



**Thinking Beyond Ethnic Hatred:
An Examination of the State's Mobilizations during the
Rwandan Genocide of 1994**

Yumeng Zhang

Faculty Advisor: Irene Silverblatt

Cultural Anthropology

April 2016

This project was submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Graduate Liberal Studies Program in the Graduate School of Duke University.

Copyright by
Yumeng Zhang
2016

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to reject the assumption that the killing of Tutsis during the Rwandan genocide of 1994 was based solely on ethnicity. The Rwandan genocide was one of the more famous disasters of the 20th century, given that about 800,000 Tutsis lost their lives during the genocide. How were Rwandan civilians mobilized to kill their families and friends? How did the civilian participation affect Rwanda's postgenocide reconciliation process? In this paper, I first examine the exaggeration of the Hutu-Tutsi differences since the colonial period. Then, I explore how during President Habyarimana's rule the exaggeration of the Hutu-Tutsi differences at first failed to bring about ethnic tensions, but how the conflicts during this time were later purposely manipulated into an ethnic war. By analyzing how the Rwandan political elites stimulated Hutu hatred of Tutsis through different kinds of mass media, I demonstrate that ethnic resentment was only a pretext for killing: Rwandan political elites constructed ethnic hatred in order to consolidate their own power. Additionally, I examine how the Hutu-Tutsi conflict was inflamed by the failure of an indifferent United Nations to act, with the French government even acting as an accomplice of the genocidal regime. Furthermore, I explore the Rwandan political elites' role in shaping and monitoring the postgenocide reconciliation process. I illustrate how Rwanda's reconciliation process failed because of the state's excessive involvement, with the RPF government promoting national unity and reconciliation only as a means of manipulating the thoughts and behavior of its citizens. I conclude the paper by making recommendations for the improvement of Rwanda's reconciliation process.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Chapter One: <i>Rwandan Conflicts in History</i>	8
<i>Before the “Hamitic Hypothesis”</i>	
<i>Rwanda Under the Colonial Rule (1897-1959)</i>	
<i>The “Social Revolution” of 1959</i>	
<i>President Kayibanda in Power (1962-1973)</i>	
<i>President Habyarimana in Power (1973-1994) and the Rise of the RPF</i>	
<i>The Genocide Started</i>	
Chapter Two: <i>The State’s Mobilizations</i>	22
<i>The Notorious R.T.L.M</i>	
<i>The Kangura</i>	
<i>Education Under the Republics</i>	
Chapter Three: <i>Reactions of the International Community</i>	37
<i>The Indifferent International Community</i>	
<i>France as the Biggest Accomplice of the Genocidal Regime</i>	
Chapter Four: <i>After the Genocide</i>	47
<i>Coerced Reconciliation</i>	
<i>Standing Against the State’s Coerced Reconciliation</i>	
Conclusion.....	60
Bibliography.....	63

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Irene Silverblatt for inspiring me and offering me valuable suggestions as I wrote the thesis. My thesis will not exist without her guidance.

I would like to thank Dr. Kent Wicker and Ms. Jamie Browne for sharing with me wonderful advice to improve my writing.

I would like to thank Dr. Ralph Litzinger, Ms. Linda Daniel and Mr. Matthew Sebastian for giving me recommendations for great bibliographies.

I would like to thank Dr. Donna Zapf for helping me brainstorm ideas about the final project.

I would like to thank Ms. Dink Suddaby for coordinating the schedule for me so that everything was well set.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my mom, my dad and my other family members, who always comforted me and encouraged me as I came across difficulties during the research. Because of their support, I have the courage to fight against challenges and have the confidence to believe that I will accomplish the project.

Introduction

It was inside of a Catholic Church, a space that was occupied by stacks of rotten bodies. Those bodies were wrapped up in various clothes, among which were two Tutsi uniforms.

I saw this shocking scene in a documentary screened in a class last spring. The professor told us that the documentary featured the mass killing during the Rwandan genocide of 1994. The Hutu, an ethnic group in Rwanda that was historically oppressed by German and Belgian colonizers, initiated the killing against the Tutsi, another ethnic group in Rwanda that was historically privileged by colonizers. During that time, I was not familiar with the Hutu-Tutsi conflict in Rwanda, yet I always kept questions in mind: “What turned the Catholic Church, a place that should had been sacred, into a slaughterhouse? What turned people into ruthless killing machines so that they could even slaughter schoolchildren?”

As I read more works about the Hutu-Tutsi conflict in Rwanda, I gradually came to understand that the terms “Hutu” and “Tutsi” did not signify only ethnicity initially, but also implied socioeconomic division in the pre-colonial period. Tutsis were deemed wealthier than Hutus by colonizers because of their ownership of a great deal of cattle (Fujii 2009: 60). It wasn’t until the colonial period that the Hutu-Tutsi differences were exaggerated so that the Tutsi superiority began to primarily signify ethnic superiority (Mamdani 2001: 87). I am interested in examining this exaggeration of the Hutu-Tutsi differences with regard to how it contributed to the motivations for the genocide. Was ethnic hatred an important motivation for the genocide? If ethnic hatred was not the only motivation for the genocide, the other two questions that I intend to explore in this paper include: how were civilians motivated to kill people and even their neighbors, friends or families? How did such civilian participation affect the reconciliation process in postgenocide Rwanda? This paper aims to interrogate these three questions by analyzing how the Hutu-Tutsi differences were exaggerated in both the contemporary and the historical context.

The Rwandan genocide of 1994 was one of the most tragic atrocities of the 20th century. About 800,000 Tutsis were slaughtered by Hutus, the largest population in Rwanda. The incident was in part triggered by the assassination of President Habyarimana (April 6, 1994), the third President of the Republic of Rwanda who was known for implementing policies disadvantaging the Tutsi population. After President Habyarimana's plane was attacked by missiles, Hutu politicians blamed Tutsis for causing the death of the President and started the genocide (Kroslak 2007: 18-47). As a result, within hours after the crash of President Habyarimana's plane, soldiers of the Presidential Guard, along with other armed militia, set up roadblocks with weapons such as machetes and rifles prepared in order to slaughter Tutsis and anyone who had a "Tutsi look." Within one week after the plane crash, killers started mass killings by gathering their "prey" at a particular place such as the church and the hospital (Straus 2006: 51-52; Fujii 2009: 53-56). A typical example of these mass killings included the "imprisonment" of thousands of Tutsis in the forest during the genocide. Being pursued by killers during the day, those Tutsis in the forest were regarded as "antelopes," which strove to escape from "hunters," who aimed to kill them with machetes (Hatzfeld 2009).

The mass killings in the south of Rwanda were implemented much more slowly than those in the north, a region that enjoyed more support for President Habyarimana. However, the situation in the south soon deteriorated with large groups of people massacred when the interim government replaced prefects of the south with new leaders who supported the genocide and sent many professional killers there (Straus 2006: 51-52; Fujii 2009: 53-56).

It was not only the Tutsi population that was slaughtered; Hutus were also killed. The Hutu population was targeted mainly by the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF). This organization was mainly composed of the Rwandan Tutsi refugees, who fled to Uganda since the 1950s in order to escape the harsh rule imposed by the Hutu-led government. (Kroslak 2007: 18-47). During its advance into Rwanda to overthrow the Hutu-led government after 1990, it slaughtered up to 60,000 Hutu elites and civilians (Straus 2006: 51-52; Fujii 2009: 53-56). The violence was

further fueled by the indifferent international community, which was reluctant to send troops to Rwanda (Smith 2010: 142-178).

It wasn't until 18 July 1994 that the RPF took over Gisenyi, a city in Rwanda's western province. The occupation of Gisenyi brought an end to the genocide, after which the government initiated a reconciliation process between Hutus and Tutsis. (Straus 2006: 51-52; Fujii 2009: 53-56).

In this paper, I will argue that the occurrence of the genocide was based on the state's mobilization of Hutus to kill Tutsis rather than merely ethnic reasons. To understand my argument requires the review of the scholarly debates, which I will situate in the historical context. Rwanda was under the colonial rule of Germany and Belgium from 1892 to 1962. The colonialists in Rwanda carried out policies favoring the Tutsi population and at the same time disadvantaging the Hutu population. For example, the chiefs in Rwanda during this period were mostly Tutsis. Tutsis received better education than Hutus. Tutsis were also constructed as the elite population by colonialists due to their European-like features. It wasn't until 1959 that the Rwandan Social Revolution began and Hutus rebelled against the oppression of Tutsis. The independence of Rwanda and the establishment of the Republic of Rwanda in 1962 facilitated the construction of a new Rwandan government, dominated by Hutus who were an ethnic majority. The new government signified a reversal of status between Tutsis and Hutus. While Hutus were historically oppressed by Tutsis, they finally overthrew the power of Tutsis and climbed to the top of the hierarchy. Tutsis were strongly disfavored under the new regime ruled by President Gregoire Kayibanda from 1962 to 1973. A large number of them were ruthlessly slaughtered from 1963 to 1964. They were also disfavored in the later period of President Habyarimana's rule. After the invasion of the RPF, the Hutu government feared that it might be overthrown by the Tutsi force and the Hutu population subjugated to the Tutsi rule again, which triggered a feeling of resentment. Such feeling facilitated the ruthless murder of Tutsi civilians, who were deemed as accomplices of the RPF by the Hutu government (Krosiak 2007: 18-47).

Ethnic resentment is widely endorsed by many scholars as a main motivation for the genocide. A typical example of these scholars is Mahmood Mamdani (2001), who understands the motivations for the genocide from a historical perspective, arguing that the “Hamitic Hypothesis” contributed to the occurrence of the genocide. By claiming that Tutsis were the Hamites, German and Belgian colonialists successfully classified Tutsis into a superior ethnic category in comparison to Hutus because “Hamites were seen as other than Negroes, those who civilized the Negroes and were in turn corrupted by the Negroes” (Mamdani 2001: 82). The notion that Tutsis were Hamites equipped them with a foreign origin, which justified their superiority over indigenous Hutus (Mamdani 2001: 80).

The “Hamitic Hypothesis” that Mamdani discusses illustrates that ethnic resentment formed a basis for the initiation of the genocide. Though such resentment might be an important motivation for the genocide, it did not tell the whole story. A great many works (Fujii 2009; Straus 2006; Hintjens 1999) cast doubts on Mamdani’s view and offer alternative explanations for the genocide, which makes ethnic resentment only one part of the explanation.

Lee Ann Fujii (2009) remains skeptical of Mamdani’s view. In pre-colonial Rwanda, because the eighteen major clans were mixed Hutu/Tutsi/Twa clans, Hutus and Tutsis lived together with intermarriages occurring frequently. The cohabitation and intermarriages among Hutus and Tutsis enabled the cultivation of friendships and intimacy between these two ethnic groups. Such friendships and intimacy were further developed due to the fact that Hutus and Tutsis shared the same culture, language and religion, which mitigated ethnic hatred and increased the difficulty of killing (King 2013: 38). According to interviewees of Fujii, who were survivors of the genocide, their Hutu friends’ capability to kill were much to their surprise because they had been friends and had lived in harmony for a long time (Fujii 2009: 90). Such attitudes are further verified by Scott Straus’s 2006 survey, in which 98.9 percent of his Hutu respondents (about 200 respondents in all) supported intermarriages with Tutsis and 86.5 percent admitted having positive relations with their Tutsi neighbors before the genocide. Additionally,

about 80 percent of Hutu respondents (about 200 respondents in all) did not know or were not interested in the idea that Tutsis were Hamites and had a foreign origin, nor did they think Tutsis would restore the monarchy in Rwanda before the genocide (Straus 2006: 132-133, 128-129). The notion that Hutus and Tutsis had lived in harmony for a long time before the genocide weakens the argument that ethnic resentment might be the only motivation for the genocide.

One alternative explanation for the genocide might be peer pressure. The notion that the killing was always implemented in front of large groups rather than individuals explains the importance of peer pressure, which might enforce conformity within social groups, in facilitating the genocide. Many Hutu civilians were forced to join perpetrators by authorities and killed their families and friends for survival because if they refused the killing, they themselves or their family members might be killed (Anderson 2012: 45; Fujii 2009: 154-178; Straus 2006: 146-147).

To further rebuke the assumption that the motivations for the genocide were ethnic-based, Fujii argues, “Resentments, animosities, conflicts, and disputes were normal, everyday occurrences, but the basis for these antagonisms was generally personal, not ethnic” (2009: 123). Fujii emphasizes that people might kill due to personal conflicts. An example was that a Hutu might kill a Tutsi landlord during the genocide because he did not want to pay the rent, or he might kill because of his jealousy over his Tutsi landlord’s property. Looting, as Straus suggests, might also be a common cause for killing (2006: 157).

Reasons for the killing are further introduced by Helen M. Hintjens (1999), who argues that the dire economic situation in Rwanda since the mid-80s also contributed to the occurrence of the genocide. The economy was devastated because of foreign debts and inflation. Famine and corruption in the government exacerbated the situation. Furthermore, the invasion of the RPF pushed the interim government to use the money that should had been used for basic necessities to improve the military hardware of government troops, which resulted in a shortage of essential food. The resources were further deprived with a great many Hutu refugees flooding into Rwanda

from Burundi since 1993. Because of a shortage of basic necessities, people killed to compete for limited resources (Hintjens 1999: 256-258).

The motivations for the genocide can also be understood from a cultural perspective. Straus (2006: 205) suggests that Rwanda has a culture of obedience, which means Rwandan people are used to obeying orders issued by authorities. Such obedient mindset might be reflected in the postcolonial period, in which Hutu officials and civilians killed Tutsis in order to obey the order of authorities (Straus 2006: 211-213; Hintjens 1999: 270-273). The habit of submitting to authorities resulted in mass killings.

The willingness to submit to authorities illustrates that the state has a firm control over its population. Such strong manipulation also applies to ethnicity. Fujii argues, “Ethnicity, in other words, was not something people felt in their core being and then acted on; it was something people in power constructed in specific ways for specific ends” (2009: 121). Fujii emphasizes that Hutus did not hold hostile attitudes towards Tutsis before the genocide. Ethnic hatred held by Hutus against Tutsis was only a construct of powerful Hutu/Tutsi elites. Fujii’s argument, along with other perspectives that I have discussed above, further refutes the assertion that ethnic resentment was the only motivation for the genocide.

