

Project NOUER

" New Hope for Rwanda "

Promoters:

James K. Gasana¹ and Nkiko Nsengimana²

BREAKING HUTU - TUTSI ENMITY IN RWANDA THROUGH RECONCILIATION

Can there be Hope for Hope again?

Lausanne, October 1997.

¹ Address: Rue de l'Industrie 21, CH-1030 Bussigny, Switzerland. Phone + Fax : (4121) 702 26 25.

² Address: Rue du Petit Chêne 26, CH-1003 Lausanne, Switzerland. Phone + Fax : (4121) 320 36 71.

BREAKING HUTU - TUTSI ENMITY IN RWANDA THROUGH RECONCILIATION

Can there be Hope for Hope again?

" They dress the wound of my people as though it were not serious. 'Peace, peace' they say, when there is no peace ". Jer. 8 : 11.

1. INTRODUCTION

On 1 October 1990, Tutsi Rwandan elements of the Ugandan Army invaded Rwanda, launching a fratricidal war that lasted 4 years and aimed at taking over power. When war started, the then regime of President J. Habyarimana, based in the northern region, was facing a dissension from the frustrated southern élites, and a sharp antagonism between the élites in general and the impoverished peasantry. Until then, nothing in the internal process could lead to ethnic enmity and massacres. It is this war that revived ancient Hutu-Tutsi antagonism and exacerbated the rivalry between extremist political and military factions.

The turning point in ethnic relations was marked by the assassination of President Ndadaye of Burundi in October 1993. Soon after this heinous act, there was a sharp rise of ethnic tension in both Burundi and Rwanda. This tension was exacerbated by the assassination of the Presidents Habyarimana of Rwanda and C. Ntaryamira of Burundi on 6 April 1994. After these assassinations whose responsibility is imputed to Tutsi military factions, the Rwandan society was devastated by the Tutsi genocide that resulted into the killing of more than one million people between April and June 1994. Although this genocide was not a result of a civil war opposing rival ethnies of the interior, there is an unprecedented enmity between Hutus and Tutsis, two ethnies divided by a common culture. When the victorious invading rebel force took over power from the short-lived April-July 1994 interim government, the killings did not end, and were even accelerated in several regions. A Hutu counter-genocide perpetrated in the shadow of the Tutsi genocide was launched, and it is estimated that between April 1994 and May 1997, there were 2.7 million victims of this blind violence.

With a cumulated toll of more than 3 million victims³ as shown in Appendix I, representing more than Rwanda's population at independence 35 years ago, the Rwandan society is completely torn apart. These astounding killings are reflected in the 1997 UNDP Report on Human Development in which life expectancy at birth is 22,6 years, an unprecedented drop from 49.5 years prior to the take-over by the Rwandese Patriotic Front (RPF). We reiterate our salute and give honour to the memory of all the innocent victims of the Rwandan⁴

³ With a few exceptions like the Kibeho massacre, the Gersony findings and reports by, the French and British newspapers Libération and Sunday Express, the western press which had other expectations in the bloody 1994 war kept a frightening silence over the massive killings perpetrated by combatants of RPF. It is an astounding scandal that millions of innocent people should be killed in such a silence and the plight of survivors totally ignored.

⁴ Looking at the real dimension of the Rwandan tragedy, we believe that what we have is not less than the genocide of a nation. This genocide has two distinct, but additive components:

genocide in its double dimension, i.e. Hutu and Tutsi genocides, and we commend them to the grand keeping of God the Merciful. We believe that genocide is an extreme denial of the right to life and alterity that each human being must condemn. We reiterate our sympathy with all the survivors of the Rwandan genocide and with the relatives of the victims.

At a time of increasing respect of human rights and democratisation in many parts of the world, the basic right to life is utterly denied to the Rwandans who do not have blood relations with men under military uniform who rule the country since July 1994. After three years in power, the new regime has not been able to outline clear orientations for the return to national harmony. The only program that is clear and is implemented by the new regime at an accelerated rate is the extermination of the poor peasantry and the Hutu élites. It is as if the best way to eradicate structural poverty in Rwanda were to kill massively the poor peasants.

In 1995, we launched the project “New Hope for Rwanda”, with the aim of promoting discussion of a vision for the future of our society. We outlined political solutions to end the Rwandan conflict. We pursue our goal of influencing as many Rwandans as possible through our analyses and proposals, on the peaceful ways of bringing back harmony in our society. To achieve this, we feel there is a need to outline further a metapolitical process of reconciliation that will help to end the conflict and to ensure that society will survive.

Our response to Rwanda's entangled trauma is to propose a paradigm for building a new Rwanda, as a nation of new hope. At least the hope that there will be hope again. For this we are calling on all the parties of the conflict to give up violence as a means of securing power, and to resort to dialogue and reconciliation. We want that in the end violent factions get convinced that violence can solve no problem, and that instead, sustainable peace can be achieved only through democracy and respect of the rules of the game of a plural society.

