Trusteeship Council shall formulate a questionnaire on the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of each trust territory, and the administering authority for each trust territory within the competence of the General Assembly shall make an annual report to the General Assembly upon the basis of such questionnaire.

Voting

Article 89

1. Each member of the Trusteeship Council shall have one vote.
2. Decisions of the Trusteeship Council shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting.

Procedure

Article 90

1. The Trusteeship Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure, including the method of selecting its President.
2. The Trusteeship Council shall meet as required in accordance with its rules, which shall include provision for the convening of meetings on the request of a majority of its members.

Article 91

The Trusteeship Council shall, when appropriate, avail itself of the assistance of the Economic and Social Council and of the specialized agencies in regard to matters with which they are respectively concerned.

⁶ See article "What's in a Name" for the Mauritian laws.

⁷ **Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Adopted by General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, *The General Assembly, Mindful of the determination proclaimed by the peoples of the world in the Charter of the United Nations to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,***

Conscious of the need for the creation of conditions of stability and well-being and peaceful and friendly relations based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of all peoples, and of universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion,

Recognizing the passionate yearning for freedom in all dependent peoples and the decisive role of such peoples in the attainment of their independence,

Aware of the increasing conflicts resulting from the denial of or impediments in the way of the freedom of such peoples, which constitute a serious threat to world peace,

Considering the important role of the United Nations in assisting the movement for independence in Trust and Non- Self- Governing Territories,

Recognizing that the peoples of the world ardently desire the end of colonialism in all its manifestations, Convinced that the continued existence of colonialism prevents the development of international economic co-operation, impedes the social, cultural and economic development of dependent peoples and militates against the United Nations ideal of universal peace,

Affirming that peoples may, for their own ends, freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources without prejudice to any obligations arising out of international economic co-operation, based upon the principle of mutual benefit, and international law,

Believing that the process of liberation is irresistible and irreversible and that, in order to avoid serious crises, an end must be put to colonialism and all practices of segregation and discrimination associated therewith,

Welcoming the emergence in recent years of a large number of dependent territories into freedom and independence, and recognizing the increasingly powerful trends towards freedom in such territories which have not yet attained independence,

Convinced that all peoples have an inalienable right to complete freedom, the exercise of their sovereignty and the integrity of their national territory,

Solemnly proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations;

And to this end Declares that:

1. The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation.
2. All peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.
3. Inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence.
4. All armed action or repressive measures of all kinds directed against dependent peoples shall cease in order to enable them to exercise peacefully and freely their right to complete independence, and the integrity of their national territory shall be respected.
5. Immediate steps shall be taken, in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom.
6. Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.
7. All States shall observe faithfully and strictly the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the present Declaration on the basis of equality, non-interference in the internal affairs of all States, and respect for the sovereign rights of all peoples and their territorial integrity.

⁸ Resolution 2066 (XX), of 16 December 1965,

⁹ Gaetan Duval's hysterical communal campaign, funded by the sugar oligarchy, was strong enough that the Labour Party could not be sure to win a referendum on the question of Independence, although it was certain to win a General Election. The British State used this threat of a "referendum" in order to make Sir Seewoosagur and his allies accept the dismemberment of the Mauritian territory.

¹⁰ Quoted from "The Chagos Archipelago Sovereignty issue (Explanatory Memorandum) published by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Mauritius, 1992, reproduced in *L'Express* 17 January, 1992: "1. From French Colonisation to British Rule: Mauritius became a possession of the French East India Company in 1715, which also acquired the Chagos Archipelago and other islands in the Indian Ocean. As a result of bankruptcy, the company sold these possessions to the King of France. The sale automatically vested legal title to Mauritius and the Chagos Archipelago with the Government of France. During the Napoleonic Wars, precisely in 1810, the British seized Mauritius from France. The Treaty of Paris of 1814, confirmed by the Treaty of Vienna of 1815, gave United Kingdom legal Title to Mauritius and its dependencies including the Chagos Archipelago."

¹¹ [74191]

¹² [74193]

¹³ **Amongst documents recently made public, for example, in January, 2001, we still see the following coming out of the dark:**

FCO 32/718 1970	Request by United States for refueling and communications in Diego Garcia
FCO 32/719 1970	Memorandum of the understanding concerning facilities on Diego Garcia
FCO 32/721 1970	Indian attitude to use of Diego Garcia
FCO 32/722 1970	Strategic military requirements in the Indian Ocean regarding Gan and Diego Garcia

Amongst the documents made public even more recently, February, 2002:

FCO 31/640	1970	United States defence facilities on Diego Garcia
FCO 46/344	1968-1969	Proposed United States Naval facilities at Diego Garcia
FCO 46/345	1968-1969	Proposed United States Naval facilities at Diego Garcia
FCO 46/346	1968-1969	Proposed United States Naval facilities at Diego Garcia

Source: <http://www/pro/gov/uk/releases/feb2002/list/htm>

¹⁴ UN General Assembly, 16 December 1985, 117th plenary meeting, on Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, The General Assembly,

Recalling the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, contained in its resolution 2832 (XXVI) of 16 December 1971, and recalling also its resolutions 2992 (XXVII) of 15 December 1972, 3080 (XXVIII) of 6 December 1973, 3259 A (XXIX) of 9 December 1974, 3468 (XXX) of 11 December 1975, 31/88 of 14 December 1976, 32/86 of 12 December 1977, S-10/2 of 30 June 1978, 33/68 of 14 December 1978, 34/80 A and B of 11 December 1979, 35/150 of 12 December 1980, 36/90 of 9 December 1981, 37/96 of 13 December 1982, 38/185 of 20 December 1983 and 39/149 of 17 December 1984, and other relevant resolutions,

Recalling further the report of the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean,

Reaffirming its conviction that concrete action for the achievement of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace would be a substantial contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security,

Recalling its decision, taken at its thirty-fourth session in resolution 34/80 B, to convene a Conference on the Indian Ocean at Colombo during 1981,

Recalling also its decision to make every effort, in consideration of the political and security climate in the Indian Ocean area and progress made in the harmonization of views, to finalize, in accordance with its normal methods of work, all preparations for the Conference, including the dates for its convening,

Recalling further its decision, taken at its thirty-ninth session in resolution 39/149, concerning the convening of the Conference in the first half of 1986,

Recalling the exchange of views in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean in 1985,

Noting the exchange of views on the adverse political and security climate in the region,

Noting further the various documents before the Ad Hoc Committee,

Convinced that the continued military presence of the great Powers in the Indian Ocean area, conceived in the context of their confrontation, gives urgency to the need to take practical steps for the early achievement of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace,

Considering that any other foreign military presence in the area, whenever it is contrary to the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, gives greater urgency to the need to take practical steps towards the early achievement of the objectives of the Declaration,

Considering further that the creation of a zone of peace requires co-operation and agreement among the States of the region to ensure conditions of peace and security within the area, as envisaged in the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, and respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the littoral and hinterland States,

Calling for the renewal of genuinely constructive efforts through the exercise of the political will necessary for the achievement of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace,

Deeply concerned at the danger posed by the grave and ominous developments in the area and the resulting sharp deterioration of peace, security and stability which particularly seriously affect the littoral and hinterland States, as well as international peace and security,

Convinced that the continued deterioration of the political and security climate in the Indian Ocean area is an important consideration bearing on the question of the urgent convening of the Conference and that the easing of tension in the area would enhance the prospect of success being achieved by the Conference,

1. Takes note of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and the exchange of views in the Committee;

2. Emphasizes its decision to convene the Conference on the Indian Ocean at Colombo as a necessary step for the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, adopted in 1971;

3. Notes that the Ad Hoc Committee has been unable, during 1985, to complete preparatory work relating to the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean and urges the Committee to continue its work with vigour and determination;

4. Requests the Ad Hoc Committee, taking into account the political and security climate in the region, to complete preparatory work relating to the Conference on the Indian Ocean during 1986 in order to enable the opening of the Conference at Colombo at an early date soon thereafter, but not later than 1988, to be decided by the Committee in consultation with the host country;