These perspectives also raise important questions. How were the differences between Hutus and Tutsis exaggerated due to the prevalence of the “Hamitic Hypothesis” since the colonial period? How did the exaggeration of the differences between Hutus and Tutsis contribute to the civilian participation in the genocide? How were civilians motivated to kill? How did the civilian participation affect the reconciliation process after the genocide? Building on Fujii’s argument, I argue that the Rwandan genocide was state-mobilized because ethnic hatred, as a construct of powerful Hutu/Tutsi political elites, was only a pretext for killing. For my paper, I define political elites as influential political leaders capable of manipulating people’s thoughts and feelings. Encouraging ethnic hatred in order to mobilize the genocide enabled them to strengthen their own power. Such manipulation by political elites not only existed before the

genocide but also in the postgenocide reconciliation process, during which the RPF government manipulated people's thoughts and behavior in order to promote national unity that was not recognized by the Rwandan people. In this scenario, the state's excessive involvement, represented by political elites' manipulation, made it a failed reconciliation.

To address these questions, I will begin with a chapter examining the exaggeration of the differences between the Hutu and the Tutsi since the colonial period. Because this exaggeration in and of itself might not be a sufficient explanation for genocidal ethnic tensions, in the second chapter I will elaborate on how the state's mobilization contributed to the Hutu-Tutsi conflict. In the third chapter, I will explain how the conflict was further fueled by the indifferent international community. In the last chapter, I will examine the state's excessive involvement in the reconciliation process, which failed to bring about a resolution of the Hutu-Tutsi conflict.

Chapter 1: Rwandan Conflicts in History

In this chapter, I will mainly examine the process of the exaggeration of the Hutu-Tutsi differences since the colonial period. I will then explore how the exaggeration of these differences failed to bring about ethnic tensions/hatred/conflicts, which were widely recognized as the main motivation for the genocide. In the end, I will analyze how the tensions and conflicts in the Rwandan context were reconstructed by political elites so that those conflicts became ethnic conflicts, which mobilized the Hutu population to slaughter their Tutsi counterparts.

Before the “Hamitic Hypothesis”

In the introduction, I explained that colonizers thought Tutsis were superior to Hutus because of the “Hamitic Hypothesis,” which argued that Tutsis had a foreign origin. As a result, they were superior to indigenous Hutus. In pre-colonial Rwanda, Tutsis were also superior to Hutus not because of the “Hamitic Hypothesis” but because being Tutsi signified a wealthy economic status and a sacred origin. Under the rule of the Mwami (king), Tutsis enjoyed the highest status among the three lineages—the Hutu, the Tutsi and the Twa—before colonization. During that time, the superiority of Tutsis did not only signify ethnic differences but also implied socioeconomic division. Because the ownership of cattle was an important determinant of wealth and most Tutsis were herders, people who owned a great many cows were regarded as Tutsis even if they descended from a Hutu or Twa lineage. In this scenario, the “Tutsi” became a signifier of socioeconomic status (Thompson 2013: 54-55; Fujii 2009: 60). The notion that Tutsis owned more cows equipped them with a wealthy status, which made them superior to the two other groups—the Hutu, who were mostly cultivators, and the Twa, who were forest dwellers.

The superiority of the “Tutsi” not only derived from wealth but also from a story of sacred origin in pre-colonial Rwanda. According to the royal myth, Nkuba, Rwanda’s first king, wanted to test the capability of his three sons—Gatwa, Gahutu, and Gatutsi. Gatwa was the

ancestor of the Twa lineage, Gahutu was the ancestor of the Hutu lineage, and Gatutsi was the ancestor of the Tutsi lineage. As a result, he asked his three sons to watch a bottle of milk for a night. When he checked out the result in the morning, he found out that Gatwa had drunk all the milk and Gahutu had spilled all his milk. Only Gatutsi's milk remained intact. To reward Gatutsi, Nkuba gave him the power "to command the glutton serf Gatwa and the clumsy peasant Gahutu" (Mamdani 2001:80). The notion that Gatutsi was granted power by his father to govern his brothers made his kingship sacred, which equipped the Tutsi lineage with superiority.

Rwanda Under the Colonial Rule (1897-1959)

Unlike the pre-colonial period, during which the superiority of Tutsis might derive from a wealthy economic status and a sacred origin, Tutsis were considered superior to the Hutu and the Twa during the colonial period only because European colonizers classified them into a superior ethnic category. These colonialists sought to construct a racial difference between Tutsis and the local population. Claiming that Tutsis came from elsewhere, colonialists argued that Tutsis were Hamites, which meant they "were actually Caucasians under a black skin" (Mamdani 2001: 82). The "Hamitic Hypothesis" introduced by colonialists was a racist theory because it evaluated each ethnic group based on their innate ability. According to the "Hamitic Hypothesis," Tutsis came from northeastern Africa, which enabled colonialists to regard them as "black Europeans" who were innately more "civilized" and more "capable of leading" than other Africans (Thomson 2013: 56; Taylor 1999:58). The official history of Rwanda also narrated that Tutsis, a group of pastoralists, arrived in the pre-Rwandan state from the north, conquered the region and created a centralized form of government (Thomson 2013: 55).

Such a hypothesis was theoretically backed by biblical myths. According to the Old Testament, Noah, the patriarch, had three sons named Shem, Japhet and Ham. Because Ham failed to avert his eyes when Noah was taking a bath, he witnessed nakedness of his father, which made Noah shameful. To punish his son, Noah cursed the descendants of Ham so that Ham's

descendants, who were widely known as ancient Egyptians, Nubians and Ethiopians, had black skin, which was a specific interpretation of the biblical myth. However, even though those Africans had black skin, the fact that they descended from Noah, who was the ancestor of Europeans and Semitic people, made them more Caucasian and less Negroid. Because Tutsis were considered by colonizers as coming from northeastern Africa, especially Ethiopia, they were also deemed as cursed sons of Ham, which made them essentially Caucasian rather than Negroid (Mamdani 2001: 81-85; Taylor 1999: 58-59). The European notion that Tutsis were essentially Caucasian further reinforced the gap between Tutsis and other indigenous population.

This division was further aggravated by physical features. While Tutsis were regarded by colonizers as possessing “tall and slender builds” as well as “aquiline noses and fine hair,” Hutus were perceived as “short, sturdy and dark” (Thomson 2013: 56-57). Such physical attributes were introduced as a part of divisive traits between Hutus and Tutsis in the classroom of Rwandan secondary schools, which further increased people’s awareness of their ethnic distinctions (King 2013: 66). On the other hand, the European-like features contributed to the whiteness of Tutsis, which made them superior to black Hutus, who were deemed as subordinate and inferior by colonizers (Thomson 2013: 57).

The status of Hutus as subordinate and inferior resulted in ethnic subjugation and discrimination. The subjugation of Hutus to Tutsi rule during the colonial period took several forms. In the first place, Hutus were subjugated to Tutsi rule because they had to perform individualized forced labor for Tutsi elites and colonizers. Such forced labor derived from *ubuhake*, a contractual service between patrons and clients that was set up in pre-colonial Rwanda.

Originally, the patron-client relationship was established to maintain the power of the royal court. Because the Kingdom of Rwanda had four units, including province, district, hill, and neighborhood, the king appointed chiefs and sub-chiefs to administer each unit by collecting taxes and dealing with other issues. Issues were reported layer by layer and were finally reported

to the central authority, which contributed to the construction of a hierarchical relationship. The basic idea behind this hierarchical patron-client relationship was that Hutus, who were normally recognized as clients, offered their Tutsi patron services in exchange for physical and financial protection (Laband 2007: 258).

As it moved into the colonial period, both German and Belgian colonizers inherited and renewed *ubuhake* in order to better exploit Hutus. The German colonial authority imposed monetary taxes, which should be paid by Hutu clients in addition to original taxes (eg. cows and goats). Additionally, the Catholic Church, which started missionary work in Rwanda during the colonial period, also imposed its own taxes. Compared to German colonizers, the Belgian colonial authority imposed even harsher rule. On the one hand, they got more involved in Rwanda's state administration by denying the king's right to appoint chiefs because they wanted to appoint chiefs themselves. The chiefs appointed by the Belgian colonial authority were mostly Tutsis, who were responsible for delivering taxes collected from Hutu clients to colonizers, during which those Tutsi chiefs also extracted extra payments for themselves.

Hutu commoners were also monitored by Tutsi overseers in performing labor. If those commoners failed to meet the target, they would be whipped by the Belgian colonial authority. More importantly, Hutu commoners were also required to grow "forced crops." The Belgian colonial authority forced Hutu commoners to grow famine-resistant but protein deficient food such as sweet potatoes in order to combat famine. Furthermore, Hutu commoners were often forced to sell crops they grew to European traders by the colonial authority. Tutsi chiefs, who were responsible for transporting those crops, took advantage of Hutu commoners by taking away "almost anything they please—bananas, yams, etc." (Mamdani 2001: 97), while Hutu commoners must comply with the demands of their Tutsi chiefs, or they might be expelled from their fields (Mamdani 2001: 93-98). That Hutu commoners were forced to perform labor for the colonial authority and their Tutsi chiefs facilitated the exploitation of Hutus, which led to their subjugation to the Tutsi rule.

In addition to forced labor, Hutus were also exploited in education. The Catholic Church monopolized education under the Belgian rule. Even though the king remained skeptical of Catholic mission schools at the beginning, such skepticism soon disappeared when the colonial authority deposed the king Musinga, who did not cooperate well with the colonial authority, and replaced him with the king Rudahigwa, who became the first Catholic Rwandan king. The conversion of Rudahigwa brought about a huge wave of conversion of Tutsi elites, which “became a cardinal requirement for membership in the political class” (Laband 2007: 261; King 2013: 50). The notion of gaining membership in the political class made mission schools appealing to both Tutsis and Hutus.

Different from Tutsis, who were welcomed by Catholic mission schools, Hutus were generally given less opportunities than Tutsis to enroll in Catholic mission schools because both the colonial authority and Catholic missionaries deemed Hutus as inferior to Tutsis (King 2013: 52). Even though some Hutus were able to enroll in Catholic schools along with Tutsis at the beginning of the colonial period, such phenomenon disappeared from 1927 onward, a period when Catholic schools were mostly populated by Tutsis (King 2013: 54). Additionally, the materials that Hutus and Tutsis learned in Catholic schools were different from each other. First of all, Tutsis were taught in French. The acquisition of French enabled Tutsis to be qualified for administrative positions in the government and the Church. Unlike the Tutsis, Hutus were taught in the local language. Second, valuable classes such as math and natural sciences were mandatory for Tutsis but optional for Hutus (King 2013: 65).

Furthermore, Hutus were not only given limited access to Catholic mission schools but were also banned from entering state primary schools by colonizers. The absence of Hutu enrollment in state primary schools could be found in archival documents from the colonial administration, which stated that state primary schools were reserved exclusively for “sons of chiefs and notables of the Tutsi race” (King 2013: 53).

The discrimination against Hutus continued during post-primary schooling. Only 4 to 5 percent of primary-school graduates were able to pursue post-primary schooling. Thus the competition was intense. Even though the examination results determined whether the student could pursue post-primary schooling in theory, the access to secondary schools was mainly gained by Tutsis. Constituting about only 15 percent of the population, Tutsis controlled about 60 percent of places in secondary schools. In comparison, though Hutus made up about 80 percent of the population, they only gained about 30 percent of places in secondary schools (King 2013: 62). While Tutsis could be offered jobs in modern factories after graduation from secondary schools, Hutus were always turned down by employers, which prevented them from seeking upward mobility. Even though Hutus held advanced degrees, it was still impossible for them to become chiefs because of their “inferiority” (King 2013: 63).

The discrimination against Hutus did not cease even during postsecondary schooling. Hutus were not given opportunities that their Tutsi counterparts enjoyed to learn subjects related to career development. The only subject that Hutus could learn was theology if they wanted to pursue postsecondary education, which made it difficult for them to find high-paying jobs after graduation (Laband 2007: 261). That Hutus were deprived of many opportunities by colonizers in education facilitated the exploitation of Hutus, which contributed to their subjugation to the Tutsi rule.

Hutus were denied not only many opportunities in education but also opportunities to gain upward mobility by the colonizers. The Belgian colonial authority created identity cards that strictly classified people into the Hutu, the Tutsis and the Twa. Such strict classification made ethnic identities rigid. While in pre-colonial Rwanda, Hutus were able to improve their status if they could own a great deal of cattle, they were unable to gain upward mobility in the colonial period because their identity became fixed when their ethnicity was recorded on identity cards during the ethnic census conducted by the Belgian authority in 1933 (Carney 2014: 35; Laband 2007: 263).

Unlike the pre-colonial period, during which the identity of the Hutu and the Tutsi were fluid—people could alter their identity by improving their socioeconomic status—the identity of the Hutu and the Tutsi became fixed and rigid in the colonial period. The notion—based on the “Hamitic Hypothesis”—that Tutsis were innately superior to Hutus contributed to exaggerating differences between Hutus and Tutsis, which led to the exploitation of Hutus and the subjugation of Hutus to the Tutsi rule in the colonial period.

The “Social Revolution” of 1959

The exploitation of Hutus in the colonial period triggered the revolution of Hutu political elites, who sought to overthrow Tutsi rule. The deterioration of the relationship between the Belgian colonial authority and Tutsis since the 1950s provided conditions for the rebellion of Hutu elites in 1959. Several factors might account for the fact that Tutsis lost the favor of the Belgian colonial authority. First of all, the Church was increasingly dominated by Tutsi priests, which made missionaries fear that they had gradually lost control of the Church. Additionally, new priests from humble backgrounds came to Rwanda. Those priests were sympathetic with Hutus’ miserable experiences of being recognized as inferior to Tutsis by the colonial authority. More importantly, the Belgian colonial authority was infuriated with the Tutsi elites’ attempt to ask for immediate independence.