2. THE BASIC FACTORS OF THE HUTU-TUTSI CONFLICT

The factors of ethnic conflict in Rwanda are basically related to political and economic inequalities. As there are far fewer positions of influence in politics, administration, army, business and Church than competitors, there is an intense competition for power between factions who want to monopolise them. In a country with a predominantly rural economy, and where over-population annihilates economic progress, the state represents a manger for the educated élites. It is an instrument of accumulation of scarce wealth and suppression of

the genocide of Tutsi Rwandans and that of Hutu Rwandans. These genocides were committed by one single category of criminals: extremist factions, of Hutus and Tutsis, fighting for power. Their vanguard leaderships are made of armed extremist active minorities, i.e. the Hutu *Interahamwe* and the Tutsi RPF, who managed to hijack an entire society, by means of the same racist ideology. Therefore when we describe the reality of Tutsi and Hutu genocides that constitute the Rwandan holocaust, there is no question, as some fanatical supporters of RPF assert, of negation of the Tutsi genocide. In the contrary, we believe that a genocide can never cancel, justify or be justified by an other genocide. We rather emphasise the necessity of a thorough international Justice to deal with all the criminals and to respect the needs of all the victims of society's evil that is racism.

rivals of a different ethnic group. Like power, the ethny itself becomes a key resource, because it allows access to state and national resources. Thus Hutu-Tutsi polarisation in this context is a symptom of unresolved problems of ethnically skewed power control, inequitable access to national resources, and appalling rural poverty. And whoever wields power has control over national resources, and determines who can and who cannot succeed to them.

Ethnicity appears therefore simply as a consequence of how the state allocates resources to different factions of the élites, and how these are represented in political institutions and the state apparatus, including the armed forces. With resource scarcity and skewed access to them, engineers of the ethnic conflict exploit their identities and imagine an ethnic discourse based on an opportunistic manipulation of historical factors. In this context, we can outline four basic problems:

- a) With the inequality of access to power and to national resources, ethnic factions impose fear on their rivals and appropriate the state. With successive take-overs, there is closure of a vicious circle of interethnic fear.
- b) The public means of violence (army, police, and the judiciary) are used to maintain the above key inequality of access to power and national resources, and to exclude the losers.
- c) There is a vicious circle of poverty that results from an increasing population and decreasing per capita means of livelihood, and deprivation and political violence interact to produce devastating effects.
- d) There is a spiral of reprisal and counterreprisal as discontented ethnic factions strive to reverse the winner-loser situation in their favour. This other vicious circle of enmity is maintained by increasing interethnic fear.

We see therefore that with time, ethnicity becomes an effect of resentment and revanchism., two sides of the same coin. In 1959-61, Hutus who had resented subjugation by the Tutsi aristocracy abolished the feudal system⁵. Since 1994, former Tutsi refugees, mostly of the clans that exercised power before the Social Revolution, are taking a fivefold revenge⁶ on

⁵ In relation to this feudal system, there were two most notorious institutions of oppression. The *Ubuhake* or clientship was a quasi-slavery system by which Tutsi lords exploited Hutu clients through inequitable cow or land rental. It reached its worst application under King Kigeli IV Rwabugiri (1853-95), the most ruthless of the *Nyiginya* dynasty whose reign exacerbated Hutu-Tutsi antagonism. The *Uburetwa*, introduced by the same King, consisted in fatigue duty by which each Hutu adult male had to work for his Tutsi lord 2 days per week (the traditional week consisted of a total of 5 days). This' was not all for the Hutus. The Belgian administration added a third, the *akazi*, by which the Hutus had to participate in public works without pay. The 1959 Social Revolution was a genuine revolt against these institutions of oppression that held Hutus and ordinary Tutsis in poverty for years.

⁶ However the explosiveness of ethnicity in the 90s is related to external factors. There is no more doubt that the war launched against Rwanda by a military faction of the then Tutsi refugees was planned in an overall strategy of Anglo-Saxon superpowers of controlling east

Hutus whom they identify with the political faction that conducted that Revolution. In addition to resentment against the Hutus, exiled Tutsis had a latent resentment against their kinsmen of ordinary clans who stayed in Rwanda after the 1959 social uprising. They too had been subjugated to feudalism, although less harshly, and many of them had played a part in the Revolution. RPF took revenge on them through a third party by exposing them to genocide by the Hutu extremist faction in 1994. In a strategy of power reconquest that was carefully planned over the years, combining military action, terrorism, disintegration of state, infiltration of political parties and the press, disorganisation of the opposition, they managed to unleash bedevilled mass killers on the Tutsis of the interior, to claim for themselves the ownership of the genocide and to justify to the world a new power hegemony.

At present, the Tutsi survivors have an understandable resentment on Hutus because of the genocide perpetrated against their group, and on Tutsi returnees who confiscated this genocide and use it as a political instrument. Similarly, the Hutus have a strong resentment on a virulent Tutsi extremism incarnated by RPF for its having relied on deceit of the international opinion to cover up an agenda of mass killings, confiscation of power and national resources.

To solve these problems, the Rwandan ethnic and political factions have to choose between reconciliation and more death of the innocent populations who are used as a sacrifice in selfish struggles. The longer the conflict lasts, the more the ethnic enmity will consolidate. The question then is whether Rwandans are doomed to live in a vicious circle of violent successions of factions in control of power and national resources. How can they launch a process that will offer them a sustainable solution to interethnic fear and enmity in a reasonable future? This paper outlines some of the most important requirements so that this process may lead to expected results.