5. Emphasizes that the Conference called for in its resolution 34/80 B and subsequent resolutions and the establishment and maintenance of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace require the full and active participation and co-operation of all the permanent members of the Security Council, the major maritime users and the littoral and hinterland States;

6. Decides that preparatory work would comprise organizational matters and substantive issues, including the provisional agenda for the Conference, rules of procedure, participation, stages of the Conference, level of representation, documentation, consideration of appropriate arrangements for any international agreements that may ultimately be reached for the maintenance of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace and the preparation of the draft final document of the Conference;

7. Requests the Ad Hoc Committee at the same time to seek the necessary harmonization of views on remaining relevant issues;

8. Requests the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee to consult the Secretary-General, at the appropriate time, on the establishment of a secretariat for the Conference;

9. Renews the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee as defined in the relevant resolutions, and requests the Committee to intensify its work with regard to the implementation of its mandate;

10. Requests the Ad Hoc Committee to hold three preparatory sessions in 1986 of a duration of two weeks each, for completion of the preparatory work;

11. Requests the Ad Hoc Committee to submit to the Conference a report on its preparatory work;

12. Requests the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee to continue his consultations on the participation in the work of the Committee by States Members of the United Nations that are not members of the Committee, with the aim of resolving this matter at the earliest possible date;

13. Requests the Ad Hoc Committee to submit to the General Assembly at its forty-first session a full report on the implementation of the present resolution;

14. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to render all necessary assistance to the Ad Hoc Committee, including the provision of summary records, in recognition of its preparatory function.

¹⁵ E/1990/5/Add.21, 14 October 1994

¹⁶ "1. Mauritius was a British colony from 1810 to 1968. On 12 March 1968, it became an independent, sovereign State within the Commonwealth with the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern

Ireland, Head of the Commonwealth, as Head of State. On 12 March 1992, Mauritius acceded to the status of a Republic, with a Mauritian President as Head of State.

“2. When Mauritius achieved independence in 1968 its territory comprised the Island of Rodrigues, Agelega Island and the Cargados Carajos Islands, mainly St. Brandon.

“3. It should be recalled that at the Constitutional Conference held in London in 1965 between the Colonial

Office and political representatives of Mauritius, the Chagos Archipelago, including Diego Garcia, was excised from the territory of Mauritius.”

¹⁷ The Optional Protocol to the ICCPR

¹⁸ Excerpts from the OAU Charter: “**Determined** to safeguard and consolidate the hard-won independence as well as the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our states, and to fight against neo-colonialism in all its forms... **Purposes** ...“To defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity and independence; To eradicate all forms of colonialism from Africa.”

¹⁹ New Partnership for Africa’s Development was also known as New African Initiative, until the initials NAI were recognised as a swearword in South Africa. It represents the African rulers taking the decision to promote IMF and WB and WTO type development.

²⁰ Article 93 1. All Members of the United Nations are ipso facto parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

Article 94 1. Each Member of the United Nations undertakes to comply with the decision of the International Court of Justice in any case to which it is a party.

Article 96 1. The General Assembly or the Security Council may request the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion on any legal question.

2. Other organs of the United Nations and specialized agencies, which may at any time be so authorized by the General Assembly, may also request advisory opinions of the Court on legal questions arising within the scope of their activities.

Brief chronology

By Veena Dholah

- 1215 Magna Carta in England ensures right not to be exiled. 800 years later this human rights charter is referred to in the UK Supreme Court Judgement of 2000 giving Chagossians the right to return.
- 1715 Mauritius, including the Chagos Archipelagos and other islands of the Indian Ocean become a “possessions” of the French East India Company later goes bankrupt and sell these “possessions” to the king of France.
- 1776 Permanent population begin; at first leper colony, stable links with Mauritius island maintained.
- 1814 Chagos along with the whole other rest of Mauritius is ceded to Britain by France. In 1814 after the 1810 capitulation during the Napoleonic was all this island together make up the colony known as “The Mauritius”.
- 1815 Treaty of Vienna gives United Kingdom legal title to Mauritius and its dependencies including Chagos Archipelagos.
- 1960 The United Nation General Assembly adopts Declaration 1514 (XV) on the Granting of Independence of Colonial Countries and Peoples. UN Declaration Paragraph 5 clearly states that the transfer of power to the peoples of those territories which have not yet attained Independence should be effected “without any conditions or reservations....”
- 1960's A Special Committee on Decolonisation is created by United Nations' General Assembly (resolution no 1654), to monitor and report on the progress of all “trust and non self governing territories” and their movement towards independence.
- 1965 Resolution 2066 (XV) is passed : “Noting with deep concern that any step taken by the administrative power to detach certain islands from the Territory of Mauritius for the purpose of establishing a military base would be in contravention of the Declaration and in particular paragraph 6 thereof ...Invites the administering power to take no action which would dismember the territory of Mauritius and violate the territorial integrity ...”
- 1965 Chagossians visiting relatives and friends in Mauritius are not allowed to return to Chagos. They are informed that “The Islands are closed”. This, and other tactics, continue until 1973.
- 1965 In the run up to full independence, a Mauritius Constitutional Conference is held at Lancaster House, London. Mauritius delegation is comprised of representatives from the Mauritius Labour Party (PT), the Parti Mauricien Social Democrat (PMSD), the Independent Forward Block (IFB), the Muslim Committee of Action (CAM), and to Independent Legislative Assembly's members.
- 1965 BIOT *Order in Council of the Court of Buckingham Palace* to dismember the territory of Mauritius and violate its territorial integrity. Date of the actual legal implement of the “stealing” of the islands.
- 1965 First public announcement regard of excision was made in the House of Commons in the United Kingdom.
- 1965 £ 3 million paid by the British Government to Mauritian Government for supposed “sale of Chagos Islands”
- 1965 Following the Constitutional Conference, the Chagos Archipelago is detached from Mauritius and, along with three islands from the British colony of Seychelles, they are made into the new Colony of British Indian Ocean Territory (BIOT).

-
- 1966 United Kingdom signs a Defence Treaty leasing to the United States of America, the so-called BIOT for defence purposes. This turns US into a “receiver of stolen goods”.
- 1966 Forcible evictions of Chagossians from now onwards, by the British and US authorities.
- 1968 Diego Garcia Islanders given two months to pack up and leave for ever. Most are placed on the other Chagos Islands of Peros Banos and Salomon.
- 1968 The Colony of Mauritius which had comprised, inter alia, the Chagos Archipelago is granted independence but without Chagos.
- 1970 Non-Aligned Summit Resolution adopts to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace.
- 1971 The British Indian Ocean Territory Immigration (BIOT) Ordinance exiles all the people of Chagos.
- 1971 United Nations General Assembly adopts Indian Ocean Peace Zone Resolution 2832.
- 1972 Agreement is signed between United Kingdom and the United States of America supposedly establishing no more than a “communication facility” on Diego Garcia.
- 1972 Compensation is paid by Britain “supposed to have been final”-£650,000 for resettlement.
- 1972 United Nation Ad-Hoc Committee is set up so as to implement the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace resolution.
- 1973 Throughout 1973 forced eviction continue.
- 1973 Christian Simon, in despair commits suicide on the boat trip.
- 1973 Nordvaer is the ship bringing the last Chagossians. They hold a sit-in on the ship and refuse to disembark.
- 1973 Housing estate houses and dockers flats made available to some families because of demonstration onboard of Nordvaer.
- 1975 George Champion sets up “1966 Society for Diego Garcia” in UK to support Chagossians.
- 1976 Seychelles Gains an important victory when Aldabra, Desroches and Farquhar Islands are returned to the Seychelles. The US cancels its 60-year lease agreement with the UK.
- 1976 Chagossian, Michel Vencatessen puts court action against British Government. He is assisted by his lawyer, Bernard Sheridan.
- 1976 Organisation Fraternelle supports Chagossians, sets up Comité Ilois OF.
- 1978 At Bain Des Dames in Port-Louis six women go on hunger strike, including Marie Lisette Talate, Charlesia Alexis and Louise Latouche. Supporters who stayed overnight include Ragini Kistnasamy, Lindsey Collen, Marie France Favory, Rajni Lallah, Serge Rayapoullé, Lindsay Aza. Ram Seegobin assisted as medical practitioner.
- 1978 Demonstration in the street of Port-Louis organised by the MMM and others over Diego Garcia and Tromelin.
- 1979 A “Comité” asks Sheridan (Mr. Vencatassen’s lawyer) to negotiate more compensation. British Government offers £ 1.5 m on the express condition that (i) Vencatassen withdraw his case (ii) sign a “full and final” and “never to return” document.
- 1979 Visit of sailors (Mauritians and Mauritians of Chagossian Origine) to Chagos.
- 1980 Lalit de Klas distribute leaflets to US Marines in Port-Louis harbour, calling for the closing of the Diego Garcia base.
- 1980 Organisation for the African Unity passes resolution calling for the unconditional return of Diego Garcia to Mauritius, as its continued occupation represent a permanent threat to Africa as a Zone of Peace.
- 1980 supplement: “Diego Lamor” in Lalit de Klas magazine.
- 1980 Françoise Botte publishes her research on “The Ilois Community and Ilois Women”.
- 1980 A unanimous resolution is taken at the Heads of State OAU Conference at Freetown, Sierra Leone, 1-4th July 1980, to demand dismantling of the Diego Garcia base, and the retrocession of Chagos to Mauritius.