Because the Belgian colonial authority was increasingly dissatisfied with Tutsis, they replaced a great many Tutsi chiefs with Hutu chiefs and organized an African armed force that was mainly composed of Hutus to combat Tutsis. The replacement of Tutsi chiefs with Hutus and the construction of a Hutu-dominant armed force strengthened the Hutu power base, which facilitated the Hutus’ revolution in 1959. On the other hand, the Belgian colonial authority supported the Hutu elites’ rebellion against Tutsi rule by helping them build up a theoretical basis for rebellion. Under the support of the Belgian colonial authority, Gregoire Kayibanda, a Hutu nationalist, published the *Hutu Manifesto*, on *Kinyamateka*, a church periodical established by the

Belgian colonial authority. The *Hutu Manifesto* was drafted by nine Hutu intellectuals in 1957. The document asked for “Hutu ethnic and political solidarity, as well as the political disenfranchisement of the Tutsi people” (Bahutu Manifesto n.d.). The *Hutu Manifesto* provided Hutu elites with a theoretical basis for the revolution. As a result, Kayibanda established the Party of the Movement and of Hutu Emancipation (MDR or PARMEHUTU), a Hutu dominant party that was also known as Rwandese Democratic Party. In response to the rebellion of the Hutu elites, pro-monarchist Tutsis founded a party named the Union National Rwandaise (UNAR) in order to compete for leadership. The tension between pro-monarchist Tutsis and Hutu elites was further aggravated when Rudahigwa, the Rwandan king, died in 1959. Pro-monarchist Tutsis attributed the king’s death to pro-Hutu Belgian colonizers’ conspiracy.

In order to compete for leadership, the supporters of MDR or PARMEHUTU and those of UNAR attacked each other. In 1959, the supporters of MDR or PARMEHUTU killed about 3000 Tutsis and at the same time forced more than 336,000 Tutsis into exile. As a result, a great many Tutsis fled to neighboring countries, including Burundi, Uganda, Tanzania and the Democratic Republic of Congo. Among these Tutsi refugees, more than 300 were Tutsi chiefs. The expulsion of Tutsis provided advantages for Hutu elites in communal elections held in 1960, during which MDR or PARMEHUTU won in a landslide—it gained about 70 percent of votes, compared to only about 2 percent won by Tutsi-dominant UNAR. The victory of MDR or PARMEHUTU signified the victory of Hutu political elites, after which Kayibanda established the First Republic of Rwanda and became the President. He ruled Rwanda from 1962 to 1973 (Laband 2007: 262-265).

President Kayibanda in Power (1962-1973)

President Kayibanda’s rule brought about the marginalization and the elimination of the Tutsi population, which signified a reversal of status. On the one hand, President Kayibanda marginalized the Tutsi population by imposing quotas to limit Tutsis’ enrollment in schools and

public services. On the other hand, the President sought to massacre innocent Tutsi civilians. Since a great many Tutsis were forced into exile by supporters of the Hutu-dominant party in 1959, those Tutsi refugees formed bases in Burundi, Uganda and the Democratic Republic of Congo, constantly attacking the Hutu-led government in Rwanda in order to avenge their expulsion. The attacks launched by Tutsi refugees infuriated President Kayibanda, who ordered the government militia to kill more than 10,000 Tutsis in 1963 in order to intimidate those Tutsi exiles. Most Tutsis killed by Kayibanda's government were Tutsi elites who survived the social revolution of 1959.

The same kind of tragedy happened again in 1973, when President Kayibanda ordered the mass killing of Tutsis for a second time after another attack from Tutsi refugees in neighboring countries. It wasn't only Tutsis that were targeted; even Hutus with a "Tutsi" look were massacred (Laband 2007: 265-266; King 2013: 72-73). Just like the colonial exploitation of the Hutu population, the marginalization and the elimination of the Tutsi population during President Kayibanda's rule contributed to exaggerating differences between Hutus and Tutsis.

President Habyarimana in Power (1973-1994) and the Rise of the RPF

Even though both the colonial authority and President Kayibanda sought to exploit and marginalize the other ethnic group, the exaggeration of the Hutu-Tutsi differences did not at first bring about ethnic tensions because ethnic relations during the early rule of President Habyarimana were very peaceful (Fujii 2009: 46). President Habyarimana, a Hutu President who came into power in a coup in 1973, reversed President Kayibanda's policy by providing Hutus and Tutsis with relatively equal treatment. Additionally, in the early period of President Habyarimana's rule, anti-Tutsi violence, which was prevalent under President Kayibanda's regime, was greatly reduced. Finally, the country became "orderly, safe and relatively free of corruption" (Fujii 2009: 46).

However, the sound rule of President Habyarimana did not last long. Some factors forced President Habyarimana to reform his policies. First of all, the economy of Rwanda deteriorated in the late 1980s. While the GDP fell sharply, the population in Rwanda soared, which made it harder for the huge population to share limited resources. It was estimated that the GDP per capita of Rwanda in 1983 was 355 dollars. It decreased to 260 dollars in 1990. Additionally, the population in Rwanda in 1970 was only 3 million. It rose to 7.5 million before 1991. Secondly, President Habyarimana received serious criticisms in the later period of his rule because of the corruption of his government. In addition, the President was constantly accused of favoring his hometown (King 2013: 75).

The economic crisis as well as the criticisms towards President Habyarimana's government resulted in people's loss of faith in the President. As a result, both the international community and Rwandan pro-democracy activists asked President Habyarimana to democratize the country by ending the one-party rule. Originally, President Habyarimana only allowed one political party—National Republican Movement for Democracy and Development (MRND)—which he founded, to exist. Now the President was asked to allow the formation of opposition parties. On the surface, the President was willing to democratize his country in response to the people's requests: he formed a commission named the Commission Nationale de Synthese (CNS) to help the Rwandan people better understand the idea of democracy and to facilitate the composition of a new constitution. The new constitution came into effect on 10 June 1991, which formally allowed people to form opposition parties.

Inwardly, the President did not welcome the democratization of the country and sought to consolidate his own power by filling the CNS with his close allies. However, the President's move to thwart multipartyism was not useful because a series of new Hutu-dominant opposition parties were formed. Typical examples included the Republican Democratic Movement (MDR) and the Social Democratic Party (PSD). Even though both the MDR and the PSD were dominated by Hutus just as the MRND, there were clear cleavages between these opposition parties and the

MRND. For example, while the MDR and the PSD favored the southern region of Rwanda, the MRND favored the northwestern region, which included Gisenyi, the hometown of President Habyarimana. The north-south rivalry contributed to the tensions between opposition parties and the MRND (Fujii 2009: 47-48).

These tensions were further aggravated during the invasion of the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) from 1990 to 1994. This organization was mainly composed of Tutsi refugees, who were forced into exile in Uganda during the revolution of 1959 and during President Kayibanda's rule in the 1960s and the 70s. The group was seriously oppressed under the rule of the Ugandan President Milton Obote, who was in power from 1982 to 1986. President Obote initiated several attacks against Tutsi refugees from Rwanda. Evictions, beatings, rape and looting occurred frequently around settlements of those Tutsi exiles. Additionally, properties of those Tutsi refugees were also stolen or destroyed. For example, about 45,000 cows were stolen and 16,000 homes were destroyed. More than 70,000 thousand people became homeless.

In order to escape the attacks, those Tutsi refugees sought to return to their home country, yet most of them were denied entry into Rwanda by President Habyarimana. Because of the political and economic problems of the late 80s, the President did not want more refugees to return and to consume limited resources. Because those refugees were denied access into their home country, they had to seek protection in Uganda. Most of these refugees successfully sought protection under the leadership of Yoweri Museveni, a Ugandan politician who toppled Obote's rule in 1986. After Museveni founded the National Resistance Army (NRA), those refugees became members of one faction of the NRA named the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), which sought retaliation against their home country (Waugh 2004: 19-25; Laband 2007: 267-269).

After the RPF's invasion of Rwanda in 1990, President Habyarimana tried to portray the invasion as an "ethnic war" between Hutus and Tutsis, given that President Habyarimana's government was a Hutu-led government and the RPF was mainly composed of Tutsi refugees. However, President Habyarimana's argument was rebuked by the MDR, the opposition party of

Rwanda. The MDR argued the reason for the RPF's invasion was President Habyarimana's failure to cope with the political problems and pressing issues emerging in the late 80s, given that a great many Tutsi refugees were denied the entry into their home country. Even though the MDR's argument was widely supported, President Habyarimana did not want to admit that the invasion of the RPF was his own fault because he was afraid that the invasion might result in an overthrow of his rule. As a result, he wanted to attribute the invasion of the RPF to the Hutu-Tutsi conflict so that he could mobilize all Hutus in Rwanda to combat Tutsi invaders.

In order to give the public an impression that the RPF posed a threat to the Hutu population in Rwanda, President Habyarimana initiated attacks against his political opponents, including both Tutsis and Hutus, in the morning of 4 October 1990. During the incident, more than 8000 political opponents of President Habyarimana were killed. Then, the President arrested many Tutsi intellectuals and lied to the public that the attacks were launched by those Tutsi intellectuals who were "accomplices" of the RPF, which created a false impression that the invasion of the RPF marked the start of an ethnic war between Hutus and Tutsis. Another faked attack organized by President Habyarimana's government happened in the northern part of Rwanda, during which more than 300 Tutsis were killed. Then, President Habyarimana attributed the death of those 300 Tutsis to their Hutu neighbors and claimed that the reason for the death of those 300 Tutsis was they were "accomplices" of the RPF. The perpetrators of those attacks rarely got punished. More staged attacks occurred in 1992 and 1993. President Habyarimana also used other methods such as spreading hate messages against Tutsis through the radio station or other kinds of mass media—which I will examine in detail in the next chapter—to mobilize Hutus (Fujii 2009: 48-50).

As we can draw from President Habyarimana's rule, even though Rwanda in the later period of his rule was not as peaceful as in the early years, the tensions arising under his regime were not ethnic tensions between Hutus and Tutsis but rather conflicts between Hutu elites themselves. That President Habyarimana faked attacks in order to attribute the invasion of the

RPF to the Hutu-Tutsi conflict rather than his own failure to cope with political problems and pressing issues demonstrated his willingness to construct ethnic hatred in order to maintain his own power. In this scenario, ethnic hatred became only a pretext for killing during the genocide.

The Genocide Started

While President Habyarimana was busy constructing ethnic hatred in order to mobilize Hutus to combat the RPF, which was the foreign enemy of the President, he was also receiving pressure from his internal enemies—the opposition parties such as the MDR. Those opposition parties accused President Habyarimana of failing to democratize the country. Under intense pressure, President Habyarimana reached an agreement with the opposition parties to form a new government. The agreement also demanded President Habyarimana to conduct peace talks with the RPF. In this scenario, President Habyarimana signed the Arusha Accords, a peace agreement, with the RPF on 4 August 1993. The peace agreement, on the one hand, negotiated a cease-fire between the RPF and Habyarimana's government. On the other hand, it called for the establishment of a transitional government dominated by all Rwandan political parties rather than only President Habyarimana's MRND.

Not everyone was happy with the signing of the Arusha Accords. The Coalition for the Defense of the Republic (CDR), a new Hutu-dominant opposition party formed in March 1992, had always opposed peace talks with the RPF because the CDR was racist. Such opposition was further fueled by the RPF's violation of a cease-fire on 8 February 1993, on which the RPF launched attacks in the northern part of Rwanda. The RPF's violation of a cease-fire made many parties feel betrayed, which increased their dissatisfaction with the RPF. Such dissatisfaction was further elevated when Melchior Ndadaye, the first democratically elected Hutu president of Burundi, was assassinated on 21 October 1993, after which the RPF showed no regret over President Ndadaye's death.

Because there was a growing dissatisfaction with the RPF, Rwandan political parties racked their brains to drive away the RPF. The death of President Habyarimana offered them opportunities. President Habyarimana was killed on 6 April 1994 after his plane had been attacked by missiles. Even though the killer of the President is still a mystery today, Rwandan political parties sought to portray the death of the President as a result of the Hutu-Tutsi conflict. They told the public that the RPF was responsible for the President's death. Because the RPF was composed of Tutsi refugees, they represented the interests of all Tutsis, who aimed to overthrow the current Hutu-led government of Rwanda and re-subjugate Hutus to the Tutsi rule just as during colonial times. The message sent out by Rwandan political parties successfully mobilized the Hutu majority in Rwanda, who then initiated mass killings against Tutsis for over four months (Fujii 2009: 51-53; Laband 2007: 270-271). The four-month killing spree in Rwanda was characterized by fear and violence. Rwandan government forces set up roadblocks with every person passing by stopped and searched. Tutsis, or those who were regarded as Tutsis by government forces, were picked out and butchered. Even moderate Hutus who were not hostile to Tutsis as well as the government's political opponents were also killed (Wallies 2006: 88).

As we can draw from the initiation of the genocide, even though the death of the Hutu President Habyarimana had been a trigger for the genocide and the RPF was composed of Tutsi refugees, it is far simpler for scholars (Mamdani 2001) to conclude that ethnic resentment was the only motivation for the genocide. The major conflict in the Rwandan context was not the conflict between Hutus and Tutsis but rather the tension between Rwandan political parties and the RPF. The attempt to drive away the RPF encouraged those political parties to portray the RPF as the murderer of President Habyarimana so that the conflict could become ethnic. In this scenario, the Hutu population was mobilized by the state to combat and kill Tutsis. Ethnic hatred was only a pretext for killing: Rwandan elites constructed ethnic hatred in order to consolidate their own power. In the next chapter, I will examine how ethnic hatred was constructed through the radio station and other kinds of mass media to mobilize the Hutu population.

Chapter 2: The State's Mobilizations

This chapter mainly examines how the RPF invasion was portrayed as an ethnic war between Hutus and Tutsis through the Rwandan radio stations, magazines and the classroom teaching. While the Rwandan radio stations and magazines spread hate speeches against Tutsis, the classroom teaching indoctrinated students with Tutsi inferiority. As a result, Rwandan Tutsis were severely degraded and stigmatized. I will elaborate on how these different kinds of mass media contributed to the stigmatization of Rwandan Tutsis and the mobilization of Hutus during the genocide.

The Notorious R.T.L.M

As I have demonstrated in the previous chapter, President Habyarimana and Rwandan political parties constructed ethnic hatred in order to mobilize Hutus to combat the RPF and other Tutsis. One of the most important tools for constructing such hatred was the Radio Television Libre des Milles Collines (R.T.L.M), which was a privately owned radio station in Rwanda. To better cooperate with the government's efforts to mobilize the genocide, broadcasters of this radio station spread hate messages against the RPF. Two themes were conveyed through the R.T.L.M. One of them was to convince the public that the RPF would break the Arusha Peace Accords, which was signed during President Habyarimana's rule, and would invade Rwanda to take over the Hutu-led government. Because the RPF was composed of Tutsi refugees who escaped the government's pogroms since the revolution of 1959, they represented the interests of the Tutsi population. In this scenario, Rwandan Tutsis became the accomplice of the RPF. Their second method was to convey the theme that the RPF, as a faction of Ugandan President Museveni's National Resistance Army (NRA), had a Ugandan character. The R.T.L.M wanted to convince the public that the RPF had a plot with the NRA to expand the territory of Uganda into Rwanda and its neighboring countries (The Rwandan Archive, International Monitor Institute, 1996).