3. IS RECONCILIATION THE HIGH WAY TO A SUSTAINABLE PEACE?

" If Rwandans are determined to fulfil the Old Testament Law An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth' then eventually, all Rwandans will be blind and toothless! ". A warning that Archbishop Desmond Tutu gave to Rwandan Church leaders on his visit to Rwanda.

3.1 Yes, because the Rwandan conflict can be resolved only by a systemic approach

In our opinion, there must be a new relationship between enemy ethnic factions, and between .the oppressors in power and the oppressed people who are constantly pushed to graveyards. We view reconciliation as a return from enmity, division and alienation to harmony. As enmity has changed from political factions to ethnic groups, reconciliation must necessarily be a sociopolitical process, and not a purely internal spiritual one. For a society that is torn apart, it must be envisaged as a broad systemic strategy of reaching peace through sustainable

and central Africa, from the horn of Africa to the Atlantic Ocean. In this strategy, Rwanda was sacrificed in order to use it as an aircraft carrier in the war for mineral resources in Zaire. This frightening reality makes one wonder to what extent the Hutu-Tutsi alone should be blamed for the Rwandan tragedy. When will it be time to shed light on the role of secret services of the superpowers?

human development. It is a permanent goal in a plural society because of a constant need to maintain the national consensus on a shared vision. We believe that in a sharply divided society, there can be neither peace nor social and economic development without reconciliation.

In the post-1994 context of Rwanda, reconciliation means that all the social and political groups of our society must reach a consensus to build together a new hope. The ultimate aim is to restore confidence to the people and to give them tools that are necessary to understand their past and their new situation, so that the country may replace the man and the woman at the centre of national preoccupation, and to offer them several options and the freedom of choice. From two ethnies united by enmity, we must move to a society united by a consensual vision.

After the Rwandan genocide, the key steps are to forgive, but not to forget, to promote a new leadership of men and women who can uphold moral values, and to build strong democratic institutions instead of a tyrannical rule by "strong men"). However, what we observe now is a tremendous exogenous effort by certain superpowers to impose a military solution to conflicts in the Great Lakes in general, and to Rwanda in particular. In this respect, our analysis is that only political consensual solutions can lead to a sustainable peace and to prosperity

3.2 Yes, because of the nature of the Hutu - Tutsi polarity

The dual character of Rwanda's society enhances its entanglement in ethnic tension. It is both ethnically dual, with the Hutu majority ethny (88% of the population), the Tutsi (11%), and the Twa (1%) and regionally dual, with its northern region and the rest of the country that competed for power. The regional cleavage bipolarises the Hutu majority. Let us recall that regional and not ethnic duality was far more important in Rwandan politics prior to the 90s. The northern Hutu faction in power was polarised against the rest of the country. The past Hutu-Tutsi antagonism that seemed to have settled down in the 70s and the 80s was revived in the 90s. It is only towards the end of 1993 that unscrupulous politicians accelerated the ethnicisation of a power struggle that was political when the multiparty system was restored in 1991.

Ethnicity in Rwanda is therefore an organising factor for access to power and resources, two ends that are not related to ethnic differences as such. On the local basis, it is an undisputed truism that Hutus and Tutsis lived together in full harmony and peace. There was no issue opposing them along the ethnic lines. Social interactions including intermarriages were more a general rule than an exception. Even competition for scarce land resources was not at all describable in ethnic terms. On the national level, it is the educated élites competing for power and national resources who artificially created the ethnic conflict. By manipulating history and collective memory to fit their selfish gains on the political arena, they managed to divide society.

We shall not review all the history that led to development of ethnicity in Rwanda. We will rather underline that the unending vicious circle of reprisal and counterreprisal is maintained

by mutual fear of Hutus and Tutsis. Each group fears that its members will be exterminated if its rival gets an upper hand. This deep fear leads to creation of monoethnic armies by the winners of power. However, the real problem is that they do not stop there. They create conditions of no return of the losers, a strategy that is common to both Hutu and Tutsi warring factions. It is no secret that Tutsi extremists in both Rwanda and Burundi aim at establishing ethnic demographic parity by massacring Hutus, and Hutu extremists aim at ethnic purity by exterminating Tutsis.

This is why every new ethnic confrontation is bloodier and a vicious circle of violence and revenge is sustained. At each ethnic massacre, more devastating means are used, and there is more grief and pain among survivors of the loser group. But in addition, each time there is more poverty and misery. The sentiment of revenge among the losers is stronger and those in power do not dare to risk working out peaceful solutions with the new oppressed. With the population explosion, there are more poor people to be massacred in this ominous circle. Now the trend is to create conditions for a sustainable apartheid⁷, by putting the Hutus in the margin of society.