-
- 1981 Chagossian women's hungerstrike at Company Gardens, 3 days street demonstration by 200 women including MLF and Lalit women. Arrest of 8 women and detention in Line Barracks for three days.
- 1981 Trial of 8 women arrested at the demonstration under the POA (Public Order Act).
- 1981 Front National de Soutien aux Ilois set up.
- 1981 Publication of Hervé Silva's Report on the "Survey on the Conditions of Living of the Ilois Community Displaced from the Chagos Archipelago.
- 1981 Delegation of Chagossians goes to London for negotiations, as a direct result of street demonstrations and massive mobilisation.
- 1981 Lagazet Lalit de Klas publishes proof of nuclear materials being transhipped at Diego Garcia.
- 1982 Select Committee of Parliament set up by Standing Order, with terms of reference to look into the circumstances which led to and followed the excision of the Chagos Archipelago including Diego Garcia from Mauritius in 1965 and at the exact nature of the transactions that took place.
- 1982 As a result of the popular mobilization, street demonstrations, arrests and trials of women demonstrators, and after the 1981 negotiations, UK pays rs 75,880,000 compensation to the Chagossians. Ilois Trust Fund is set up.
- 1983 Report of the Select Committee on the Excision of the Chagos Archipelago is published.
- 1983 The 7th Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement, when it meets in Delhi, votes a resolution for the dismantling of the base and for the retrocession of Diego Garcia and Chagos to Mauritius.
- 1989 The US, UK and France pull out of the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace Ad-Hoc Committee to prevent the Colombo Conference of 1990 from going ahead.
- 1990 Hungerstrike of the Organisation Fraternelle is held at Pointe aux Sables.
- 1990 The Mauritian State tables an official motion to put Diego Garcia and the Chagos Archipelago on to the United Nations General Assembly agenda. Some weeks later, it withdraws this motion.
- 1991 US uses Diego Garcia base to bombard civilians in Iraq.
- 1992 Mauritian new Republican Constitution names Chagos including Diego Garcia as part of Mauritius.
- 1994 Agreement is signed between Britain and Mauritius on fishing. This is the first official agreement in which the Mauritian State accepts the existence of a military base on its territory.
- 1994 Publication of novel *The Rape of Sita* by Lindsey Collen, with fictionalised accounts of Chagos struggles.
- 1995 The UN Economic, Social and Cultural Rights Committee draws attention to the fact that self-determination has not been implemented in the case of Mauritius because of illegal occupation of Chagos in its Concluding Observations, when Mauritius country is being reviewed.
- 1996 Pelindaba Treaty for a Nuclear-Arms-Free Africa is drawn up and signed. The Mauritian State accepts that dotted lines be put around Diego Garcia in the Treaty map.
- 1997 Lalit "Open Letter to Tony Blair".
- 1997 From here onwards, Official Secrets Act in UK 30-year secrecy rule expires. Documents now public.
- 1997 "Diego Files" series by Henri Marimootoo published in Week End newspaper.
- 1997 Rann Nu Diego Committee is set up by Lalit and Grup Refizye Chagos. Some 12 organizations members. Negotiations with Greenpeace to visit Diego Garcia by boat.
- 1998 Ferdinand Mardarin and his legal advisor, Hervé Lasemillante present case for Chagossians as "autochtone" at United Nations Committee in Geneva.
- 1999 Lalit runs International campaigns for electors in their countries to put pressure on US President Clinton and UK Prime Minister Blair to close the US base, compensate Chagossians, and make way for the re-uniting Mauritius.

-
- 1999 Victory in *Bancoult v Queen* case, granting Chagossians the right to return, and exposing the state conspiracy of the 1960's. Historically important judgement.
- 2000 African Growth and Opportunity Act is passed.
- 2000 Ram Seegobin, Lalit member, exposes link between AGOA and Diego Garcia at international workers' meetings in San Francisco and Los Angeles.
- 2000 Publication of novel *Mutiny* by Lindsey Collen, with account of fictional Chagossians Woman's life.
- 2001 US bombs Afghan civilians from its base on Diego Garcia.
- 2001 United Nations General Assembly adopts new Resolution on Indian Ocean Zone of Peace.
- 2001 Lalit circulates open letter to citizens of UK and US.
- 2001 Lalit runs poster campaign: "SSR ti vann Diego ar UK, Bérenger ek Jugnauth pe vann Diego ar US".
- 2001 Anti-War Lalit forum at Port Louis Theatre. Base closure called for.
- 2002 Mauritian Government for the first time officially receives an official of the BIOT.
- 2002 Lecture on Diego Garcia by Lindsey Collen at History Conference in Liverpool, UK.
- 2002 Chagos Refugees Group and their legal advisor, Robin Mardaymootoo, sue the British state for damages and reparations. (As we go to press)
- 2002 Chagos Refugees Group and their legal advisor, Robin Mardaymootoo, sue the US State, Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld and US corporations for damages for torture and genocide. (Still in courts as we go to press)
- 2002 Sahrignon holds Strategy Workshop in Mauritius. Organizations and individuals present vote a resolution for US Base Closure, for reunification of Mauritius, for reparations and resettlement, for an ecological assessment, and for the Mauritian Government to create a 22nd Constituency for Chagos, and to present a bold resolution at the UN. The resolution is now being circulated for Africa wide endorsement. (As we go to press).
- 2002 US uses African Growth and Opportunity Act (Trade Law) to silence Mauritian State.
- 2002 US Armed Forces prepare Diego Garcia for war against Iraq.

RECENT CAMPAIGNS DOCUMENT-1

LETTER TO TONY BLAIR

1st July, 1997

Dear Sir,

We choose today to address you this open letter demanding the return of Diego Garcia and the whole of the Chagos Archipelago to the Republic of Mauritius because it is the very day of the return of the Republic of China. It is a day when people are obliged to remember the cruelties of colonization and to think of making repair.

65 Mauritian Islands still colonized

British colonization still persists, even after the end of colonization in Hong Kong.

As you know, Britain still occupies the British Indian Ocean Territories (BIOT). This colony consisting of 65 islands, was dismembered from Mauritius, as part of an illegal condition for Independence, and the BIOT was set up as a brand new colony as late as 1968.

All the islands concerned were cruelly "depopulated" by the British State, an act described in an editorial in the Washington Post of the 11th September 1975, as "this act of mass kidnapping".