To convey the message that the RPF was the biggest conspirator and Rwandan Tutsis were accomplices, the R.T.L.M., on the one hand, established the relationship between Rwandan Tutsis and the RPF and degraded the RPF by associating its members with free riders, killers, hostile infiltrators, spies, assassigators, sorcerers, looters, conspirators, thieves, cockroaches, cowards, deceivers, promise breakers and wild animals. On the other hand, it also sought to remind the Hutu population of the colonial period, during which Hutus were seriously oppressed by the colonial authority and Tutsi elites. Excerpts from the R.T.L.M.'s broadcast scripts illustrate how the Hutu-Tutsi conflict was constructed and inflamed by the R.T.L.M broadcasters (The Rwandan Archive, International Monitor Institute, 1996).

The station resorted to ethnic demonization in order to inflame Hutus' hatred of Tutsis. It did this in several ways. First of all, the station portrayed members of the RPF as free riders and other Tutsis as accomplices of the RPF:

Excerpt No. 1. *Kantano Habimana [the broadcaster]:* The same applies to the man who has spent forty years in exile and comes back overnight to harvest the fruit of the Rwandans' labour. The Rwandans will rise against this; (TRA, RTLTM broadcast, 12 April 1994)

In the excerpt above, by claiming that people who had spent forty years in exile came back, the broadcaster sought to establish the relationship between Tutsi exiles fleeing the country since the 50s and the RPF in order to maintain that the RPF represented interests of the Tutsi population. He, then, described members of the RPF as coming back "to harvest the fruit of the Rwandans' labour," which facilitated the portrayal of members of the RPF as free riders.

Additionally, the station degraded the RPF's so-called Tutsi accomplices as thieves and cockroaches:

Excerpt No. 2. *Resident:* There we fought many Inyenzi (the Kinyarwanda word for "cockroach," used as a slur against the Tutsi) who had come to look for some beans and rice to eat... We first went there in the evening to examine the situation because they had come and were firing at that place but three Inyenzi died there. In the morning, when we went back to see, we fired at two of them who were carrying two sacks of rice...
Kantano Habimana [the broadcaster]: So, you killed five of them. Keep it up! (TRA, RTLTM broadcast, 27 May 1994)

The excerpt above is from an interview made by a R.T.L.M broadcaster with a Rwandan resident who claimed to have killed five Tutsis with his accomplices. The resident described to the broadcaster about how he and his accomplices killed those Tutsis. The broadcaster encouraged him to kill more. In this conversation, the notion that Tutsis came to take food without the knowledge of Hutus facilitated the portrayal of Tutsis as thieves, which led to degradation. Tutsis were further degraded when they were termed as “cockroaches” in this conversation.

Third, the station also portrayed members of the RPF as hostile infiltrators:

Excerpt No. 3. *Kantano Habimana [the broadcaster]:* I agree with what you say but that the check should not be canceled because an Inkotanyi (a way of saying the RPF in Kinyarwanda) can hide among you. (TRA, RTLM broadcast, 27 May 1994)

In this excerpt, the broadcaster described the RPF as always hiding among people. The notion that the RPF could “hide among you” facilitated the portrayal of members of the RPF as hostile infiltrators.

Fourth, members of the RPF were portrayed as ruthless killers and conspirators by the station:

Excerpt No. 4. *Unidentified speaker:* Neither the militias nor the elements of the regular armed forces or the presidential guard massacred anybody. Massacres have really stopped and at the time of massacres, there was no government...In any case, the massacres are not the government’s responsibility, our government that we support and that decided to fight against any kind of massacre, which the RPF does not do. Quite the reverse, it is helping the continuation of massacres, helping anybody who massacre the Hutus. (TRA, RTLM broadcast, 27 May 1994)

In this excerpt, the broadcaster sought to deny the responsibilities of the Hutu-led government for initiating killings against Tutsis and at the same time accused the RPF of killing Hutus, which contributed to the portrayal of members of the RPF as ruthless killers and conspirators who aimed to overthrow the Hutu-led government and re-subjugate Hutus to the Tutsi rule.

The same kind of portrayal was also reflected in the following excerpts:

Excerpt No. 5. *Unidentified journalist:* A lot of people who were at Amahoro stadium or other places, at Roi FAISSAR hospital and who fled from the Cockroaches...have affirmed that RPF killed people taking Hutus. (TRA, RTLM broadcast, 16 May 1994)

Excerpt No. 6. *Gaspard Gahigi [the broadcaster]:* RPF is killing innocent people wherever it passes, especially in that demilitarized region. (TRA, RTLM broadcast, 12 April 1994)

Excerpt No. 7. *Kantano Habimana [the broadcaster]:* The Rwandan envoys will explain how the RPF Inkotanyi have been killing innocent people in their way, especially in the buffer zone which should normally be free of hostilities. (TRA, RTLM broadcast, 12 April 1994)

In the excerpts above, the broadcaster accused the RPF of killing innocent Hutu civilians, which contributed to the portrayal of members of the RPF as ruthless killers.

Fifth, the station also delineated members of the RPF as Ugandan spies and assassins:

Excerpt No. 8. *Unidentified speaker:* When RPF brings Ugandan soldiers to Rwanda, we strongly condemn it... Major General Juvenal Habyarimana did not die of an accident, that he did not die of accident, that he did not die of old age or of a long and hard sickness. He died in an assassination attempt that cost him his life, and this assassination attempt had been settled by RPF. (TRA, RTLM broadcast, 27 May 1994)

Excerpt No. 9. *Gaspard Gahigi [the broadcaster]:* The delegation will accuse RPF. Through this accusation they will clarify how our president Juvenal Habyarimana has been killed. (TRA, RTLM broadcast, 12 April 1994)

Excerpt No. 10. *Kantano Habimana [the broadcaster]:* The envoys will also explain how the RPF Inkotanyi, assisted by foreigners, succeeded in assassinating the President of the Republic. (TRA, RTLM broadcast, 12 April 1994)

In the excerpts above, the broadcaster accused the RPF of colluding with Ugandan soldiers. On the other hand, he also accused the RPF of assassinating President Habyarimana.

Sixth, the station associated members of the RPF with sorcerers and portrayed Tutsis as accomplices of the RPF:

Excerpt No. 11. *Kantano Habimana:* This child of Inkotanyi (RPF) tells you how sorcerers, including women who suck themselves died at Rebero... arrest those street children. There are three at Kimisagara near Rose's. There is a team of 30 street children which informs Inkotanyi on the number of people who are on barriers, the kind of weapons they have, how they sleep. (TRA, RTLM broadcast, 16 May 1994)

The excerpt above is from an interview made by the broadcaster to a RPF child soldier. The broadcaster accused the RPF of colluding with sorcerers. Additionally, the broadcaster called for the arrest of Tutsi street children and claimed that they were accomplices of the RPF. The notion

that Tutsis plotted with sorcerers and the recognition of Tutsi street children as accomplices of the RPF degraded the RPF and other Tutsis.

Seventh, members of the RPF were also degraded as wild beasts by the station:

Excerpt No. 12. *Kantano Habimana [the broadcaster]:* Be patient in this war launched by the cockroaches Inkotanyi who came killing us and eating our things... The Inkotanyi we captured this morning told us that they hunt moles, partridges and cicadas. So it is wrong to think that such people will rule this country, that they will become officers, drive our vehicles and live in our houses. (TRA, RTLM broadcast, 16 May 1994)

This excerpt shows that the broadcaster intended to associate the RPF with wild beasts who ate food that human beings wouldn't eat. Such accusation degraded the RPF and at the same time disqualified the RPF from ruling the country. The notion that the RPF was incapable of ruling the country stimulated Hutus' attempts to drive away the RPF.

Eighth, the station further depicted members of the RPF as cowards, thieves and ruthless killers:

Excerpt No. 13. *Kantano Habimana [the broadcaster]:* Inkotanyi are using people as shields... Inkotanyi can hide himself behind an old woman so that if he is shot at, the old woman can serve as his shield... They become like thieves and indeed they are thieves... Any Hutu found in a house has been killed with machetes. They have killed all Interahamwe (a Hutu paramilitary organization that participated in the killing of Tutsis during the genocide), members of CDR... (TRA, RTLM broadcast, 12 April 1994)

In this excerpt, the broadcaster degraded members of the RPF by claiming that they were cowards who used people as human shields. The fact that members of the RPF were termed as thieves also contributed to the degradation. Furthermore, the broadcaster's claim that the RPF murdered Hutu soldiers facilitated the portrayal of members of the RPF as ruthless killers who were hostile to Hutus.

Ninth, members of the RPF were also depicted as deceivers by the station:

Excerpt No. 14. *Kantano Habimana [the broadcaster]:* Inkotanyi use the trick of attacking in a group of less than 50 people. They attack a commune, chase the bourgemestre and police men. Radio MUHABURA propagates rumors that RPF has attacked in a given place. When they hear, people flee and then RPF profits to take that place and they go on... (TRA, RTLM broadcast, 12 April 1994)

The excerpt above shows that the broadcaster accused the RPF of deceiving the public by claiming that the RPF always falsely announced victory in certain areas in order to force people to surrender.

Last but not least, the station portrayed the RPF as the “promise breaker”:

Excerpt No. 15. *Kantano Habimana [the broadcaster]:* Their resumption of hostilities has reduced the Arusha Peace Accord to nought. The RPF has resumed hostilities on all positions throughout the country (TRA, RTLTM broadcast, 12 April 1994).

In this excerpt, the broadcaster accused the RPF of breaking the Arusha Peace Accord, which turned the RPF into the “promise breaker.”

Furthermore, the station sought to arouse Hutus’ hatred of Tutsis by reminding Hutus of the oppression they had experienced in history:

Excerpt No. 16. *Kantano Habimana [the broadcaster]:* RPF wants to take and monopolize the power to oppress Hutus and ipso facto make democracy disappear. The Tutsis’ superiority complex dates fro time immemorial...(TRA, RTLTM broadcast, 12 April 1994)

Excerpt No. 17. *Kantano Habimana [the broadcaster]:* They should tell them in Arusha that it is the RPF that attacked Rwanda in October 1990 and that it is the same RPF which unilaterally resumed hostilities...the smart ones quickly understood that the RPF wanted nothing but to take power by force. (TRA, RTLTM broadcast, 12 April 1994)

In the excerpts above, the broadcaster sought to remind Hutus of the superiority that Tutsis enjoyed in history. By claiming that the RPF wanted to “take and monopolize the power to oppress Hutus,” he tried to portray members of the RPF as conspirators who sought to restore the Tutsi superiority by re-enslaving Hutus. Additionally, he reinforced the RPF’s image as the big conspirator by claiming that they would “take power by force.”

The excerpts that I selected from the R.T.L.M radio scripts show that the broadcaster sought to arouse the anger of Hutus in Rwanda by degrading the RPF and its so-called Tutsi accomplices. Members of the RPF were portrayed as thieves, sorcerers, cowards, deceivers, hostile infiltrators, promise breakers, wild animals who were incapable of ruling the country, ruthless killers who were hostile towards Hutus, the assassin of the Hutu President Habyarimana, and conspirators who colluded with Ugandan soldiers and aimed to restore the monarchy in

Rwanda in order to re-subjugate Hutus to Tutsi rule. The degradation of the RPF transformed its invasion into an ethnic war. Hutus were largely mobilized by those radio messages to slaughter Tutsis because they were convinced that the RPF represented the interests of the Tutsi population. Thus the RPF would overthrow the Rwandan transitional government and enslave all Hutus.

The R.T.L.M station not only worked to denigrate the RPF but also to diminish Rwandan political parties' role in provoking the genocide. A typical example was an interview made to Froduald Karamira, a Rwandan politician who was later charged with initiating the genocide. During the interview, Karamira claimed,

What I want to say about this government is that everybody should know that when a government is put in place, it is a government for the entire country, not for political parties... You can see therefore it is not an MDR government as one might be tempted to believe. It is a government for all Rwandans. When a government is put in place, it is a government for all; we have always wished that the government should realize first and foremost that it has to resolve Rwanda's problems rather than serve the interests of a group or a party as already happened in the past. (TRA, RTLM broadcast, 12 April 1994)

In this paragraph, Karamira sought to deemphasize Rwandan political parties' role in provoking the genocide. By claiming "it is a government for the entire country, not for political parties," Karamira wanted to highlight that the decision to slaughter Tutsis was made by all Rwandan people rather than a few political elites, which concealed the fact that political elites constructed ethnic hatred in order to consolidate their own power. Additionally, by arguing that the Rwandan government should first and foremost "resolve Rwanda's problems rather than serve the interests of a group or a party as already happened in the past," Karamira implied that Rwanda's current problems came from the RPF, which represented the Tutsi group. In order to curb the conspiracy of the RPF, who conspired to re-enslave Hutus by overthrowing the transitional government, the Rwanda government should feel justified to issue the order of slaughtering Tutsis. Karamira's statement contributed to the RPF's image as the big conspirator, which inflamed the conflict between Hutus and Tutsis.

The Kangura

The R.T.L.M radio station was not the only form of media to spread hate speeches against the RPF and other Tutsis. *The Kangura*, a notorious magazine founded by the Hutu-dominant MRND party after the invasion of the RPF in 1990, also spread hate speeches against the RPF and other Tutsis in order to stimulate Hutus' hatred towards them. To mobilize Hutus, *the Kangura*, on the one hand, degraded Rwandan Tutsis and sought to portray Rwandan Tutsis as accomplices of the RPF. On the other hand, it tried to depict the RPF as a big conspirator that sought to restore the feudal regime in Rwanda in order to enslave and even exterminate the Hutu population. Below I will give a series of excerpts of those hate speeches.

Excerpt No. 1. Even though the tension has not yet become a diplomatic conflict between the two governments, suspicion has set in Kigali is in fact convinced that the R.P.F. is essentially a Tutsi movement. (Rwanda File, Issue No. 4, July 1990)

Excerpt No. 2. We all know that with the exception of a few Hutus such as Kanyarengwe and Bizimungu, the refugees who have become Inyenzi-Inkotanyi (RPF) are all descendants of the Tutsis...(RF, Issue No. 19, July 1991)

In the excerpts above, by claiming that the RPF was “essentially a Tutsi movement,” the author intended to portray Rwandan Tutsis as accomplices of the RPF. Additionally, the notion that members of the RPF descended from Tutsis further contributed to the claim that the RPF represented the interests of the Tutsi population. The portrayal of Rwandan Tutsis as accomplices of the RPF activated Hutus' hatred towards them.