3.3 Yes, because there is an unbearable social and political degradation

The damage done on Rwandan society is immense. With an unquestioning attitude of western media, NGOs, and administrations caused by the Tutsi genocide, the Tutsi army faction carried out a carefully planned Hutu extermination at an unprecedented scale. Its effect is the consolidation of a new culture of violence and ethnic enmity, the overwhelming number of helpless widows and orphans, and above all, the denial of the essential right to life. As an attempt to expand its narrow political and social base, the Tutsi army perpetrated massive killings of Hutus to improve Tutsi proportions in the residual population. Every week we are informed of occurrences of horrific violence that takes place mostly in the countryside, in a demographic war of extermination of the " Hutu electorate ". As described by the journalist S. Smith⁸ of *Libération*, the country of a thousand hills has become " the country of a thousand mass-graves ". State terrorism invades all spaces, including the place of work, the school, the home, the market place, the wedding and other forms of gathering. Silence is the golden rule for coexistence. There is silence at home at night, silence along the way to work, silence on telephone, silence in private correspondence. A number of more than 120.000 inmates, that is about 2% of the country's population, is in detention, most of them, arbitrarily.

⁷ The present RPF regime shares the structural characteristics with former South African apartheid regime. There is a different treatment in granting rights and privileges to members of different ethnic groups. The basic right to life and the right to form social or political associations are denied to Hutus. Political power and access to the armed forces are allowed only to the Tutsis. Living an untroubled life in major cities like Kigali and Butare has become a quasi monopoly of Tutsis who enjoy an equally quasi monopoly of access to business activities and public administration.

⁸ See *Libération* of 25 September 1997: " Rwanda, pays des milles fosses communes Un rapport d'A innesty dénonce les massacres des civils et le silence international ".

In the years of their service in the Ugandan army, the Tutsi officers of the high command of Rwandan ethnic army have authored original ruthless torture techniques that are used to strengthen a political system that has no minimal respect for human rights and democratic rules. The state with its army is an immense war machine that no internal mechanism can deter from the rulers' hidden agenda of Hutu extermination. Most of the achievements in social and economic development in 35 years of independence have been washed away in torrents of blood that has been spilled over the country's thousand hills.

Society is totally paralysed by the lack of consensus on how to address the challenges of a common future for the different ethnic groups. There are no words to describe the agony the misery, the poverty, the hatred, and the hopelessness that are the effect of the unending killings under the new regime which has become a mirror image of the preceding one. The level of existing discontentment of the population is equal to the level of brutality of the army against the innocent defenceless citizens.

3.4 Yes, because of a strong moral foundation

Unlike the new Rwandan authorities that compare dialogue and reconciliation to a terrible disease, we believe that reconciliation is the only morally right process for resolving sharp bipolar social and political conflicts. We are comforted by biblical examples that relate how conflicts of leadership can be resolved. Jacob who had cheated his brother Esau the legacy, of the right of leadership resolved to get reconciled with him (Gen. 33). Esau went forward to meet him. As they embraced, a fratricidal combat that could oppose them was averted. We learn from this case that when enemies look at each other face to face in a reconciliation process, it is as if each one were looking at God in face. At the height of their reconciliation emotion, Jacob told Esau (Gen. 33: 10): "*(...) to see your face is like seeing the face of God, now that you have received me favourably*".

For those who truly follow Christ, reconciliation is a divine order. In the Sermon on the Mount, he outlined an approach of solving social conflicts through reconciliation. In the context of Rwanda, the Gospel requires us to break the vicious circle of resentment and revenge, as well as the ensuing spiral of ethnic violence. Christ commands us to abandon the revenge model of "*Eye for eye, and tooth for tooth*", to love our enemies, and to forgive men their sins (Mt 5: 38, 43-44, Mt 6: 14-15). Christ took our violence on himself by promising love and pardon where there is enmity. As the victor of Easter, he broke the vicious circle of fear, hatred and revenge. In him we experience the freedom we can not secure from the barrel of the gun, nor from ethnic arrogance and solidarity.

Hence in return we have a duty to resolve not to hate our compatriots of the other ethny and to keep remembering that Christ was crucified for them too. He himself set an example for us to follow when he met a Samaritan woman at the well and asked her to give him water to drink (John 4: 27-38). For 700 years, there had been enmity between the Jews and the Samaritans. After she met Jesus, this lady went to the village and reported the story of her encounter with a Jew, and the villagers rejoiced. This is a sign to us that today, Jesus is urging Tutsis and Hutus to offer each other the water for life, i.e. a chance for living a safe and dignified life again.

4. THE BASIC REQUIREMENTS FOR RECONCILIATION

" For the sake of my brothers and friends, I will say, 'peace be within you'. For the sake of the house of the Lord our God, I will seek your prosperity " Ps. 122: 8-9.

4.1 Reconciliation requires the acceptance of democratic rule

In 1994, there was a conquest of power by former exiled Tutsis who invaded Rwanda with the support of the Ugandan army headed by President Y. Museveni⁹. Although these victors constructed an excessive military strength, they still lack social acceptability. Their army, which is the sole political actor, has created a garrison-state¹⁰ that is a tyrannical, terrorist and ultracentralised ethnocracy. The army men are positioned on every hillside, and every Hutu home is under surveillance. Their control of power is total and direct in spite of co-optation of Hutus in government and parliament for public relations and deceit of international opinion on power sharing on the top. Correspondence is opened, and telephone conversations are monitored to silence potential sources of political dissension. This is an ethno-fascism, because of its open hostility to democracy, to egalitarianism, in addition to its practice of blind state violence. In short, what we have is a tyrannical rule of a Tutsi military faction by a Tutsi military faction for a Tutsi military faction. There is therefore no question about whose benefit and whose cost. The real question is for how long.