Until today, the British Government rents the BIOT to the United States Armed Forces. They, in turn, use Diego Garcia not as a "communications station" as the British Government at the time officially pretended they would, but as a huge, full-scale military base, literally bristling with nuclear installations. Thus, the beautiful coral island, described by an Englishman shipwrecked on it in 1786 as "one of the wonderful phenomena of the globe" is now an Anglo-American military enterprise.

Britain's admission that Chagos is indeed Mauritian.

The last Conservative Government re-illuminated Britain's admission that the colony ought eventually to be returned to Mauritius.

We quote from Mr Howell, former British High Commissioner to Mauritius, who in a letter to the Mauritian former Prime Minister in July 1992, admitted: "the British Government has always acknowledged that Mauritius has a legitimate interest in the future of these islands and recognizes the Government of the Republic of Mauritius as the only State which has a right to assert a claim to sovereignty when the United Kingdom relinquishes its own sovereignty.

The British Government has therefore given an undertaking to the Government of the Republic of Mauritius that, when the islands are no longer needed for the defense purposes of the United Kingdom and the United States, they will be ceded to Mauritius."

We think it is high time now.

Labour responsible

With the advent of the new Labour Government, under your leadership, we think that it would be in keeping with general anti-colonial sentiments and commitments of the Labour Party that the Labour Party at once begins a process of the return of this territory to Mauritius.

This would be particularly apt, as it was actually under a Labour Government, that of Mr. Harold Wilson, that in 1965, the Chagos Archipelago was "excised" by an Order of Her Majesty's Council. It was under a Labour Government that the shameful transfer of 3 million pounds was paid for the "resettling" of the people of the excised islands, the Ilois people. It was also under a Labour Government that as from 1970, the Ilois were forcibly removed from their homes. Ilois families by the hundred were tricked, then cajoled, and then removed forcibly from the islands, the last resisters brought over in slave-like conditions onboard the

“Nordvaer”, imprisoned temporarily in Seychelles, which was also a British Colony, and then, had it not been for a demonstration onboard, they, too, would have been literally “dumbed” in the slums of Port Louis to fend for themselves as Ilois preceding them had been. It was under a Labour Government that all this took place. This means that there would be a kind of “poetic justice” in a Labour Government being the Government that starts procedures for the just retrocession of the Chagos to Mauritius, for the restoring of sovereignty to Mauritius, thus ending another bit of shameful colonial history.

Labour in Mauritius also responsible

By strange co-incidence, the Labour Party of Mauritius finds itself in power in Mauritius for the first time (outside alliances) since 1982; and it was indeed the Mauritian Labour Party which in 1965 in the pre-independence “Government” went into the illegal “deal” for the detachment of the 65 islands. This kind of deal is specifically outlawed by international law, because a colony (or any pre-independence government) is not a separate entity yet, and is therefore unable to enter into any type of contract or treaty. In fact, what this kind of “deal” amounts to is the British State making a deal with a part of itself, its pre-independence Mauritian cabinet.

The Labour Party of Mauritius knows that the deal was illegal, and knew full well at the time, as well.

Those on both sides of the illicit agreement are thus in power at the moment and are thus in a position to make historic amends.

Secret Documents published recently

At the very same time as your new Government has been elected, there have been certain key British documents until now classified as “defense secret” (file No FO371/184523) which have recently been de-classified and made public in a series of press articles in Week End in Mauritius. These documents reveal the 1964 Anglo-American survey, the United States insistence on getting “the whole Chagos Archipelago”, and revealed the “price” in terms not only of the so-called “3 million pounds compensation”, but also in terms of a quota of sugar being allowed into the US market!

The then Colonial Secretary, Anthony Greenwood, was quite rightly concerned: “We may have a rough time at the United Nations but we are prepared for that”, he wrote.

These “new” documents were not available at the time of the Congressional hearing in the USA on the question of Diego Garcia and their availability means that we can press for the US Congress to take the matter up again.

UN, OAU and Non-Aligned support for retrocession.

UN Resolution number 1514 is quite unambiguous in referring to the inalienable right of Colonial people’s to Independence. In addition there has been a number of bold UN Resolutions about the illegality of Anglo-American occupation of the Chagos and the necessity for the retrocession of the Archipelago, including Diego Garcia, for example Resolution 2066 (xx) of 1965, which the UK Government naturally did not sign, instructing Britain “to take no action which would dismember the territory of Mauritius and (not) to violate its territorial integrity”. The 1971 Indian Ocean Zone of Peace resolution, has also continued to be violated.

Britain also clearly violated Article 9 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 at the time, as: “No-one should be subjected to...exile”.

At the Organization for African Unity there have also been quite unequivocal resolutions. Until today they stand.

The retrocession of Chagos has also been an on-going demand of the Non-Alligned Movement (1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1977, 1979, 1980 and until today).

Battles here in Mauritius for retrocession and demilitarization

Over the years in Mauritius there have been ongoing protests, petitions, demonstrations, hunger strikes, processions, and street riots for the return of Diego Garcia and the whole of Chagos. A second wave of compensation was even gained in 1981 from the British Government, after a long hunger strike by the Ilois women, which ended in the arrest of eight women demonstrators, five Ilois and three of our women members. This demonstration was followed by long court cases for illegal protest, and the acquittal of all eight women, for lack of clear evidence being produced by the police.

Demilitarization campaign

In your country, the USA and all over the world, there are progressive people who are struggling for de-militarisation, including de-nuclearization. One of the realtive gains has been the Treaty of Pelindaba, signed in June 1995, which declares the Indian Ocean to be “Nuclear-Weapon-Free”. However, because of the occupation of Diego Garcia, the British and USA insisted that dotted lines be put around the Chagos Archipelago, which is thus once again “excised”, this time from this supposedly epoch-making anti-nuclear- weapon pact.

We will be calling on the people of the United States of America to put pressure on their government to close down its base at once, The USA is, in any case, closing down many bases, and plans to close down still more bases. Recently Subic Bay and Pearl Harbour bases have been down-graded.

There is no longer any Cold War. The Cold War, was in any case, at best a weak pretext for the dismembering of a nation state, for the exiling of a people and for a savage militarization of the Chagos.

Economic value

Britain and the USA risk being accused of the holding on to the BIOT for economic reasons, as well as military. The vast banks and shelves around the Chagos are probably a source of great riches. And these do not belong to the multinationals of the UK and USA but to the people who live here.

Colonization continues

As if to make our demand for re-unification of Mauritius all the more poignant, at this very moment there is a Mauritian worker, Mr. Louis Cherry Annea, who is in prison in London, after having been tried in a BIOT court on Diego Garcia. He was working as a contract worker at the US base, and got into a fight with someone. Instead of being tried in Mauritius, he was tried by BIOT, and sent to prison in London.

Conclusion

We remind you that in keeping with the fact that the “excision” of 1965 was null and void because of being contrary to UN General Assembly resolutions 1514 (xxv) and 2066, the constitution of Mauritius reads as follows: (sec.111) : “Mauritius includes – (a) the islands of Mauritius, Rodrigues, Agalega, Tromelin, Cargados Carajos and the Chagos Archipelago including Diego Garcia and any other island comprised in the state of Mauritius”.

We, in LALIT, intend to help to build up an international movement for the demilitarization of the Chagos Archipelago, and for the end to this last bit of British colonization in the Indian Ocean. We hope that your Labour Party Government will contribute to this ongoing movement for progress, and make a clean break with politics of previous British regimes.

*Yours sincerely,
Alain Ah-Vee
for LALIT*

RECENT CAMPAIGNS DOCUMENT-2

The Rann Nu Diego Committee

The Rann Nu Diego Committee was jointly initiated by *Lalit* and the *Groupe Refugiés Chagos* in 1998. Here is the platform developed by this Committee and a list of the founding members.