The magazine also portrayed Tutsis as demons, hostile infiltrators, ruthless killers as well as a threat to Hutus:

Excerpt No. 3. True, the Inkotanyi are synonymous with demons, and they have no desire to put an end to the massacre of their fellow countrymen who ardently support peace and noble justice (RF, Issue No. 8, January 1991)

Excerpt No. 4. The Inkotanyi enlist the help of their worldly sisters and daughters. You find them everywhere in all the institutions, in the Ministries, in the private sector, in legal and illegal drinking-places, as well as in our own houses, which many of them have managed to infiltrate through marriage. Having husbands does not prevent them from being accomplices... (RF, Issue No. 19, July 1991)

Excerpt No. 5. It is no longer a secret to anybody that the Tutsis, hiding behind their P.L. party, are trying to exterminate the Hutus...In fact, what do these insatiable Tutsis want? Arriving in October 1990 and armed, they killed the Hutus at Mutatas...Their

plan, it emerges, was to kill every Hutu child, particularly the boys. (RF, Issue No. 30, January 1992)

Excerpt No. 6. After the infamous massacres of Hutus in 1965, 1972–1973 and 1988 by minority Tutsi regimes in Burundi, the Hutu people are today, more than ever before, threatened with extermination. (RF, Issue No. 3, July 1990)

In the excerpts above, the author sought to degrade Tutsis by claiming that they were demons. Additionally, the notion that Tutsis were “everywhere in all institutions” facilitated the portrayal of them as hostile infiltrators. They were also portrayed as ruthless killers after the broadcaster accused them of conspiring to exterminate all Hutus. Furthermore, the fact that a great many Hutus were massacred in Burundi since the 1960s delineated the morose atmosphere that Hutus lived in under the Tutsi oligarchy. The MRND government made full use of such morose atmosphere in order to portray Tutsis as a threat to the Hutu population.

Moreover, the RPF was further portrayed as a big conspirator and war provoker by the magazine:

Excerpt No. 7. The Hutus must understand that they are not at all waging the war as the Tutsis, because everyone can see that the Tutsis want to regain the power that was taken from them by the Hutus... Those are the ones who want to continue waging the war until there are no Hutus civilians or soldiers left in Rwanda, except for their slaves. The Tutsis and the Inyenzi will have conquered the country (RF, Issue No. 19, July 1991)

Excerpt No. 8. Following their overthrow during the 1959 social revolution, the Tutsis have never given up. They are doing everything possible to restore their regime by using their vamps and money (RF, Issue No. 40, February 1993)

In the excerpts above, by claiming that “Tutsis want to regain the power that was taken from them by the Hutus” and “They are doing everything possible to restore their regime,” the author aimed to portray the RPF’s goal as overthrowing the Hutu government and restoring the Tutsi oligarchy just as during the colonial period, which facilitated the portrayal of the RPF as a big conspirator. Additionally, the author also accused the RPF of waging wars against Hutus.

The excerpts that I selected from *the Kangura* demonstrate that the MRND party sought to portray the RPF’s invasion as an ethnic war between Hutus and Tutsis. The degradation of Tutsis as demons, infiltrators, a threat to the Hutu population and ruthless killers facilitated

Hutus' antagonism towards Tutsis. Such antagonism further increased after the Kangura convinced the public that the RPF would restore the feudal regime in order to re-enslave and even exterminate Hutus. Additionally, the notion that the RPF represented the interests of the Tutsi population further mobilized Hutus to slaughter Tutsis.

The Hutu-Tutsi conflict was further inflamed by the publication of Hutu Ten Commandments in December 1990 in the Kangura. Below are the contents of these Ten Commandments.

1. Every Hutu male should know that Tutsi women, wherever they may be, are working in the pay of their Tutsi ethnic group. Consequently, shall be deemed a traitor:
Any Hutu male who marries a Tutsi woman;
Any Hutu male who keeps a Tutsi concubine;
Any Hutu male who makes a Tutsi woman his secretary or protégée.
2. Every Hutu male must know that our Hutu daughters are more dignified and conscientious in their role of woman, wife or mother. Are they not pretty, good secretaries and more honest!
3. Hutu women, be vigilant and bring your husbands, brothers and sons back to their senses.
4. Every Hutu male must know that all Tutsi are dishonest in their business dealings. They are only seeking their ethnic supremacy. "Time will tell." Shall be considered a traitor, any Hutu male:
who enters into a business partnership with Tutsis;
who invests his money or State money in a Tutsi company;
who lends to, or borrows from, a Tutsi;
who grants business favors to Tutsis (granting of important licenses, bank loans, building plots, public tenders...) is a traitor.
5. Strategic positions in the political, administrative, economic, military and security domain should, to a large extent, be entrusted to Hutus.
6. In the education sector (pupils, students, teachers) must be in the majority Hutu.
7. The Rwandan Armed Forces should be exclusively Hutu. That is the lesson we learned from the October 1990 war. No soldier must marry a Tutsi woman.
8. Hutus must cease having pity for the Tutsi.
9. The Hutu male, wherever he may be, must be united, in solidarity and be concerned about the fate of their Hutu brothers;
The Hutu at home and abroad must constantly seek friends and allies for the Hutu Cause, beginning with our Bantu brothers;
They must constantly counteract Tutsi propaganda;
The Hutu must be firm and vigilant towards their common Tutsi enemy.
10. The 1959 social revolution, the 1961 referendum and the Hutu ideology must be taught to Hutus at all levels. Every Hutu must propagate the present ideology widely. Any Hutu who persecutes his Hutu brother for having read, disseminated and taught this ideology shall be deemed a traitor. (RF, Issue No. 6, December 1990)

The Ten Commandments published in the Kangura illustrates that the Hutu-dominant MRND party sought to create ethnic distinctions by banning intermarriages and business partnerships between Hutus and Tutsis. Such distinctions were strengthened when the party sought to impose discriminations against Hutus by limiting their enrollment in schools and armed forces. By calling Hutus who did not follow the ban and those who had pity for or helped Tutsis traitors, the party successfully created ethnic distinctions between Hutus and Tutsis, which facilitated the mobilization of Hutus to kill Tutsis during the genocide.

Education Under the Republics

The state's mobilization of Hutus was not only implemented through mass media such as the radio station and the magazine but also through education. President Habyarimana gave up the relatively equal treatment of Hutus and Tutsis that he upheld in the early period of his rule and started to marginalize Rwandan Tutsis by restoring the quota system that President Kayibanda endorsed since the mid-1980s. Originally, the quota system imposed by President Kayibanda only offered Tutsis 9 to 15 percent of spots in schools because Tutsis constituted only about 9 to 15 percent of the Rwandan population. President Habyarimana complicated the quota system by taking students' regional origin and rural/urban provenance into account (King 2013: 82). As a result, the Tutsi population was more severely marginalized in education. According to the Ministry of Education (1989-1990) report, Tutsi students only constituted about less than 10 percent in primary schools, while Hutu students constituted about 90 percent. Such discrimination against Tutsis continued during the secondary schooling. Even though, in theory, the results of exams determined who would be admitted into schools, Tutsis were rarely admitted into public secondary schools no matter whether or not they got good grades. Tutsis' representation in the university was even less. For example, less than 15 percent of the students enrolled in the National University of Rwanda were Tutsis since the mid-80s. Furthermore, Tutsis were also discriminated against when facing employment opportunities. While Hutus

were sent to modern sectors after graduation, Tutsi graduates were sent to rural outposts.

The ethnic discrimination was combined with regional and class discriminations. On the one hand, Hutus from the north were strongly favored by President Habyarimana so that they could have a good education, given that the President himself was from the north. However, Hutus from the south were disfavored by the President. As a result, they considered themselves to be Tutsis, granted that Tutsis were also disfavored by the President. The notion that being Tutsi signified a disadvantaged status contributed to the stigmatization of the Tutsi population, which increased Hutus' hostility towards Tutsis. On the other hand, wealthy Tutsis usually paid to have their ethnicity changed on ethnic identity cards in order to get better education and gain upward mobility (King 2013: 84-93). Such behavior further exemplified the disadvantageous status of being Tutsi, which made Hutus hold Tutsis in contempt.

The Hutu government justified its discrimination against Tutsis by publishing articles conveying the message that "Tutsi don't study," which contributed to the denigration of Tutsis, who were seen as venomous snakes and were always chased around by Hutus in schools (King 2013: 87-91). The denigration of Tutsis further increased Hutus' hostility towards them. The fact that Hutus were hostile to Tutsis and held Tutsis in contempt facilitated Hutus' implementation of killing during the genocide.

Hutus were further mobilized by classroom practices, which aimed to indoctrinate people with Tutsi inferiority. Rwandan schoolteachers were taught by the government to make their students aware of their ethnicity. As a result, they separated Hutu students from Tutsi students with Hutus sitting in the front and Tutsis in the back. Tutsi students might be persecuted by the teacher and were even verbally and physically harassed just because they were Tutsis. They might also get a low grade because of their ethnicity. The teacher usually told the students that Hutus and Tutsis had different looks: Tutsis had refined noses, while Hutus had big noses. Tutsi students might be punished because of their "beautiful look." The teacher even told Tutsi students that because they were Tutsis, they should not speak up and raise their hands in class.

As a result, Hutu students usually mocked and humiliated Tutsi students. The classroom practices conveyed a message that while being Hutu signified the acquisition of a “license to be proud and to humiliate everyone who was different,” being Tutsi was a shameful thing, which contributed to the stigmatization of the Tutsi group (Brouwer, Chu, Muscati 2009: 92; King 2013: 96-101).

Such stigmatization further increased due to the indoctrination of history lessons. Rwandan schoolteachers taught their students the “Hamitic Hypothesis.” However, in contrast to the colonial authority, who used such hypothesis to construct the ethnic superiority of Tutsis, Rwandan schoolteachers used it to stigmatize the Tutsi group, arguing that Tutsis were wicked conquerors who conquered Rwanda and enslaved Hutus for more than 400 years. However, they were not eligible for ruling Hutus because they came from other places. As a result, when the Rwandan government’s armed militia slaughtered Tutsis during the genocide, they usually threw the bodies into the river so that those bodies could drift back to Ethiopia (Brouwer, Chu, Muscati 2009). Additionally, Tutsi exiles that fled Rwanda since the 1950s were termed as the “cockroach” in Rwandan textbooks. They were portrayed as conspirators who aimed to restore the Tutsi rule in Rwanda after the invasion of the RPF. While portraying Tutsis as conspirators, schoolteachers also told students that the Revolution of 1959 brought about justice, democracy and liberation to Rwanda because of the overthrow of the Tutsi monarchy (King 2013: 101-109). Rwandan schoolteachers’ portrayal of Tutsis as wicked foreigners and invaders and Hutu rebels of 1959 as liberators formed a sharp contrast, which contributed to the stigmatization of the Tutsi group. Such stigmatization facilitated Hutus’ hostility towards Tutsis, which contributed to the mobilization of Hutus during the genocide.

As we might draw from the state’s mobilization of the genocide, President Habyarimana, along with other Hutu-dominant political parties, intended to portray the RPF’s invasion as an ethnic war between Hutus and Tutsis. With the adoption of the radio stations, the magazines as well as radical classroom teaching, the Rwandan political elites successfully

constructed ethnic hatred held by Hutus against Tutsis. The denigration and stigmatization of the RPF and Rwandan Tutsis increased Hutus' hostility towards Tutsis, which mobilized Hutus to slaughter Tutsis during the genocide. Such hostility further increased when Hutus were reminded of their tragic past—they were historically oppressed by the colonial authority and Tutsi elites. Additionally, the concealment of the fact that Rwandan political parties played an important role in provoking the genocide further fueled Hutus' hatred towards ordinary Tutsis.

Chapter 3: Reactions of the International Community

In this chapter, I will mainly examine how the Hutu-Tutsi conflict was further fueled by the international community due to its nonintervention. Additionally, I will elaborate on how France became an accomplice of the Rwandan genocidal regime. It, first of all, remained silent over the anti-Tutsi violence initiated by President Habyarimana's government. Then, it provided the Rwandan government with military support. Other than that, the French government also degraded the RPF, remained indifferent to the deaths of Tutsis and even participated directly in the war between President Habyarimana and the RPF.

The Indifferent International Community

The Hutu-Tutsi conflict was further fueled by the indifferent international community, which was reluctant to take actions when the genocide occurred. The United Nations (UN) did, however, establish UNAMIR, a united peacekeeping force in Rwanda. This organization, composed of troops sent by different countries such as Belgium and France, was small and weak because those countries were reluctant to send enough troops to Rwanda. For example, the number of troops sent by Belgium was far below its promised amount. Originally, Belgium agreed to send 800 troops. It, finally, only sent about 400 troops. Additionally, after Belgium's failed attempt to persuade the UN to send in more troops and the death of nine Belgian soldiers, Belgium withdrew many troops. The U.S. was busy dealing with Somalia and thus basically ignored the incident in Rwanda.

The indifference of the international community also derived from the international community's reluctance to term the Rwandan massacre as "genocide." The recognition of the Rwandan massacre as "genocide" might force the international community to heavily intervene in Rwanda, given that "genocide" signified severe human rights abuses. However, Smith suggests that countries such as the U.S., UK, and Spain preferred to call the Rwandan case as catastrophe, massacre, tragedy and bloodshed, even though the EU declaration definitely

referred to the Rwandan case as genocide. The notion of perceiving the Rwandan case as civil war instead of genocide facilitated the diffusion of responsibilities of different countries so that those countries did not have to take actions (Smith 2010: 144-171).