Ethno-fascism constitutes a swing back of the pendulum. In 1959, the Social Revolution, which emancipated Hutus and Tutsis of lower strata had opened them to plural democracy. After subsequent years of undemocratic rule, the country moved again from the rhetoric of ethnic majority politics to the politics of ethnic proportionality between 1973 and 1991 and to political pluralism between 1991 and 1994. But the strain of war caused ethnic bipolarisation again. Under the new regime, democracy is kept too remote by hammering the guilt of genocide on the Hutus to keep them out of power. A tiny faction of fanatical ethnicists believes in the inalienable rights of the Tutsis to rule over the Hutus. All those who may enjoy the support from the majority of Rwandans are excluded. More than ever before, the dominant power ideology is ethnicity. Its instruments are tutsisation of politics, the army, public administration, the economy, and of Church hierarchies. The status of the Hutus, similar to that of the Samaritans we described above, is that of inferiority in social, economic and political life.

⁹ After his success in conquering Rwanda, President Museveni can not hide any, more his expansionist policy. The EIR Special Report of June 1997, p. 17, quotes from a speech that he delivered on 21 April 1997 to the General assembly of the East African Law Society: <(My mission is to see that Eritrea, Ethiopia, Sudan, Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda, Burundi, and Zaire become federal states under one nation. (...) As Hitler did to bring together Germany, we should also do it here. Hitler was a smart guy,, but I think he went a bit too far by wanting to conquer the whole world " .

¹⁰ A garrison-state is " a state geared towards militaristic self-preservation ". See A.A. Mazrui, 1990. Cultural forces. in world politics. James Currey, London. p. 56.

Democracy based on majority rule is a principle to which leaders of the Tutsi military extremist faction do not want to subscribe. They are struggling against a so-called "pre-eminence of Hutu electorate)", because they know that if there was a free choice the citizens would reject the present rule. They equate majority rule to Hutu rule, and refuse to negotiate with other factions the mechanisms to recognise the interests of minority groups. They refuse dialogue on the mechanisms that may prevent the need of any ethnic group to destroy the other or to dominate it. Instead, members of the ruling faction label whoever talks of the necessity of returning to democratic rule as a planner of the Tutsi genocide. They talk of African democracy to give a presentable name to a system based on infantilisation and contempt of the citizens who are presented as incapable to choose who should be their leaders. Instead of negotiating a reassuring constitution and an equitable electoral legislation, they choose the bayonet and hammer solution.

With all the devastation due to lack of democracy, we believe that sustainable peace in Rwanda cannot be achieved without moving to consensual politics, the respect of majority rule and of minority rights. In other document¹¹, we have outlined a **paradigm of consensual democracy** allowing different socio-political factions to participate in forging the destiny of the country. Proposals include federalism, bicameral representation, and independence of the judiciary, demilitarisation and a mechanism of mediation.

For our society, democracy means the return from the rule of the bullets to the rule of the ballots. As such it is the only efficient medicine to heal our broken society, because it is in the ballots that Hutus and Tutsis can throw their passions. But today, there is an immoral use by the new regime of ethnic identity to reject democratisation of the country until such a time that Hutu populations are cut down to parity with Tutsis.

Until then, the ruling Tutsi military extremist faction faces a dilemma. Its political base is narrow and its rule has no legitimacy, as it owes power only to a boundless diplomatic and military support from the two Anglo-Saxon superpowers. Only a few years ago, these superpowers had declared war against African Marxists. But today, together with their former foes, they are waging a war against democrats in Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi and Zaire. Hence the increasing despair of those who have no means to oppose this powerful alliance.

Whatever the situation, the ultimate aim of the efforts to return to harmony is to reconcile extremist ethnic factions of the élites and the people whom they have infantilised. They must render power and sovereignty to the people and allow them to shape their institutions and choose their representatives. They can not live in peace while many others die in pieces. It is important to replace the ethnic garrison-state that is seated on crimes against humanity and continues to run the country on the basis of immoral principles, by a democratic one ruled by reconciliation institutions. Democracy is therefore the foundation of reconciliation and is the only system that is compatible with biblical teaching. There is need of an interim government supported by an international authority designated by the UN to implement an internal

¹¹ See for example Gasana J. & N. Nsengimana, 1995. Building new hope for Rwanda. Lausanne, Switzerland.

process of normalisation. Europe would not have recovered from devastation by Nazism if the victor nations had not restored democratic rule, justice, and respect of human rights for Germany.