Platform

- For the dismantlement of the military and nuclear base on Diego Garcia.
- For a peaceful Indian Ocean Zone.
- For the retrocession of the Chagos Archipelago to the Republic of Mauritius.
- For the right of the Illois Community as well as any Mauritian citizen to return to the Chagos Archipelago if they wish so.
- For a life compensation for all Illois people who have suffered from deportation in 1965.
- For the setting up of an Illois Welfare Fund.
- For the retrocession of Tromelin to the Republic of Mauritius

Members of Komite Rann Nu Diego:

Lalit

Grup Refizye Chagos

Muvman Liberasyon Fam

General Workers Federation

Federation of Progressive Unions

Rodrigues Government Employees Association

Federation of Pre-School Playgroups

Rassemblement Pour la Reforme

and the following individuals:

Atma Shanto, Kishore Mundil, Jean Claude Augustave, Dick Ng Sui Wa.

RECENT CAMPAIGNS DOCUMENT-3

THE AGOA AND DIEGO

This is the summary of a speech made in February 2000 by Ram Seegobin, Lalit representative at the World Conference of Workers' Organizations held in San Francisco. There were delegates from some 65 countries present.

"I shall speak of two international campaigns that my organisation has been actively participating in. They show the need for trade union independence, on the one hand, and for workers' solidarity the world over, on the other hand. I will show how, strangely, they are related to each other.

The first campaign has been to organise resistance to the Africa Growth and Opportunities Act, both in Mauritius and in the other 47 countries involved. Why organise resistance in Africa to a law that is being voted here in the USA?

Briefly, the AGOA, in exchange for so-called free trade, imposes:

- (i) The uniform IMF prescriptions on all 48 African countries¹.
- (ii) WTO rules (even those pushed back after the "battle of Seattle"²).
- (iii) Clauses of the aborted "Multilateral Agreement on Investments"³.

AGOA is not in the interest of workers, either here in the US, or in any of the African countries involved. It is really only US multinational corporations that will benefit, in the long run, from this legislation, and yet part of the trade union bureaucracy in Mauritius found itself on the wrong side of the barricade, for lack of independence from the influence of the Government and the bosses, in their application of the logic of capitalist globalization.

The second campaign has been on the demilitarization of the Indian Ocean, in particular for the dismantling of the US military base on the island of Diego Garcia in the Chagos Archipelago.

This Archipelago was illegally excised from Mauritius in 1965 prior to Mauritius shaking off the British colonial yoke. Between 1965 and 1971, some 2000 Mauritians of Chagos origin were forcibly removed from the Chagos Archipelago to allow the military base to be set up there.

We have been campaigning for the dismantling of the base, the return of the Chagos Archipelago to Mauritian sovereignty, and for Chagos people to have the right of return and reparations.

What is the link between the two campaigns I have just described?

In the case of the AGOA, the eligibility of each African country to the dubious benefits of that legislation is subject to the President of the USA taking into account, and I quote: "Whether or not such country engages in activities that undermine US national security of *FOREIGN POLICY INTEREST*" end of quote (The emphasis is mine)

I shall leave you with the following question: "When we continue to press for the dismantling of the military base and for the return of the Chagos Archipelago to Mauritian Sovereignty, will that be considered as undermining 'US foreign policy interest'?"

I think we should constantly keep in mind the lessons to be drawn from these two examples. I thank you.

1 Especially as regards to liberalisation, privatisation, doing away with price controls.

2 Reference to the huge demonstration in Seattle for the WTO summit there in December 1999.

3 This multilateral agreement had been fabricated secretly by the G-7 countries, then passed more-or-less secretly in the OECD countries, and was about to be imposed on the world, when a widespread movement, starting in Canada, began against it. It was abandoned for reasons of its unpopularity.

RECENT CAMPAIGNS DOCUMENT-4

International Tribunal of Workers and Peoples of Africa, February 2000

Ram Seegobin exposes the dangers of AGOA conditionalities

In February 2000, as ex-Prime Minister Navin Ramgoolam was in Washington, US to lobby for the African Growth and Opportunity Bill, Ram Seegobin was in Los Angeles to depone at the "International Tribunal of Workers and Peoples of Africa". In his deposition, Ram Seegobin highlights, amongst the many dangerous conditionalities in AGOA for peoples of Africa, the threat that this law would constitute for the struggle to close down the US base on Diego Garcia.

"Dear Sisters and Brothers:

I will be speaking on the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act. The Clinton Administration, the American Congress, and American Multinationals are attempting a recolonization of 48 countries in the southern part of the African continent, through the instrument of this Bill.

What is the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), previously known as the Africa Bill, or the Lugar-Crane Bill, or perhaps more appropriately as the Africa Recolonization Bill?

The introductory line to the Bill, which has already been voted in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, albeit in different versions, reads thus: " To authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa." The gist of the Bill is to offer free entry into the American market (i.e no quota or tariff barrier) to a certain number of manufactured goods from the 48 African countries listed in the Bill: free entry as long as these 48 "targeted" countries comply with the conditionalities enumerated in the Bill. In other words: free trade, but at a price". Later we shall come back to these conditionalities.

We think it is very appropriate that our Party LALIT from Mauritius should speak out against the murderous policies that this particular Bill represents. Appropriate because the Mauritian State and Bourgeoisie, as a joint venture, have been in the forefront of the lobbying in favor of this Bill. Right now, as a joint Senate-House of Representatives Conference Committee is attempting to reconcile the two different versions of the Bill voted, the Prime Minister of Mauritius, aided and abetted by textile industrialists, is in Washington trying to convince the Senate Foreign Committee presided by the notorious Senator Jesse Helms, that the Africa Growth and Opportunity Bill is a good thing for the United States; the Prime Minister of Mauritius will continue his lobbying at the National Prayers Breakfast.

There has been strong opposition to this Bill from within the U.S.: the American Textile Manufacturers Institute has expressed concern that the Bill will offer opportunities for cheap Asian textiles to flood the American market, after trans-shipment through African countries. The reassurance offered to the American Manufacturers by the Mauritian Ambassador in Washington is quite candid: he writes in a letter published in The Washington Times of September 2, 1998: "There are tremendous opportunities for the U.S. domestic textile industry to set up profitable enterprises in Africa, just as it has done in Mexico and the Caribbean\$.". We can easily understand why the AFL-CIO has also expressed strong opposition to the Bill. But if in the U.S. the Bill may represent a threat to employment, for the 48 African countries concerned, the threat is of a different nature, of a totally different magnitude.

What is the basis of our accusations?

In exchange for free entry into the American market, the Bill imposes an economic model that will bring social, political, and economic disaster to the African countries concerned. The Bill represents a direct threat to these countries' sovereignty, the well-being of their peoples, and their future development.

- The Bill starts off by a colonial style carving up of the Continent: it establishes a list of 48 countries that it describes as "sub-Saharan Africa"
- The conditionalities contained in the Bill impose IMF type rules that aim at decreasing corporate tax while increasing indirect taxation like VAT that affect the poor more, cutting back expenditure on social services and infrastructure development, broad privatization through divestiture, causing dramatic increases in the price of domestic water and electricity supply, and other services.
- Although the WTO has suffered a serious set-back in the Battle of Seattle, the Bill imposes the agenda of the WTO in terms of tariff cuts, removal of import restrictions and subsidies on food and agriculture, liberalizing of service sectors to allow unlimited foreign acquisitions and deregulation, monopoly patent and other intellectual property rights.
- The conditionalities go as far as replicating the provisions of the defunct Multilateral Agreement on Investment, in terms of currency and investment deregulations, same treatment for foreign investors as for national capital, thus establishing new rights for foreign investors to grab ownership over Africa's natural resources and land.

Apart from the above conditionalities, the President of the USA, when deciding on the eligibility of any of the 48 African countries listed in the Bill, takes into account "Whether or not such country engages in activities that undermine United States national security or foreign policy interests." Mauritius, for example, will need to think twice before pressing its sovereignty claim on the Chagos Archipelago with a U.S. military base on Diego Garcia, as this might be interpreted as an action which undermines the "foreign policy interests" of the U.S., and this would immediately make Mauritius "ineligible", and precipitate widespread closing down of textile factories that would have in the meantime become totally dependent on the American market. Even a particular vote in the U.N. General Assembly may be interpreted by the U.S. President as undermining the "foreign policy interests" of the U.S.