France as the Biggest Accomplice of the Genocidal Regime

In addition to remaining indifferent to the genocide, France even served as an accomplice of the genocidal regime. Many works (Wallis 2006; Krosiak 2007) considered France as more responsible for the anti-Tutsi violence in Rwanda than other countries because on the one hand, the French government had a closer relationship with President Habyarimana. On the other hand, the French government hated the RPF. France was fully aware of the possibility that mass anti-Tutsi violence would occur in 1994, yet it chose to remain silent over the potential danger. Before the genocide, there were many warning signs of the tragedy in 1994. After the invasion of the RPF in 1990, President Habyarimana and other Hutu-dominant political parties used mass media such as the radio stations and the magazines to spread hate speeches against the RPF and its so-called Tutsi accomplices. Additionally, the MRND, headed by President Habyarimana, even organized massacres against the Tutsi population in response to the RPF invasion. For example, from 11 to 13 October 1990, about 400 Tutsis were massacred in Kibilira, a city in the western province of Rwanda. The same kind of violence also occurred in Murambi, a town in the northern province of Rwanda, and in Bugesera, a district in the eastern province of Rwanda, in 1991 and 1992 respectively, during which hundreds of Tutsis were massacred. Additionally, President Habyarimana's regime also arrested, imprisoned and even shot a great many opponents, who were suspected of collaborating with the RPF (Krosiak 2007: 84-86).

France was aware of those massacres and arrests because several documents reported President Habyarimana's initiation of anti-Tutsi violence. A typical example was the FIDH report, which was made by several national and international human rights organizations after

they conducted investigations in January 1993. The report claimed, “the Rwandan state was committing human rights abuses on a massive scale and in a systematic manner with the deliberate intention of targeting one ethnic group and the regime’s political opponents” (Krosiak 2007: 87). The same kind of message was also conveyed through The UN Human Rights Commission Report, which, after the occurrence of those massacres, claimed, “serious human rights violations were taking place and that there was a risk of genocide” (Krosiak 2007: 92). Such warning was also indicated in The Genocide Cable, a famous document written by UNAMIR’s force commander Major-General Romeo Dallaire on 11 January 1994. The document informed the UN of the testimonies that a Rwandan informant provided, which illustrated the potential danger that Rwandan Tutsis might face in 1994. The informant claimed that the Interahamwe, a Hutu armed militia that was backed by the Hutu-led government, trained people to kill 1000 Tutsis in 20 minutes. He himself was ordered by the militia to register all Tutsis in Kigali, the capital of Rwanda, in order to facilitate the killing. He also revealed the plot of the militia to kill Belgian soldiers (Krosiak 2007: 91-94; Stanton 2009: 1-3).

Another example was the report made by Bacre Waly Ndiaye, a UN special reporter who conducted an investigation in Rwanda in 1993. Ndiaye recognized the massacres occurring in Rwanda before 1993 as genocide after “Tutsis were being targeted for no reason other than their ethnic identity” (Wallis 2006: 60). The notion of defining massacres occurring in Rwanda before 1993 as genocide and recognizing Tutsis as being targeted for their ethnicity predicted an escalation of the anti-Tutsi violence in the following year. Another reason that might explain France’s awareness of the possibility for the genocide was they offered military training to the Rwandan army. Thus they should have been aware of the army’s preparation for the genocide (Krosiak 2007: 127).

The third piece of evidence that might reflect France’s pre-knowledge of the genocide was the open letter published by Human Rights Watch on 25 January 1993, an international non-governmental organization. In the letter, the organization stated,

The French government were with the Rwandan government that were planning the genocide, knew everything that was going on and not only didn't complain but did the opposite—legitimized and spoke on behalf of the government everywhere in the world. (Wallis 2006: 75-76)

The notion that the French government not only knew the atrocities committed by the Rwandan government but also helped the Rwandan government legitimize its atrocities turned France into the accomplice of the genocidal regime.

Even though France was aware of the possibility for the genocide, they, along with other countries in the international community, ignored such danger. Daniela Krosiak mentions that France “dismissed the reports of massacres in the northwest as ‘just rumors’” after the publication of those reports since 1993 (2007: 88). Andrew Wallis also mentioned, “the response of the French government, which had copies of all the reports and inside information from its own military and secret services, was to ignore them” (2006: 60). A typical figure who dismissed the reports of massacres was the French ambassador Georges Martres. He refused to join a group of Western diplomats who decided to ask President Habyarimana's government in March 1992 about a series of massacres occurring in Rwanda since the invasion of the RPF (Wallis 2006: 61). Additionally, according to an open letter written by 13 Rwandans to the French President, which was published in March 1992, France tolerated President Habyarimana's anti-Tutsi propaganda and the organized massacres in order to serve “as a moral guarantee for the regime in place” (Krosiak 2007: 85).

France tolerated and remained silent over the anti-Tutsi violence under President Habyarimana's regime because it wanted to keep President Habyarimana in power. France justified their support of President Habyarimana's regime by claiming that the government headed by the President represented the interests of the majority in Rwanda. Thus the government was “legal.” The close relationship between the President and France could be dated back to 1991. Hardliners in the French army claimed that they would support President Habyarimana and curb the peace talks with the RPF so that Rwandan government forces could

defeat the RPF. In response to France's declared support, President Habyarimana ordered the publication of the French President Mitterrand's photograph on *the Kangura* and termed him as "a true friend of Rwanda" (Wallis 2006: 43). The French government also provided President Habyarimana's government with generous financial aid. Compared to the financial aid provided by the French government from 1975 to 1990, which was only 5 million Francs, the aid given by France from 1991 to 1992 reached 55 million Francs—after the invasion of the RPF, the Rwandan government received more financial aid from France in many sectors, including education, culture, rural development, health, infrastructure, communications, administration, and businesses. Additionally, the French government provided Habyarimana's government with security support. For example, it helped Habyarimana's government construct the air traffic control system (Kroslak 2007: 102, 126).

France supported President Habyarimana because President Habyarimana stood against the RPF. Thus France's support of the President might facilitate the combat against the RPF. France feared the RPF and recognized the RPF invasion as "an external aggression by an army supported, equipped and trained by Uganda" (Kroslak 2007: 113). It also accused Paul Kagame, who was the leader of the RPF as a spy of America. According to a French mercenary, Paul Kagame was "a very clever soldier. But he's a product of America, he's CIA. For a start he doesn't speak a word of French. He only speaks English. And he did all his training...as an officer in American military schools" (Wallis 2006: 26). The fact that the RPF was trained with the support of the U.S. government further contributed to France's recognition of it as a threat because France thought, "Ugandan Tutsis were plotting to reconstitute an English-speaking empire close to the U.S." (Kroslak 2007: 130).

Unable to bear the invasion of the RPF, France dispatched a military force, in what was labeled Operation Noroit to Rwanda. However, the troop was not sent to prevent the anti-Tutsi violence conducted by President Habyarimana's government but to protect the interests of the French government—"to protect the French embassy, to ensure the protection of French citizens

and to be there case of possible evacuation” (Krosiak 2007: 124). France even mobilized the UN to send troops into Rwanda, yet the aim of those troops should not be to curb the anti-Tutsi violence but to prevent the RPF from taking power (Krosiak 2007: 121).

In order to prevent the RPF from taking power, France, first of all, provided the Rwandan government with military training. A typical example was Interahamwe. Hutu militants from this organization were trained to use guns by French sergeants at the military camp (Wallis 2006: 74). Rwandan armed personnel such as Rwandan Defense Forces (FAR), police officers and the Presidential Guard (PG) were also trained through Military Assistance Mission (DAMI), a type of military cooperation between France and the Rwandan government that was launched after 1991. The head of the DAMI became the advisor to President Habyarimana. With the military support of France, the Rwandan army expanded from merely 6000 in 1990 to 35000 in 1994 (Krosiak 2007: 125-132).

France also provided the Rwandan government with artillery support. Originally, African armies were usually equipped with weapons from east Europe, China and Russia, which were cheap and were of low quality. France provided Rwandan government forces with modern weaponry such as tanks, mortars, helicopters and radar equipment. From 1992 to 1993, arms worth about 12 million dollars were supplied to the Rwandan government (Wallis 2006: 30; Krosiak 2007: 140-146).

In addition to providing military support, French sergeants remained indifferent to the deaths of Tutsis and even mobilized Hutu soldiers to kill Tutsis during the training. According to Hutu trainees, French sergeants told them that Tutsis sent their children to the RPF, so they should slaughter Tutsis, or they themselves would be attacked by the RPF. As a result, Hutu trainees learned from French sergeants about how to catch people and bind people down. They even tortured and killed Tutsi prisoners in front of French soldiers, while there was no intervention from French soldiers (Wallis 2006: 56). Some Tutsi survivors also testified that when people were chased around by the Interahamwe, French soldiers just stood by and watched

(Brouwer, Chu, Muscati 2009: 46). Dennis Polisi, the former RPF ambassador, accused the Rwandan government of “being in league with the genocidaire” because he “certainly did not see them trying to help anyone” (Wallis 2006: 85). Another testimony was from a Belgian journalist named Els de Temmerman. According to Temmerman, the French troops refused to intervene when six persons were murdered in front of them. Those French soldiers later explained, “It is not our mandate” (Wallis 2006: 87).

The same kind of indifference was also reflected in the French embassy. Despite the fact that Tutsis were severely marginalized in the later period of President Habyarimana’s rule, the French embassy was still mostly populated by Tutsi staff. When the administrative staff of the embassy asked for asylum after President Habyarimana’s plane crashed, the French government refused to give asylum to them because it did not regard Tutsis as friends of France. According to a Tutsi survivor who worked in the French embassy, the French soldiers replied him, “Our mission is not to protect you but the building” after he asked those soldiers to take him and his Tutsi colleagues to safety (Wallis 2006: 92). However, while those French soldiers refused to help the Tutsi staff in the embassy, they did agree to help Rwandan government forces. For example, after the Interahamwe used up their grenades, the French soldiers gave them more (Wallis 2006: 92). The French government’s indifference to the deaths of Tutsis was further illustrated in a report made by Human Rights Watch,

The French were in a position to save Tutsi and others at risk with relatively little difficulty, and yet they chose to save very few. In at least one case, French embassy personnel made no response to pleas for help from a Tutsi employee and in another they refused assistance to a Hutu prosecutor well known for his opposition to Habyarimana. (Wallis 2006: 100)

The French government’s reluctance to save Tutsis and President Habyarimana’s political opponents indicated that it was the accomplice of the genocidal regime.

In addition to remaining indifferent to the deaths of Tutsis, the French government also degraded the RPF and its so-called Tutsi accomplices in order to mobilize Hutus to combat the RPF. First of all, it discriminated against all Tutsis by refusing to recognize them as Rwandans.

By claiming that Tutsis were “black Khmers,” France implied that they were similar to supporters of the Khmer Rouge, a political party under the leadership of the dictator Pol Pot that initiated genocide in Cambodia in 1975. The portrayal of Tutsis as supporters of the genocidal regime facilitated the construction of the RPF as terrorists who invaded “purely to wreak havoc and with no meaningful political agenda” (Wallis 2006: 26). The construction of the RPF as terrorists increased the hostility of Hutus towards Tutsis, which mobilized Hutus to combat the RPF. Additionally, the French government accused the RPF of colluding with the Ugandan government. After the RPF’s invasion, the General Directorate for External Security (DGSE), an external intelligence agency of France, told the French public that the RPF rebels burned Rwandan villages and the Ugandan government was behind the RPF’s attack. However, the agency failed to inform the public of the massacres committed by Rwandan government forces (Wallis 2006: 72). The failure to inform the public of the atrocities committed by the Rwandan government facilitated the portrayal of the Rwandan government as a victim of the attack imposed by the RPF villain, which aroused people’s sympathy towards President Habyarimana’s regime and at the same time facilitated the combat against the RPF.

The French government even participated directly in the war between the government and the RPF. A large number of French troops were sent into Rwanda after 28 February 1993 in order to help the Rwandan government combat the RPF. Even though France promised not to intervene in the war between government forces and the RPF, witnesses saw French troops working with Rwandan government forces in civilian areas. For example, the French government troops, along with Rwandan government forces, performed identity checks at roadblocks, which were set up by the Rwandan government after the assassination of President Habyarimana, in order to help the Rwandan government figure out who the Tutsi were so that the government forces could kill them. A Tutsi survivor testified that when French soldiers caught Tutsis at the roadblock, they “handed them to the angry militiamen who hit them with machetes and threw them into a gully” (Wallies 2006: 38). Additionally, France helped the

government forces by patrolling in the war zone, supervising and organizing the supply of arms and other equipment as well as taking care of helicopters (Kroslak 2007: 135). Other than that, France was also involved in questioning the RPF soldiers in August 1991, who had been captured during the war between the Rwandan government and the RPF (Kroslak 2007: 146-151) According to the International Federation for Human Rights, a non-governmental human rights organization, France “led ‘strong-armed’ interrogations of RPF prisoners” (Wallis 2006: 50).

The French government’s direct involvement in the war was further backed by the testimonies of victims of sexual violence in the war. During the Rwandan genocide, both Hutu and Tutsi women were widely raped. They claimed that in addition to Hutu rapists, French soldiers also participating in committing such atrocities,

The perpetrators of sexual violence were mostly members of the Hutu militia, the Interahamwe. But rapes were also committed by Presidential Guards, military soldiers of the Rwandan Armed Forces (FAR), the Rwandan police and civilians, as well as by international soldiers—most notably the French... (Brouwer, Chu, Muscati 2009: 17)

Another Tutsi survivor also described how she was raped by French soldiers,

Suddenly, a French soldier appeared out of nowhere, grabbed me by the arm, took me to a trench, took my baby off my back, slapped me, pushed me into the trench and raped me, while five other French soldiers watched... I was raped in the camp by French soldiers four more times. (Brouwer, Chu, Muscati 2009: 46-47)

The testimonies of those victims showed that French soldiers were not only bystanders but also contributed to the commitment of violence during the genocide, which turned the French government into an accomplice of the genocidal regime.

The notion that the international community was reluctant to send troops into Rwanda to intervene during the genocide facilitated the implementation of violence by Hutus against Tutsis. The fact that France colluded with the Rwandan government by remaining silent over the anti-Tutsi violence, providing the regime with military support, degrading the RPF and its so-called Tutsi accomplices, remaining indifferent to the deaths of Tutsis and even participated directly in the war turned France into an accomplice of the genocidal regime, which further fueled the

Hutu-Tutsi conflict and contributed to the occurrence of the genocide in 1994.

Chapter 4: After the Genocide

This chapter examines the RPF government's postgenocide national unity and reconciliation policies. By examining the RPF government's manipulation of the Rwandan people's thoughts and behavior, the chapter seeks to illustrate how the government-sponsored reconciliation became a coerced reconciliation, which means the Rwandan people did not feel truly unified in their hearts, even though the government sought to manipulate people to believe in national unity and reconciliation. Additionally, by examining the resistant measures adopted by the Rwandan people against the government's manipulation, the chapter will also elaborate on how the state's excessive involvement made the government-sponsored reconciliation a failed reconciliation.