4.2 Reconciliation needs respect of the identity of each group

To build one society, it is important to respect the separate identity of each ethnic group. The foundation of a plural society at peace with itself is the recognition of all civic rights to all the social groups. In Rwanda, denial of the right to life starts with the treacherous denial of the existence of ethnic groups. The Burundian model of maintaining Tutsi hegemony by denying ethnic differences is used in order to kill Hutus with impunity. However, whether ethnies exist¹² or not should not be the question anymore, because victims of ethnic identities are a devastating reality. Furthermore, after the genocides which caused a heavy toll in populations of mixed parentage, ethnic genotypes are even more distinctive today. The vital question is rather whether members of different ethnic groups have equal rights and opportunities. Struggle against discrimination does not start by the denial of identity, but by the affirmation of rights to everyone. In Christ " *there is neither Jew nor Gentile* " (Gal. 3: 28) means that before God, Jews and Gentiles, Hutus and Tutsis, are equal in rights and opportunities. This is the reconciliation that the Scriptures teach us, of men and women who are invited to form a single identity in Christ.

The Bible's teaching on peaceful coexistence of different human groups lays a foundation to superiority of pluralistic democracy, and shows that peace and respect of pluralism are not mutually exclusive. Prophet Micah (4:5) drew an excellent succinct manifesto for a pluralistic society as follows. "*All the nations may walk in the name of their gods; we will walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever*". Thus there is no moral foundation for regimes that do not respect democratic pluralism, for tolerance of alterity is the binding force of a reconciled society. The denial of ethnic identities as a strategy to camouflage ethnic minority hegemony is immoral, as it gives a cover to ominous crimes against humanity. In a similar manner, walking in the names of ethnies transformed into idols, instead of the name of the True God, is immoral.

4.3 Reconciliation requires winner - winner solutions

With the political model used in Rwanda, the loser faction loses all including lives of its members, and the winner wins all but the hearts of members of the ethny of his rival faction. The winner, instead of being removed by ballots, is removed by bullets. That is why the

¹² On this question of existence or inexistence of ethnic differences, let us make the following quotation from an article by Mahmood Mamdani, " From conquest to consent as the basis of state formation: reflections on Rwanda ", in *New Left*, Nb. 216, 1996, p. 6: " I remember what I heard from a Nigerian colleague (...) that if he went to a discussion on Rwanda and Burundi, he could close his eyes and tell the identity of a speak-er from these countries by the twist of their argument: if a person claimed that there were no differences between Bahutu and Batutsi, or that the difference was that of class, the speaker was most likely a Mututsi, for a Muhuttu intellectual was most likely to argue otherwise, that the difference was one between distinct ethnic - or even - racial groups".

Rwandan society is hijacked by fear. The loser fears to be exterminated by the new winner. Fear leads to polarisation and to formation of dominating and oppressed ethnic groups. Domination leads to resentment of the oppressed, this resentment leads to ethnic enmity, and enmity maintains tension and leads to revenge when the upheavals resume. The fear is symmetrical among the two ethnic groups because of society's ethnic duality. The effect is an equally symmetrical enmity. It is this double symmetry of fear and enmity that is the source of structural instability. The Hutus think that the Tutsis threaten their existence. The Tutsis think the same of the Hutus. There is thus a growing danger of a structural instability because the youth are taught to hate those of a different identity.

The difficulty the advocates of reconciliation face is how the enemy too can be a winner, so that the ominous winner/loser model can be reverted to build a winner - winner society. How convince all the rival ethnic factions that sustainable peace will come about only if Hutus seek the security and the prosperity that do not exclude Tutsis, and Tutsis seek the same for Hutus? It is important that the Hutus concede guarantees to Tutsis that they will not risk to be exterminated any more. It is equally important that Tutsis accept that new rules of coexistence be defined so that the Hutus be assured that they will not risk to be dominated and overkilled by them any more.

Real reconciliation will come about through equitable human development programs aiming at metapolitical objectives that emphasise education, health, employment, housing and security from hunger for everybody. In general, society must guarantee to each citizen the minimum for survival. The poor should meet at least their food requirements (Prov. 30. 8). This is particularly important for the deprived youth, whatever their ethny. If their needs are not attended, they are not going to accept the rules of coexistence and the moral standards of their society.

4.4 Reconciliation requires truth finding and justice

Equitable solutions must be based on truth¹³ finding, equitable Justice, and forgiveness. We must face our painful past in order not to reproduce it. It is important to break the vicious circle in which each ethnic group believes it is right and good, and the other is wrong and bad. This circle has even worsened, as each group believes it is the victim, and the other the victimiser. In our point of view, the return to social harmony requires a collective memory and conscience with regards to the more than 3 million victims of the wickedness of both Hutu and Tutsi extremisms. Honouring all our victims of genocide, Hutus and Tutsis, without an

¹³ Truth has been one of the important casualties of the Rwandan conflict. The reality is that the Tutsi rebels conducted their war with an agenda of **bringing** down the Hutu population to manageable level. Indeed what we are dealing with is a demographic war. We can deduce this from an article by Nick Gordon in the Sunday Express of April 21, 1996 ((Return to hell". He reports how RPF killed scores of Hutus using crematoriums at a large scale to incinerate the victims. and spreading the ashes to hide the evidence. Western analysts still lack the capacity to interpret what really, happened in this satanic war. In particular, they, lack the capacity- to grasp the tradition Inherited from the Tutsi aristocratic sub-culture of concealing or distorting the truth as a virtue of *ubupfura* or nobility and a political and diplomatic tool.