The version of the Bill voted by the Senate contains a further conditionality which is not in the House of Representatives version, and which caps all the others: to qualify for free entry of their manufactured goods into the American market, African countries covered by the Bill will, in addition, have to import the raw materials from the U.S.! A condition that the Senate inserted into the Bill to allow for the usual "wheeling and dealing" and "horse trading" that must be happening right now in the Conference Committee which is trying to reconcile the different versions of the Bill voted in the House of Representatives and Senate, respectively.

There are now several studies that have been carried out by organizations like OXFAM, and even the OECD and World Bank, that have established beyond any doubt that countries that have been compelled to adopt the uniform prescription of IMF Structural Adjustment Programmes have suffered enormously: agricultural production has stagnated, with the loss of food security and widespread famine; health care systems have collapsed, with even basic care becoming a commodity well outside the means of the vast majority; school attendance rates are declining, while thousands of teachers have been sacked or are receiving no wages; subsidized housing projects have been abandoned, with millions living in shanty towns; essential infrastructure development has ground to a halt, for lack of funds.

The Africa Bill will impose these same harsh economic and social measures, with the same disastrous effects. The internal economy of African countries will collapse, the masses will suffer from famine and deadly epidemics, and local conflicts will erupt in an increasing number of areas (as happened in Rwanda/Burundi), bringing about the tragedy of millions of refugees walking away from one armed conflict into another.

We now pose the question: who stands to benefit in the medium and long term, from the provisions of the Africa Bill? The working masses in the African countries will suffer the same poverty, or even worse, that they have known under the IMF programmes, the American working class will fear factory closures and lay-offs.

Evidently, with the WTO type measures included in the Africa Bill, U.S. industrial capital will see increased markets in the African countries concerned: recently U.S. exports to Africa have stagnated, and is losing ground to Japanese, South-East Asian, and European export drives. Even in the tiny market that the Republic of Mauritius represents, the U.S. Ambassador has, over the past year, made several public statements to deplore the fact that U.S. products were not managing to penetrate the market. But certainly the biggest beneficiaries of the Africa Bill will be the U.S.-based multinationals. Here I will quote from an article by Leonard Robinson Jr., President and CEO of the National Summit on Africa, that appeared in The San Francisco Chronicle on June 3, 1999: " According to the U.S. Commerce Department, the average return on investment in Africa is more than 20%- higher than in any other region. As Coca Cola, American Express, McDonald's, Microsoft and other corporations have discovered, doing business in Africa is good business."

We must now pose another question: why do so many African governments and bourgeoisies actively support the Africa Bill? With the setting up of regional economic and trade blocks, something which incidentally the Africa Bill encourages actively, the capitalists in African countries have started to move their production units around from country to country to maximize their profits through cheap labour.

Already the largest knitwear producing company in Mauritius has delocated half of its production units to Madagascar: the sugar companies in Mauritius now manage production units in Mozambique, Benin, and Ivory Coast. South African capital has moved into the sugar industry in Mauritius. Soon there will be a regional African capitalist class which can already see that the Africa Bill will allow it to move about in the region to maximize profit, while having a guaranteed market for its export products.

In Mauritius, in particular, the capitalist class has developed under the protectionist umbrella of the Europe-ACP Lomé Convention, so for them, the Africa Bill represents a bridge to allow them to negotiate the threatened WTO dismantling of Conventions like the Lomé one. They are not particularly concerned with the havoc that the Africa Bill will cause for the working masses in any particular country in the region.

So for that reason we accuse equally the bourgeoisie and political régimes of the 48 African countries concerned by the Africa Bill , for their cynical collusion with the U.S. Multinationals who are the driving force behind the imposition of IMF, WTO, and MAI- type conditionalities in exchange for so-called free trade between African countries and the U.S.

To sustain the accusations against the Africa Growth and Opportunity Bill, I will quote from documents and Appeal Letters from organizations, both here in the U.S. and in Africa, who have also studied the murderous implications of this Bill.

1. Letter to U.S. Senators

Letter addressed to U.S. Senators by 28 public figures in the U.S., including Senators and Congressmen:

"Under the cover of an appealing name and non-binding preamble, the Lugar-Crane bill contains numerous provisions mainly aimed at benefiting large foreign private investors and multinational corporations at the expense of true and equitable African development" " It would be cynical indeed if the terms of this legislation promoted the replacement of the governmental colonialism Africa fought to escape with economic colonialism of equally strangling dimensions. Indeed, some African economists, writing in the journal Third World Economics, specifically have labelled the Crane Bill as an instrument of recolonization".

2. Letter to OAU General Secretary

Open Letter addressed to the *OAU* General Secretary by the All Workers Conference of Mauritius: " It is in the context of independence and human rights that we write a desperate appeal in the name of the Mauritian working class and the African working class that the *Organization for African Unity* call on all member countries to weigh up the dangers of the new carving up of Africa and recolonization of so-called "Sub-saharan Africa" that will occur as direct result of the Africa Growth and Opportunity Bill, which is in the U.S. Congress again."

3. Ressionation of Southern African Organisations

Southern African Peoples Organizations: Resolution taken at the Harare Workshop, 6-8 October 1999:

" We therefore call on you, as U.S. Senator, to:

1. Vote against AGOB that is being presented in the Senate
2. Oppose all conditionalities that we mentioned above in any U.S. legislation that concern trade and aid with Africa.

4. Pan-African Women's Declaration

Appeal of African Women and Women's Organizations (endorsed by 212 women and delegates of Women's organizations after the WILDAF General Assembly, Accra, Ghana, July '99)

"We, African women's organizations and African women call on you, as an African Head of State to oppose conditionalities in the African Growth and Opportunity Act being debated in the U.S. Senate."

"These conditionalities will have a drastic impact on African women's lives. Human rights for African women depends on African States ensuring universal access to basic economic and social services, to public infrastructure, access to land, to protection of our collective agricultural heritage and control of seeds on the one hand and animal genetic material on the other, to the right to secure employment and to the right to a living wage."

Conclusion

To conclude: The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act will undermine the sovereignty of African countries, attack the economic and social rights of the working masses, and cause a major set-back in the development of democratic institutions that can respond to peoples' aspirations and needs in Africa.

RECENT CAMPAIGNS DOCUMENT-5

The 2002 Resolution on Diego Garcia initiated by the Sahrington Strategy workshop

The Southern Africa Human Rights NGO Network (SAHRINGON) a regional network for human rights and democracy, organised a National Strategy Workshop on Tuesday 24th September 2002 in Port-Louis, Mauritius. Sixty (60) participants were present, and after deliberation, adopted the following resolutions. Lindsey Collen and Alain Ah-Vee, representing Ledikasyon Pu Travayer participated in the workshop.

We, the undersigned, taking note that:

In 1965, when the British government excised the sixty five (65) Chagos Islands including Diego Garcia from the rest of the Mauritius Islands, this was done illegally, as a condition for Independence, and noting that the British government then unlawfully took these islands and some Seychelles Islands (Seychelles was still a colony) and formed a new territory called BIOT (British Indian Ocean Territory);

Noting that, the British government illegally bartered with the US Government: Diego Garcia was offered to the US Armed Forces for a military base in exchange for Polaris missiles for the British Armed Forces. The US insisted that the islands be “depopulated”. The British and US authorities then proceeded with forced evictions of the two thousand (2000) inhabitants. They were transported to Seychelles and Mauritius over the years 1965 to 1973 through a combination of tricks, intimidation, terror and brute force. This secretive plot was designed to evade Chapter XI of the UN charter on colonial territories and to avoid the scrutiny of world public opinion. And noting that all the facts in this paragraph have been confirmed by the Judges in the UK Royal High Court in the case¹ for the right to return which the Chagossians won.