Coerced Reconciliation

The genocide ended when the RPF finally beat the Hutu-led government and took over power in July of 1994, after which it started a reconciliation process between Hutus and Tutsis. However, the reconciliation was a coerced reconciliation, given that the RPF government intended to manipulate the Rwandan people's thoughts and behavior. Because the Rwandan people were aware of the government's manipulation, they did not feel truly unified. Susan Thomson argues that Hutus and Tutsis "reconcile according to script" (2013: 113). First of all, the government promoted national unity and reconciliation by banning the Rwandan people from discussing their ethnicity. People were indoctrinated with the idea that they were not Hutus, Tutsis or the Twa but were all Rwandans. Additionally, the government sought to manipulate victimhood by collectivizing Hutu guilt. The RPF government made the generalization that all Hutus were perpetrators in the genocide, while only Tutsis were eligible for being survivors. In this scenario, Hutus were denied the opportunities to become survivors, granted that the RPF government wanted the genocide to be remembered as the violence committed against Tutsis. However, the truth was many moderate Hutus—those who did not

commit the violence against Tutsis—were also massacred. The government's recognition of all Hutus as perpetrators did not make sense also because many of them were forced by the government's armed militia to slaughter Tutsis. Thus they should not be fully responsible for the killing. Nevertheless, many Hutus who were forced to become killers were arrested by the RPF after the genocide (Thomson 2013: 115-116; Fujii 2009: 135).

Another reason why all Hutus should not be seen as perpetrators is that some Hutus were actually rescuers of their Tutsi neighbors during the genocide. They helped their Tutsi neighbors and friends by warning them before the genocide began, hiding them, refusing to hand them over to the government's armed militia, defying the authority's order to kill them and helping them obtain fake documents, which might protect Tutsi document-holders by granting them fake identities. For example, the document might falsely claim that the document-holder was a Hutu despite the fact that he/she had lost the identity card, which was used to identify who the Tutsi were during the genocide (Brouwer, Chu, Muscati 2009: 126; Fujii 2009: 134, 139-144). The notion that some Hutus did not commit the violence against Tutsis and even saved them during the genocide defied the RPF government's claim that all Hutus were perpetrators. Additionally, the fact that many moderate Hutus were also massacred during the genocide just as Tutsis further rebuked the government's assumption that only Tutsis were eligible to be considered survivors. The RPF government's distortion of truth exemplified its manipulation of the Rwandan people's thoughts. Such manipulation distressed the Rwandan people.

The government also sought to manipulate people's behavior by politicizing individual mourning. After the genocide, bodies of people who were massacred were dug up for reburial, after which a mourning ceremony was held for dead Tutsis. The participation in the mourning ceremony was compulsory—all Rwandans were required to attend the mourning ceremony regardless of their ethnicities. However, a great many people cast doubt on this mourning ceremony. First of all, they were not sure whether the reburied bodies were Tutsis who died during the genocide. Additionally, they were dissatisfied with the RPF government's omission

of Hutus' sufferings during the genocide. Others expressed the concern that the RPF government did not respect the dead and their family members because it forced people to bury the remains of the dead in official mass graves. Nevertheless, families of the dead wanted to bury the remains in their own land in order to honor the dead in their own way.

Last but not least, the Twa described that they did not want to mourn for the dead because the mourning ceremony was only held for Tutsis not for people of their own ethnic group (Thomson 2013: 116-118, 153). According to a Twa interviewee, "I want nothing to do with that as my people [ethnic Twa] are not recognized there...My husband died at Kibeho camp, and the RPF did it. We all know that. To say that only Tutsi are the survivors of the genocide is just false" (Thomson 2013: 154). The fact that all Rwandans were required to participate in the mourning ceremony and to only mourn for Tutsis demonstrated the RPF government's manipulation of people's behavior. The doubts and concerns expressed by the Rwandan people towards the government-held mourning ceremony illustrated that they did not feel truly unified.

Other ways to promote national unity and reconciliation included the adoption of a new flag, anthem and national seal in order to show that Rwanda was "peaceful and prosperous." However, the notion that postgenocide Rwanda was peaceful and prosperous was far from reality. In reality, people living in postgenocide Rwanda did not enjoy peace in their hearts. It was, first of all, because they suffered from severe poverty. In postgenocide Rwanda, economic survival became a daily struggle for ordinary Rwandans. The daily income of Rwandan adults was less than 0.5 dollars. The poorest made about 0.3 dollars on a daily basis. People could barely afford goods that were more expensive than basic necessities. Rwandan cities remained quiet with few people visiting bars and cafes. The cities were not prosperous, given that far less foreigners than before gathered in cities. Unemployment was common with a great many people standing in line in order to compete for a few jobs at cities' construction sites (Waugh 2004: 214).

People also complained about a lack of food, clean water as well as affordable health services. Until 2001, about 250,000 residents in Kigali did not have regular access to clean water (Waugh 2003: 214). Peasant Rwandans were always hit by severe malnutrition. They claimed that their caloric intake was not enough to support them through manual labor and they had little and even no access to cash. Additionally, they did not have sufficient arable land after the genocide because a great deal of land was appropriated by the RPF government for commercial use. More importantly, many people lost their land and home during the genocide. For example, many Tutsis who fled the regime during the genocide returned later only to find that their properties had been taken by others.

The same kind of situation also applied to Hutus. After the genocide ended, some Hutus fled to Congo and other neighboring countries, while others were imprisoned or sent to reeducation camps, which I will introduce in detail in the following paragraphs. When Hutu refugees and prisoners were repatriated or were released from prison and returned home, they might find that their properties had already been taken by others (Thomson 2013: 116, 136-143). Furthermore, among all the Rwandan people, female-headed households suffered from the severest poverty because many women, who lost their husbands and male relatives during the genocide, must work along with men in the fields and at the same time take care of babies. Such a busy schedule might exhaust those widowed women.

Women's situation might be exacerbated if they were raped during the genocide and were diagnosed with HIV/AIDS. The 2003 statistics showed that about 14 percent of the population was diagnosed with HIV (Waugh 2004: 213). Women who were diagnosed with HIV suffered from social stigma; thus they might face severe discrimination when seeking employment, proclaiming their rights over properties and asking for medical services. Other kinds of human rights abuses also occurred to them. They also suffered from a lack of access to health care. According to a UN report made in 2008, only about 30 percent of victims of sexual violence were able to afford basic health care. Only half of the victims received medical

treatment after experiencing sexual violence (Brouwer, Chu, Muscati 2009: 146).

Other than economic hardships, people living in postgenocide Rwanda also suffered from posttraumatic distress because of the severe violence they had witnessed or committed during the genocide. Moreover, Hutu men were usually excluded from the community life after they had been released from prison. For example, they were always viewed with suspicion because of their identity as “perpetrators.” Another example would be that people were not willing to stay close to them and they were given few opportunities to get income-generating jobs such as the carpenter and the taxi driver. Third, Hutu perpetrators usually felt uneasy when they returned from prison or reeducation camps because of the angry reactions of Tutsi survivors. Some survivors even threatened Hutu men by harassing them in the street or throwing rocks at their houses during the night (Clark 2010: 119). In addition to Hutu men, genocide orphans were also severely excluded after they grew up because they had “no work and no sense of attachment to family and society” (Waugh 2004: 211). Many orphans were forced into prostitution after they became youths (Waugh 2004: 222). Given that a great many people suffered from economic hardships and exclusion in postgenocide Rwanda, the idea that postgenocide Rwanda was peaceful and prosperous, which was claimed by the RPF government, turned out to be far from reality. The contrasting image presented by the RPF government demonstrated the government’s attempt to manipulate people to believe in Rwanda’s postgenocide prosperity. Such manipulation discomforted the Rwandan people.

To further convey the message that postgenocide Rwanda was “peaceful and prosperous,” the RPF government established the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission (NURC). The commission was solely composed of members from the RPF, who aimed to teach the public about the unifying aspects and downplayed the divisive history between Hutus and Tutsis that was highlighted since the colonial period (Thomson 2013: 118-119). The strong presence of members of the RPF in the commission and the heavy indoctrination of the unifying aspects featured the RPF government’s manipulation of people’s

thoughts. Such manipulation overwhelmed the Rwandan people.

The same type of manipulation was also reflected through the establishment of Local Defense Forces, which were constructed to monitor the Rwandan people. If people dissented from the RPF government, they would be arrested and even assassinated (Waugh 2004: 210). Such surveillance terrified the Rwandan people, which formed the most obvious contradiction between the RPF government's promoted image that Rwanda was "peaceful and prosperous" and reality.

The establishment of the Gacaca court also illustrated the RPF government's attempt to promote national unity and reconciliation. While the masterminds of the genocide were sent to the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR), which was set up by the Security Council in 1994, for justice, ordinary Rwandans were persecuted at the Gacaca court (Bornkamm 2012: 28-29). The Gacaca court was set up in order to relieve the pressure of overcrowded prisons, which had been filled up with about 100,000 perpetrators of the genocide before 2001. As a form of community-based justice, the Gacaca court aimed to "bring together local communities to witness, identify, corroborate and prosecute perpetrators" (Thomson 2013: 121). Because the goal of the Gacaca trial was to reconcile rather than punish, prisoners who committed less serious crimes and who gave a full confession during the trial were rewarded benefits—their prison term might be reduced by half and they might replace their second half of the prison term with community service, which could be done around their home region.

Some survivors of the Rwandan genocide admired the Gacaca trial because it allowed popular participation. They claimed, "Gacaca is important because it allows us to be together and to hear the truth and to learn to live together again" (Clark 2010: 90). Additionally, the Gacaca court also empowered women by granting them more opportunities to participate in nondomestic spheres. While traditional Rwandan women were widely deprived of opportunities to become judges, modern Gacaca courts were composed of about 40 percent of female judges. As a result, women had more opportunities to talk in nondomestic spheres. Furthermore, many Rwandan

people believed that the Gacaca court facilitated the restoration of relationships by offering a space for truth-telling. According to a Gacaca participant, “The community will definitely accept what I say at gacaca. I will stand up and tell them everything I saw when these killings occurred and they will agree that I am telling the truth” (Clark 2010: 193). The notion that people congregated to learn about the truth facilitated the restoration of relationships so that people could “engage with others—both those who [shared] their experiences and with those who may even [had] committed crimes against them—and thus [achieved] a greater sense of personal integration” (Clark 2010: 195). In this scenario, perpetrators might acquire a sense of relief after they confessed to and apologized for what they had done in front of their victims, while survivors might also feel comfortable because there were other survivors who could understand their pain due to their similar experiences (Clark 2010: 194-195).

The Gacaca court also worked as a space for healing because it allowed people to obtain a sense of belonging. According to Gacaca participants, the audience at the Gacaca court was empathetic so that the community could recognize the sufferings of survivors, which might facilitate survivors’ reintegration into the community. In this scenario, survivors of the genocide might acquire a sense of belonging (Clark 2010: 262).

Moreover, the Gacaca court might also promote the reconciliation between perpetrators and victims by providing people with a space for talking and sharing. According to a survivor of the genocide, “The reason I came to gacaca today is because I want to speak to the killers. Talking to them face to face is important for our reconciliation. How can I live with them again unless I can talk to them first?” (Clark 2010: 314). A perpetrator also claimed that he wanted to confess during the Gacaca trial so that “he could ‘live peacefully with others’ in the future” (Clark 2010: 316). The notion of “talking first before living together peacefully again” exemplified the process of reconciliation between perpetrators and victims.

However, many Hutus cast doubts on the Gacaca trial, which formed a sharp contrast to the positive views held by some survivors. They claimed that innocent Hutus could be convicted

during the trial and sent to perform community services because of the false testimony given by Tutsi survivors. Given the community service required the performance of manual labor, which was very degrading for Hutu intellectuals, many Hutus claimed that the community service was set up to “keep educated Hutus out of the public system” (Thomson 2013: 157). The notion of “keeping educated Hutus out of the public system” showed the RPF government’s manipulation of Hutus’ behavior, which made Hutus feel they were inferior to Tutsis.

Another aspect reflecting the manipulation was the forced forgiveness and forced participation in the Gacaca trial imposed by the RPF government. Survivors of the genocide were forced to forgive perpetrators once those perpetrators confessed their crimes during the trial. According to Paul Kagame, the leader of the RPF government, perpetrators deserved forgiveness because “you can’t give up on that—on such a person...they can learn” (Waugh 2004: 209). However, most Tutsis did not want to forgive those Hutu killers in reality, given that they had lost a great many family members and friends during the genocide. According to a Tutsi survivor, “mourning week is a joke...I mean, we were targeted because we were Tutsi; now we have to forget about that in the name of national unity and reconciliation” (Thomson 2013: 152). The Tutsi survivor emphasized that the so-called national unity and reconciliation policy was a farce because it was impossible for Tutsis to forgive those Hutu perpetrators simply because of their confession. The notion of being unable to forgive was also reflected in other testimonies given by Tutsi widows. They claimed that they “could not deal with seeing their husbands’ killers at large in the town again...if the killers came back, [they] would leave the town” (Waugh 2004: 211). Apart from feeling reluctant to forgive Hutu perpetrators, many Tutsi survivors thought that most Hutu perpetrators received lenient punishment during the trial (Clark 2010: 84). Additionally, they also expressed their concern for their own safety because of the reduced sentences that Hutu perpetrators got. According to a Tutsi survivor, “because most of the perpetrators will be leaving the prison any day now. I live in a neighborhood with many genocidaires and I am afraid for my safety” (Brouwer, Chu, Muscati 2009: 90). Other survivors

also reported the violence they had been through, which was committed by people related to Hutu perpetrators, because those survivors testified in court against Hutu perpetrators (Brouwer, Chu, Muscati 2009: 105). That Tutsi survivors were not able to truly forgive Hutu perpetrators during the trial illustrated that they did not feel truly unified and reconciled. The fact that they also worried about their own safety further contributed to their reduced sense of unification.

Participation in the trial was also not voluntary but rather compulsory. Every Rwandan was assigned a pink card, which showed whether she or he had participated in the local trial. Failure to participate in the Gacaca trial might lead to a fine. The RPF government might even use force to ensure people's attendance during the trial. Even the election of Gacaca judges was compulsory. People were forced to vote for the candidates of Gacaca judges presented by the RPF government. As a result, more than 200,000 Gacaca judges were elected for about 11,000 Gacaca courts.