immoral post-mortem extermination, will contribute to consolidate the foundation of a new society that is reconciled with itself

The problem in this respect today is lack of an explicit recognition by the international community of the overwhelming killings of Hutus undertaken by the Tutsi army since April 1994. To put it squarely, some people in western administrations and a certain press believe or make believe that members of the extremist faction of RPF are " good guys ", as opposed to their clones of the ill-famed Hutu extremist factions. As many countries, organisations and people in those countries do not want to recognise that they have been fooled by the nice discourse of Tutsi extremist leaders, they can not face the sour reality that both groups are equally wicked " bad guys ". We dissent from this satanic principle of saying that men and women of one ethny are good and right and those of the other are bad and wrong, The defenders of this oversimplification must understand that RPF, after having contributed to sawing death, first by declaring war on Rwanda in October 1990, and by violating the ceasefire soon after President Habyanimana's assassination, wants to appear as a victim in order to use Tutsi genocide to legitimise its illegal take-over of power.

What is encouraging today, is that the genocide survivors who have really suffered untold atrocities perpetrated by violent groups are the most ready for reconciliation¹⁴. Those who have not, mostly returnees from neighbouring countries, defend a harder line. The reason for their radicalism is that on their return, they squatted property of massacred and exiled Hutus as war spoils, and they would not like to give them back to the legitimate owners'. For them reconciliation is a threat to their new status. The highest authorities call it a terrible disease from outside that should not be allowed to threaten the new political system

The group of violent people is twofold. There are those who are violent because they are really suffering for the wrong done to them or to their relatives. There are others who are just greedy and power thirsty, and who exploit genocide to plunder the country's resources. The former need help and understanding because they are as victims as their own victims. The latter include mostly criminals and cynical politicians in their ranks, who have pushed thousands of poor Hutu farmers to graveyards in order to squat their property. Only a systematic search of the truth can help uncover the damage done by these criminals.

Truth is, to say the least, as important as justice and both are two pillars of a reconciliation endeavour. Combined, they can heal our society of its deep wounds. There is no doubt that the Rwandan tragedy was compounded by a one-sided presentation of the conflict. At present, there is a strong, but as yet unjustified feeling that the international justice is going to be equally one-sided. So far there is no investigation to determine responsibility for the assassination of President J. Habyarimana. No RPF criminal has been brought to the International Tribunal for Rwanda to respond for the mass killing of Hutus. The Gersony report, inspite of having been accepted by the High Commissioner for Refugees, has been put under embargo by the Secretary General of the United Nations for political reasons. Working

¹⁴ See for example the account of a Tutsi survivor, Madame Valérie Mukakarara, in Dialogue No 197 of March- 1997. " *Solidarité humaine entre Hutu et Tutsi pendant le génocide*". p. 69-75.

on a sample of 3 communes out of a total of 143, Gersony had shown that the new RPF regime had exterminated 30.000 Hutus between June and September 1994.

Truth is also needed on the fate of 500.000 inhabitants of Byumba prefecture who were already displaced by war before the resumption of hostilities in April 1994. Similarly, there is a need to know the fate of 80.000 men, women and children declared missing by the UN agencies, who had been forced to abandon the camp of Kibeho, when government troops massacred more than 8.000 defenceless persons in one of their most savage carriages. The Rwandans and the international community should also know the whole truth on the responsibility of the massive killing of Hutu refugees in Zaire by troops of the Rwandan government. What will be the fate of Roberto Garreton's report on this crime against humanity?

Truth finding by an international truth commission should allow designating the real criminals instead of taking the entire ethnic groups as responsible for crimes. Such a commission is a necessity to safeguard the memory and rekindle hope. For reconciliation to succeed, we have to know what happened and how we got there. It is very important to stop the cover up of the Hutu genocide perpetrated by the military of the Tutsi army in power. The pain of the past that is shared by all the Rwandans, and the particular pain of all those who have been affected by violence, whatever their ethnicity, must be registered in order to prevent the build-up of resentment. All the widows and all the orphans, Tutsis and Hutus, need consolation and assistance.

Looking at the fate of survivors, that is similar to the fate of Hutus who protected them, the strategic role that RPF intended the Tutsi genocide to play is becoming clearer and clearer. For military leaders of former exiled Tutsis, President J. Habyarimana's regime (1973-1994) had united Hutus and Tutsis against the Tutsi aristocracy. They considered their kinsmen who stayed in Rwanda as collaborators of successive Hutu regimes, and have always been ready to sacrifice them to actions of extremists in their struggle to recapture power.

Since the early 60s, political and military leaders of the extremist faction of the Tutsi refugees thought that if their Hutu rivals perpetrate acts that are describable as genocide, they would conquer power with impunity. Their calculations¹⁵ in the 90s were that such acts of genocide would let the international community abandon the Hutus, and give legitimacy to their imposition of a hegemonic rule. Therefore by assassinating President Habyarimana on 6 April 1994, RPF¹⁶ had calculated that Tutsi genocide would ensue and be an instrument for obtaining legitimacy from the international community. Thus in their struggle for power, strategies of Hutu and Tutsi extremists combined in a way that led to Tutsi genocide.