And noting that the Diego Garcia military base, which is situated in the SADC region, has been and is still being used for B52's to bombard civilian populations in Iraq and Afghanistan. And noting that this US base represents a permanent threat to peace and security in the region.

And noting that, since then, the forcibly displaced Mauritians of Chagossian origin, together with the citizens of mainland Mauritius, have constantly struggled for their common sovereignty and rights through petitions, conferences, seminars, hunger strikes, common fronts, and street demonstrations.

And noting that UN resolutions on *Indian Ocean Zone of Peace* have also been a constant pressure for base closure. And noting that in 1980 an OAU resolution called for the unconditional return of Diego Garcia to Mauritius as its continued occupation represents a permanent threat to Africa as a Zone of Peace. And noting that the continued existence of the US military base on Diego Garcia constitute an infringement of the Pelindaba Treaty for a Nuclear Arms Free Africa. And noting that the Republic of Seychelles successfully claimed its islands back.

And taking note that:

The Southern Africa Human Rights NGO Network (SAHRINGON) as a regional network for human rights and democracy, organised a National Strategy Workshop on Tuesday 24th September 2002 in Port Louis, Mauritius. The sixty (60) participants present, after deliberations, adopted the following resolutions which we the undersigned endorse below:

1. For the immediate closure of the US military base of Diego Garcia.
2. For the complete decolonisation of Africa through the disbanding of BIOT and the reunification of the Republic of Mauritius.
3. Support for the request for an independent assessment of the ecological damage caused by the thirty years occupation by the US.
4. Support for the legitimate claims for compensation/reparations and resettlement of the Mauritians of Chagossian origin.
5. That the Mauritian government proclaims the Chagos Archipelago as the 22nd electoral constituency of the Republic of Mauritius.

We also call upon the Mauritian government to table a bold resolution at the UN General Assembly for immediate action on the above-mentioned points.

RECENT CAMPAIGNS DOCUMENT-6

Letter to any interested people in UK and U.S.A about injustices elsewhere

The Island of Diego Garcia, B52'S and you and me

This open letter on Diego Garcia was written by Lalit and Muvman Libarasyon Fam member, Lindsey Collen in October 2001, and was circulated internationally by Lalit. It was sent to political organization, to anti-capitalist networks, to the women's movement across the world, and was in turn recirculated by them internationally. After this letter was circulated Lalit received over 100 responses, including responses from a few ignorant GI's.

Dear people of Britain and USA,

I write from Mauritius,

You may not remember quite where that is. Although, then again "The Overcrowded Bay Baracoon" by V.S. Naipaul, especially since he has just won the Nobel Prize for Literature, may just stir a memory, if ever you come across his bitingly accurate travelogue where Mauritius is depicted as a lousy hell-hole of a place. His story was banned by the Mauritian Government at the time.

Or the word "Mauritius" may evoke the equally accurate tourist brochures showing luscious green islands, where it never rains of course. A place so perfect for visitors to holiday in, that there are no people actually living there. No factory workers on piece rates, no sugarcane workers in that hot sun, no computer workers linked to satellite, not even hotel workers as human beings. May be just a stage props for dreams.

But there are people living here. In all the contradictions. And some of us have a link with you. Through our shared history.

That's how it is that I come to write to you, who vote in and are citizens of Britain or the US? I, who vote here and am a citizen of Mauritius.

It's all because of an island.

It's a particular island that you, over there, and us, over here, share responsibility for. Only maybe you don't know that you share this responsibility. And while we know we do, we can't do enough about it so long as we are on our own.

This island is being used for waging war.

In Mauritius it is hard to find anyone who agrees to the island, part of our country after all, being used for B-52's to set off from to go bombard the cities of Afghanistan. Our hearts ache to see the children in the rubble the next morning. Maybe there is someone here who agrees, but I haven't met the person yet.

The Mauritius Foreign Affairs Ministers did publicly "give assent". So he agrees. But he only says it in his formal speeches as representative of the state. At a political party rally, he would certainly not try it. The people are too angry with "America".

I'll share the story with you, the story about the island. It is a "small story". But it is one that will perhaps help understand the deepness of the rage felt in so many places against the powers that be in your countries. A rage often wrongly projected on to "Americans" as a whole. A rage that sometimes makes it hard for people world-wide to pardon the ignorance amongst ordinary folks in the US and Britain about the role of their elected governments in "the rest of the world". (The rest of the world is such a big place.)

And this rage here, and I would think elsewhere in the rest of the world, too has somehow got mixed up with the horror that spread on the day of the attack on the World Trade Center, an attack by missiles made up of passengers and aimed at the level of the hearts of the Twin Towers. Causing collapse. And the terrible emptiness left at Ground Zero. Giant in rubble, Enough to cause everyone on the planet insomnia. And yet somehow the recurring image, no matter how much I try to wipe it from my mind, is that of Goliath being felled by the hand-made sling of the new millennium, a carpet cutter.

And then? As if bombarding Kabul from B-52's could rout out young men with carpet cutters.

But, I am speaking today, in particular, of an island. The island of Diego Garcia. And the role of the Diego Garcia military base on it. A US base it is, in the Indian Ocean. In the Republic of Mauritius, more specifically. And curiously, just one week before the 11 September came and changed everything, the Bush administration announced that Diego Garcia was being expanded to take in all the hardware and troops from US bases in Europe that, they added, would from then on be gradually phased out.

The story I will tell is so evocative that you may not have believed it, were it not for all the articles in November last year on the High Court in London's stinging judgement against the British State in a case brought by people from here. The time had come around for a court action for the right of inhabitants to return to the island, when all the relevant facts, after a 30-year period of being held under secrecy laws, were "declassified" in Britain in 1998.

The story is another story of a terrible emptiness.

In 1965, in the preparation for the independence of Mauritius, the Harold Wilson Labour Government in Britain decided to act illegally and to cut out a part of Mauritius and hold on to it, as a condition for independence, which was to be "granted" in 1968. This kind of blackmail is against the UN Charter. A colonizing power cannot impose conditions on a part of itself, that is to say, on one of its colonies, in exchange for independence.

Britain then tagged on some of the Seychelles Islands (Seychelles was still a colony too), and made up a new fiction of a "colony" on 8th November, 1965 and called it the British Indian Ocean Territory. The Seychelles Government has since fought and got its islands back. But Britain has continued to hold on to the "goods" stolen from Mauritius.

The British State, at the time, conducted this manoeuvre under pressure from its big-brother ally, the United States. The US States badly wanted what they called a "de-populated" island for a military base. Their words are sometimes too accurate to bear. They needed it, they said, for the cold war.

So the British government proceeded, with full US government knowledge, with the "depopulation" of the Archipelagoes concerned. All the people were spirited off all the Chagos islands: Diego Garcia, Peros Banos and Salomon.

These were forcible removals.

The families who had been living there for generations were shoved into ships' holds against their will and transported to Port Louis and dumped on the quayside. Homeless and lost, mothers and fathers and grannies and children and grandfathers wandered into the slums of the Mauritian capital. By the thousand. The poor of Port Louis took them in. But many people from Diego Garcia died. Others ended up in prison. Children ate green mangoes and salt. That is rock-bottom poverty in Mauritius. Emptiness in their hearts.

"This act of mass kidnapping" is how an editorial in the Washington Post described the forcible removals. The editorial was published in 1975 on a strangely eerie date, 11th September.

And there were heroic struggles here, mainly by the women from the Chagos, fighting to put Diego Garcia on the agenda. Petitions and meetings. Night vigils. Marches. Hungerstrikes and street demonstrations. Hand-to-hand fights with the riot police. Arrest and trials. I was myself one of the eight women arrested and put to trial for illegal demonstration in 1981.

So Diego Garcia had become a US base. The British Government leases it to the US Government. Maybe for a lot of money. At the time, in exchange for bargain prices on Polaris missiles. But whatever the price, the US Government is the receiver of the stolen goods.

We want to close this base down.