The third aspect reflecting the government's manipulation during the Gacaca trial was that all members, including perpetrators, survivors and even Gacaca judges, were under the strict surveillance of the local government. A Tutsi survivor might be forced to testify in court against a Hutu perpetrator by the local government, even though he or she did not want to be reminded of those traumatic memories. Exhumed remains of genocide victims were sometimes displayed during the trial, which might trigger protests from survivors who opposed the exhibition of such traumatizing evidence (Clark 2010: 85). Additionally, a Tutsi survivor might even be instructed by the local government to testify in court against a Hutu suspect, even though the Tutsi survivor knew that the Hutu suspect was not guilty. A typical example was that Jeanne, a Tutsi survivor, was asked by the local official to testify against a Hutu suspect, who was accused of murdering her whole family. However, when she saw the man in court, she found out that the man accused by the local government was not the killer but rather her brother-in-law. She broke down later. In this scenario, an innocent Hutu man or woman might be sentenced to imprisonment due to false testimonies given by Tutsi survivors. In other circumstances, innocent Hutu men might

falsely confessed to crimes in order to get reduced sentences (Clark 2010: 210). Furthermore, if Hutu perpetrators questioned the impartiality of the court by asking the judge why RPF soldiers could get rid of the prosecution for murdering Hutus during its advance and slaughtering soldiers of the former government's armed militia after it took power in order to avenge the deaths of Tutsis, they might risk losing their lives (Thomson 2013: 169-175).

In addition to perpetrators and survivors, even Gacaca judges were under the strict surveillance of the local government. On the one hand, Gacaca judges might be forced by the local government to conduct trials no matter whether they had time. A typical example was that the wife of a Gacaca judge complained to him that he always let his family starve when it was time to harvest, given that the judge was forced to conduct the trial during the harvest (Bornkamm 2012: 37-40; Thomson 2013: 169). On the other hand, Gacaca judges might be forced by the RPF government to "give their judgments more quickly" (Bornkamm 2012: 40). As a result, trials were normally done within three sessions. Even some of the cases were finished within one day (Bornkamm 2012: 40). Furthermore, government officials might instruct judges by correcting their statements and even passing notes to them during the trial (Clark 2010: 146). As we might draw from the Gacaca trial, even though the court was set up to facilitate the reconciliation between Hutus and Tutsis, the forced forgiveness, compulsory participation as well as the strict surveillance over perpetrators, survivors and judges exemplified the RPF government's manipulation of people's thoughts and behavior. Such manipulation distressed the Rwandan people.

The reconciliation effects further diminished in the Ingando reeducation camp, a place filled up with prisoners who were old, seriously ill or were minors when committing the crime. Those prisoners were sent to the camp to be reeducated instead of serving sentences in prison (Bornkamm 2012: 36-38). In the camp, people were taught by the staff that only Hutus were eligible to become killers, which made Hutus "a source of shame" for the government (Thomson 2013: 120). However, the truth was the RPF also massacred a great many Hutu civilians during

its advancement and slaughtered soldiers of the former government after it took power. The cover-up of truth by the RPF government demonstrated the government's attempt to manipulate the narrative. Such manipulation upset the Rwandan people.

In order to manipulate people's thoughts and behavior more effectively, the RPF government even paid the local authorities and administrative personnel with livestock and asked them to help the government monitor the Rwandan people. People who expressed dissatisfaction with the government's policy to promote national unity and reconciliation might be arrested and imprisoned. Additionally, the funds they received from the government, which were granted to compensate for their sufferings during the genocide, might also be subject to cancellation. Furthermore, domestic human rights NGOs, which criticized the RPF government and accused the government of committing human rights abuses, were closed for promoting divisive views and genocidal ideologies. A typical example was the Rwandan League for the Promotion and Defense of Human Rights (LIPRODHOR). This organization was charged with debilitating the national unity promoted by the RPF government. Thus the organization was closed and many members fled into exile (Thomson 2013: 123-125).

As we can draw from the postgenocide reconciliation process, even though the RPF adopted a series of measures to promote national unity and reconciliation, the government's strong manipulation of people's thoughts and behavior, which was represented by forced participation in the mourning ceremony and the Gacaca court, the forced recognition of the Tutsi as the sole survivor and the Hutu as the sole perpetrator during the genocide, forced forgiveness, the idea indoctrinated into the minds of the public that was far from reality as well as the strict surveillance over perpetrators, survivors and judges during the Gacaca trial contributed to the state's excessive involvement in the reconciliation process, which made people not feel truly unified.

The fact that people did not feel truly unified was also backed by testimonies of Tutsi survivors:

but everything has changed. It isn't like before, when we worked closely together, when Hutu and Tutsi intermarried and Hutu children were considered Tutsi children. People are more careful... There is no reconciliation here. There is no more violence but there isn't reconciliation. Even in church, Hutu sit on one side and Tutsi on the other. (Clark 2010: 124)

The testimonies show that after the genocide, the relationship between Hutus and Tutsis was not as intimate as before, which demonstrated a lack of reconciliation. In this scenario, the government-sponsored reconciliation became a coerced reconciliation.

Standing Against the State's Coerced Reconciliation

The coerced reconciliation promoted by the RPF government aroused resistance from many Rwandan people, who rebelled against it on a daily basis. Above all, they did not want to grant Hutu perpetrators the forgiveness that was demanded by the RPF government. As a result, they avoided interactions with local officials in order to miss the participation in the Gacaca trial or in the welcome ceremony that should be held for Hutu perpetrators returning from prison or reeducation camps. Additionally, some avoided the Gacaca trials through excuses such as taking care of a sick child or having "women's problems." Mocking was also a common tactic used to express dissatisfaction towards the government's coerced reconciliation. For example, a person might laugh at the speech made by local officials in the returning ceremony for those Hutu perpetrators who were released from prison or the Reeducation Camp in order to protest against perpetrators' release (Thomson 2013: 147-152).

Another way to protest against the state's coerced reconciliation policies was to remain silent. Government officials might be angered when a Tutsi survivor refused to give testimonies in court by remaining silent. Hutu perpetrators might also remain silent to protest when they felt that they were wrongly accused by the judge during the trial. Last but not least, people might also protest by speaking against the RPF government's reconciliation policies before the Gacaca court. For example, Hutu perpetrators might complain about the poor living conditions in the prison and accuse the RPF government of aiming to get rid of all Hutus, while Tutsi survivors

might speak against the RPF's policy by complaining about economic hardships that people experienced in postgenocide Rwanda. Tutsi survivors attributed these economic hardships to the poor management of the RPF government by claiming that they themselves worked hard every day. A typical example of these testimonies was, "I wake up early to harvest so we can come to Gacaca on time" (Thomson 2013: 181). The complaints made by Hutu perpetrators and Tutsi survivors before the court often won applause from the court's spectators (Thomson 2013: 155-181).

As we can draw from the RPF government's reconciliation process and Rwandan people's resistance against the government's reconciliation, the Rwandan people did not feel truly unified because of the RPF government's strong manipulation. As a result, people rebelled against the government-sponsored coerced reconciliation on a daily basis. Therefore, the government's reconciliation process failed. This failure is supported by the facts. In 2001, about 55,000 Hutu refugees who fled Rwanda after the RPF took over power still refused to return. Additionally, about 10,000 new refugees fled Rwanda in 2000, which illustrated that "the government's proclaimed reconciliation measures had yet to inspire the confidence of many of its own people" (Waugh 2004: 210).

Conclusion

In this paper, I refuted the assumption that ethnic hatred was the only or even the main motivation for the genocide, and argued that the killing of Tutsis was not merely based on ethnic reasons but also on the state's mobilizations of Hutus. I made this argument by looking at how the exaggeration of the Hutu-Tutsi differences since the colonial period failed to bring about ethnic tensions during President Habyarimana's rule, how the tensions and conflicts under his rule were portrayed as an ethnic war by political elites through various kinds of mass media, and how such conflicts were inflamed because of the international community's lack of intervention.

The government-sponsored reconciliation process further helps me understand the role of the Rwandan political elites in controlling and manipulating people's thoughts and behavior, which imposed intolerable pressures on many Rwandan people. However, even though I argued that Rwanda's reconciliation process failed, I do recognize the limitations of my own argument because the Gacaca trial, as a typical example of Rwanda's reconciliation process, received both compliments and criticisms from the Rwandan people. Additionally, I would like to encourage people to think further about elites' manipulation in the Rwandan context. We learned that the Rwandan political elites constructed ethnic hatred and monitored the reconciliation process, yet why did they enforce such a strong control over the Rwandan population? Why not pick a more democratic method to implement reconciliation? Future studies could be done to answer these questions.

Furthermore, in response to my own argument that Rwanda's government-sponsored reconciliation failed, I want to give several suggestions for how to make the reconciliation process more successful. Rwanda's reconciliation could have been more successful as long as three conditions were achieved. Staub (2006: 887) argues that contact could promote positive relations and mitigate hostility between two groups. If the RPF government did not seek to manipulate the narrative by banning the discussion of ethnicity but instead were to acknowledge

the differences and encourage the conversations and negotiations between the two ethnic groups, the Rwandan people might feel more reconciled. Additionally, even though the Gacaca trial aimed to reconcile rather than punish, I believe that perpetrators should be sentenced based on the severity of their crimes rather than whether or not they had made confessions. It was unfair to survivors if perpetrators could get reduced sentences by taking advantage of the confession. Survivors were only able to grant perpetrators true forgiveness after perpetrators received deserved punishment and felt deep regret for what they had done. Last but not least, the reconciliation process in Rwanda should be mainly sponsored by non-governmental organizations rather than the RPF government, given that the government-sponsored reconciliation signified manipulation by political elites, and thus might bring about stress and dissatisfaction. A successful example of a non-governmental organization promoting reconciliation in Rwanda was the Association des femmes pour le developpement rural (AFDR), a grassroots network that aimed to help rural Rwandan women who were traumatized both physically and psychologically during the genocide. By reaching out to women who suffered from economic hardships and sexual violence and providing a space for trauma counseling, AFDR made those women feel comfortable because those women were able to express themselves in the organization (Burnet 2012: 180-185). The reconciliation process in Rwanda could be more successful if more non-governmental organizations took main responsibilities for initiating reconciliation.

This research also draws me to the theme of exclusion. In the first chapter, I discussed the exclusion and the marginalization of the Hutu population under the rule of the colonial authority and Tutsis. In addition to thinking about how Hutus were excluded and marginalized, I would also like to encourage people to think about why the colonial authority wanted to exclude Hutus. Is it truly or simply because they believed in the “Hamitic Hypothesis” that Tutsis were innately superior to Hutus? I highly doubt it. Instead of saying that the colonial authority sought to promote Tutsi superiority, I would rather suggest they wanted to promote white superiority by making the Tutsi a model of whiteness, given that Tutsis possessed European-like features. In this

scenario, the colonial authority did not exclude the local population but rather sought to assimilate them into a system of white privilege. By separating Hutus from Tutsis, the colonial authority was able to tell the public that Tutsis were good, while Hutus were bad. Therefore, the public should embrace whiteness and defy blackness. Future studies could be done to further interrogate the construction of white superiority since the colonial period.

Works Cited

Primary Sources:

The Rwandan Archive, International Monitor Institute, 1996. TRA is an abbreviation of The Rwandan Archive.

List of Kangura Articles. *Rwanda File: Primary Sources from the Rwandan Genocide*. Retrieved from <http://www.rwandafile.com/Kangura/kanguralist.html>. RF is an abbreviation of Rwanda File.

Brouwer, A, Chu, S & Muscati, S. (2009). *The Man Who Killed Me: Rwandan Survivors of Sexual Violence*. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.

Secondary Sources:

Anderson, E. N. (2013). *Warning Signs of Genocide: an Anthropological Perspective*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Bahutu Manifesto (1957). *BlackPast.org: Remembered and Reclaimed*. Retrieved from <http://www.blackpast.org/gah/bahutu-manifesto-1957>

Bornkamm, P. C. (2012). *Rwanda's Gacaca Courts: Between Retribution and Reparation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Burnet, J. E. (2012). *Genocide Lives in US: Women, Memory and Silence in Rwanda*. The University of Wisconsin Press.

Carney, J. J. (2014). *Rwanda before the Genocide: Catholic Politics and Ethnic Discourse in the Late Colonial Era*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Clark, P. (2010). *The Gacaca Courts, Post-Genocide Justice and Reconciliation in Rwanda*. Cambridge University Press.

Fujii, L. (2009). *Killing Neighbors: Webs of Violence in Rwanda*. Cornell University Press.

Hintjens, H. (1999). "Explaining the 1994 Genocide in Rwanda". *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 37, 2. Cambridge University Press. Pp. 241-286.

Hatzfeld, J. (2009). *The Antelope's Strategy: Living in Rwanda after the Genocide*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Krosiak, D. (2007). *The Role of France in the Rwandan Genocide*. London: Hurst & Company.

King, E. (2013). *From Classrooms to Conflicts in Rwanda*. Cambridge University Press.

Laband, John. (2007). *Daily Lives of Civilians in Wartime Africa: From Slavery Days to Rwandan Genocide*. Greenwood Press.

- Mamdani, M. (2002). *When Victims Became Killers*. Princeton University Press.
- Staub, E. (2006). "Reconciliation after Genocide, Mass Killing or Intractable Conflict: Understanding the Roots of Violence, Psychological Recovery, and Steps toward a General Theory". *Political Psychology Vol. 27, Issue 6*. Pp. 867-894.
- Stanton, G. (2009). "The Rwandan Genocide: Why Early Warning Failed". *Journal of African Conflicts and Peace Studies Vol. 1, No. 2*. Pp. 6-25.
- Straus, S. (2006). *The Order of Genocide: Race, Power, and War in Rwanda*. Cornell University Press.
- Smith, K. E. (2010). "Rwanda". *Genocide and the Europeans*. Cambridge University Press. Pp. 142-178.
- Taylor, C. C. (1999). *Sacrifice as Terror: the Rwandan Genocide of 1994*. New York: Berg.
- Thompson, S. M. (2013). *Whispering Truth to Power: Everyday Resistance to Reconciliation in Postgenocide Rwanda*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Wallis, A. (2006). *Silent Accomplice: the Untold Story of France's Role in the Rwandan Genocide*. New York: I.B. Tauris.
- Waugh, C. M. (2004). *Paul Kagame and Rwanda: Power, Genocide and the Rwandan Patriotic Front*. N.C.: McFarland & Company.