We want the terrible emptiness of the tarmac runs ways out! And the concrete docks out! We want the emptiness of all the military hardware out, too. We want to regenerate the coral around these islands. And the palms. Living life. We want Diego Garcia to be declared a UNESCO World Heritage Site immediately on the closure of the base.

But more than anything, we want to heal the terrible emptiness in the hearts of a people forcibly removed. We want to heal the tearing apart of a country. We want people to be free to go back home.

There have been UN resolutions, year after year, for the reunification of Mauritius through the return of Diego Garcia and the whole of Chagos. Only the US and UK governments voted against. But these two votes have, so far, been enough.

The 1995 UN "Pelindaba Treaty for a Nuclear-Weapon Free Africa" was signed by all the countries concerned, but on the insistence of the representatives of your two countries, there were the infamous "dotted lines" scribbled in around Diego Garcia.

So Diego Garcia is not "Nuclear Free". And nor are Pakistan and India.

Which is all the more reason for all of us to say "no" to war. And "yes" to the closing down of the base.

I write to ask if perhaps you could start by writing to your MP's and Congressman to inform them that the theft of the islands and the receiving of stolen goods was done without the knowledge of the people of your lands, that the forcible removals of our people were done behind your backs, that your people would never have condoned this ultimate violence, that you want the people of Diego Garcia to return to their homes, that a Court judgement has granted them the right to return, that the base is illegal and must be closed down.

That the base must be closed down in any case.

We ask this to be included as part of the movement towards ending the war. As part of the movement for peace.

And as we all know, peace only comes with justice. And justice only comes when we find out about injustices being committed near and far, and all over the rest of the world, so we can put a stop to them. It is these injustices that sometimes breed the ideas that sometimes breed terrorism. At other times, the injustices breed rioting. In Los Angeles and in Mauritius. In Harare and in Northern Towns in Britain. In Algeria and in Indonesia. And whether it is terrorism or rioting, it brings in its wake, repression.

So, we need coherent, conscious movements against the war, and for justice worldwide.

And justice, as we all know in our hearts, is only born in the movement towards equality. The e-word. You are not allowed to say it in good company anymore. It is only permissible in reference to past revolutions. But it is, curiously, precisely the e-technology that may help now.

We live in a world of sufficient technological advancement to permit a much better form of democracy than we ever dared dream of before. Democracy at the work place. Democratic control over finance. Where democracy will be much more than casting a vote to choose between two political parties, both financed by private companies, once every five years, where you live or where I do.

Democracy in which human rights in all spheres-political, civil, economic, social, cultural-gain broader and broader definitions through our struggles, wherever we are.

Democracy where human beings gain in dignity. Democracies from which guns and land – mines are not exported to prop up dictatorships in countries unknown, nor to make profits from warring factions in countries elsewhere in the world. We have to inform ourselves and act. Together.

So that dog stops eating dog. And horse horse.

Lindsey Collen,
For LALIT
Mauritius
16th October, 2001

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Alain Ah-Vee represented Ledikasyon Pu Travayer in the Rann nu Diego common front in 1999 and also at the Sahrington meetings preparing the resolution for international endorsement in 2002. He is a member of the Rose-Hill branch of Lalit, and is in the Central Committee. He works as a graphic artist by profession, and is perhaps the finest cover-designer in Mauritius. He designed the popular “Indian Ocean Peace Zone” poster. His first political action was distributing leaflets to American marines calling on them to support the campaign to close the base in Diego in 1981. He was on the streets in the fight to stop bulldozers knocking down people’s houses in 1998.

Lindsey Collen was at the 1978 Diego Garcia vigil in Bain des Dames, and was in the forefront of the street demonstrations around the big Diego Garcia hunger strike in 1981. She was one of the eight woman arrested, charged under the notorious Public Order Act, and finally acquitted. She is a member of the Bambous Lalit branch and is a Lalit Central Committee member. In her internationally acclaimed novels, the Rape of Sita and Mutiny, there are characters from Chagos, who intertwine her knowledge of history with the fiction. She wrote the open letter to the people of Britain and the US in 2001, linking the Diego Garcia issue to US militarism. She gave a speech on the Diego Garcia issue (linked to the US anti-terrorism campaign) at the Malawi meeting of the Southern African People’s Solidarity Network, in 2001. She was in the Rann nu Diego committee and at the Sahrington meetings drawing up the international petition. She is in Muvman Lakax, the homeless peoples’ movement, and was in the physical opposition to the bull-dozers used by Government.

Veena Dholah, who works in a bookstore, became well known when she was arrested for assault on a police officer at St. Jean roundabout at the demonstration against French President Mitterand and for Indian Ocean Zone of Peace in 1991. In fact, dozens of plain clothes police had attacked the demonstrators to confiscate our posters on Indian Ocean Zone of Peace. Only posters welcoming Mitterand were allowed. On the day of the hearing, when 33 other demonstrators came forward as witnesses, the police withdrew charges. Veena Dholah is a member of the Saint Pierre- Alma branch of Lalit and is a central Committee member.

Batma Devi Kistnasamy participated in the all- night 1978 Diego Garcia vigil in Bain des Dames, and was in the forefront of the street demonstartion around the big Diego Garcia hungerstrike in 1981. She was one of the eight women arrested, charged under the notorious Public Order Act, and finally acquitted. She is a member of the Bambous Lalit branch. She is active in the women’s movement, member of Muvman Liberasyon Fam, which she represented at the Rann Nu Diego common front. She works in data capture, as the software part of a technical team. She was responsible for conceptualizing the Lalit “Documentation Centre” in 1982.

Rada Kistnasamy, Computer Hardware technician by profession, is a member of the st. Pierre-Alma branch of Lalit and is a Central Committee member. He is active in Muvman Lakax, the homeless peoples’ movement and in Ledikasyon pu Travayer in promoting the Kreol language and adult literacy. He has represented LPT at international conferences on the language issue. He is also a trade unionist, in particular in the construction sector. He was amongst those who led the construction and Allied Workers Union to its historic victory against the Jugnauth-Bérenger regime.

Rajni Lallah, when she was very young, participated in the all-night 1978 Diego Garcia vigil in Bain des Dames. She is a professional musician and a piano teacher. Her compositions draw from Mauritian music, as well as the classical and popular traditions of the west, the Indian sub-continent and Africa, defying the compartmentalization of music. She is in the Fangurin music group. She is in the Curepipe branch of Lalit and is in the Lalit Central Committee. She is an activist in the trade union movement, in particular amongst construction and transport workers. She was amongst those who led the Construction and Allied Workers Union to its historic victory against the Jugnauth-Bérenger regime, and she is a major contributor to the struggle against privatisation of social services.

Ram Seegobin, medical practitioner by profession, followed the health of the hunger striking Chagossian women in the 1978 Bain Des Dames hunger strike. He represented Lalit in the Fron Nasyonal Sutyen Ilwa (FNSI) which was setup in 1981 after the street demonstration. He is a member of the Bambous Lalit Branch and is a Lalit Central Committee Member, and represented Lalit at the World Conference of Workers' Organisations held in San Francisco in 2000, where he predicted accurately how AGOA would be a menace to the Diego Base closure. Author of a two-part 2002 press article on AGOA, called "The Sting", which again links the Diego question, amongst other things, to AGOA conditionalities.

Ashok Subron is a computer software teacher and documentation expert. He has, since its inception, been one of the main ongoing conceptualizers of the Lalit Documentation Centre, which is one of the best in the world on issues like Diego Garcia. He represented Lalit at the WOSA international conference in 1997. He is a member of the Curepipe Lalit branch and is a Central Committee Member. He represented Ledikasyon pour travayer at the All Workers' Conference which for four years united the trade union movement. He is an activist in Muvman Lakaz, the homeless peoples' movement, and was in the physical opposition to the bulldozers used by Government in Camp Chapelon. He has given a political dimension to the social at the housing estate level for the removal of the asbestos panels. He was amongst those who led the Construction and Allied Workers Union to its historic victory against the Jugnauth – Bérenger regime. He is a percussion musician in the Fangurin Group.