¹⁵ Tutsi survivors are increasingly aware of this as one can conclude from an article by Chris McGreal in the Guardian Weekly of 28 July 1996, " The nightmares of a Tutsi survivor ". In this article, the author quotes a survivor saying this of returnees: " Those outsiders did not suffer like we did. They used our suffering and they promised us lots of things. But I think they want to forget us. Perhaps it would have been easier for them if everyone had died " .

¹⁶ On the likeliness of RPF's responsibility in Habyarimana's assassination. read for example F. Reyntjens' " Rwanda Trois jours qui ont fait basculer l'histoire ". L'Harmattan, Paris. 1995.

In addition to designating criminals, truth finding would further allow to designate real victims of genocides. These are the innocent Tutsis of inside the country who had no implication in the power struggle. Therefore Tutsi genocide should not be confiscated by the ruling military for immoral exploitation. It belongs inalienably to the survivors, for it is them who need Justice, compassion and consolation. In addition to victims of Tutsi genocide, there are victims of the Hutu genocide who have been massacred between April 1994 and May 1997.

A group of victims that deserves a special mention is made of thousands of Hutu babies born in refugee camps of hungry, sick and desperate mothers, and who died in the same camps, of hunger or slaughter by men of the Rwandan Tutsi army, with the unjust label of genociders imposed on them by the Rwandan rulers and some quarters of the international community. Who can claim to have a clear conscience before the reality of the shameful abandonment of orphaned babies to despair in the Congo-Zaire jungle? There have been unbearable sights of these babies staggering amid piles of Hutus killed by Tutsis of the Rwandan army, searching for their slain mothers to suck desperately at their breasts, as the international community was not sympathetic to their agony.

The aim of truth finding process should not be to find who is wrong or who is right, but to restore harmony and build a new national foundation for a future in which individuals can expand their options. In this perspective, emphasising restorative rather than retributive justice may achieve reconciliation. In this respect, It is important to recognise the contribution of the heroes of non-violence in both ethnies who have resisted human demolition at the risk of their own lives. They can serve as an important bridge between groups, and their testimony can boost the reconciliation effort. Unfortunately, the Rwandan army killers target them because they contradict the ruling model depicting all Hutus as bad.

4.5 Reconciliation requires demilitarisation for confidence building

The major prerequisite for reconciliation in Rwanda is restoration of confidence between Hutus and Tutsis. We are talking about confidence in the political institutions and confidence between social groups. At present, this confidence is far from sight because the devil has chosen to wear the military uniform, to abolish democratic institutions and to exterminate the country's populations. It is with military protection and complicities that overactive extremist Hutu factions were able to perpetrate Tutsi genocide. Similarly, it is for their military strength that Tutsi extremist combatants were able to overkill the Hutu population between April 1994 and May 1997.

As reconciliation means security for everyone, not just security for the members of the ethnic faction in power, we strongly dissent against the notion of justified state violence - practised by a political system that rejects dialogue to solve conflicts. We are convinced that the army is an institution of death and should be constitutionally abolished. However, those in power believe that they owe everything to monopolising the armed forces. At present, they are teaching all the youth of their ethny that the best way to secure their survival is to kill the rivals before they can challenge minority rule.

There is no doubt that ethnic differences are a reality, and so are memories of past inter-ethnic victimisations and revolving cycles of vengeance. It is equally a reality that ethnic violence is an important element of state violence, and both are associated inextricably with ethnic armed forces. The crux of the problem is that for several decades ahead, there seems to be no formula by which the armed forces can cease to represent the interest of one ethnic faction.

At present, there is an extreme abuse of military power by the Tutsi rulers. It is evident in Rwanda that the armed forces serve no humane purpose. They are a real threat to the survival of our society because they are used to kill the people they should normally protect against external threat. Such a use is immoral. In the Bible, there is no example where the army of the people of Israel turns against Israel. The Victory of Joshua was against Jericho (Josh. 6), and Gideon defeated the Midianites and not Israel (Judges 7). The model leading to ethnic armies simply leads to the partitioning of society into two peoples paradoxically united by enmity and mutual fear. In this respect, the Bible teaches us that a demilitarised nation can become more prosperous. Describing Jerusalem, the city of peace, prophet Micah (4: 3) says: " (...) *they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks, nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore* ".

Thus demilitarisation is a pre-condition for interethnic confidence rebuilding and for helping Rwanda turn irreversibly its back on violence. We are often asked to explain what mechanism we are suggesting for protection of the citizens as an alternative to the armed forces. In our point of view, the army must not be given the mission of insuring internal security. For this we must rely on a police force which is placed under civilian control and exercises its coercive power legitimately, in a way that is legally and socially acceptable. There must be enough safeguards in the constitution and the legislation to prevent the use of police violence against innocent citizens. Even police power and means of violence should not be so important that they could neutralise society.

It is important to demilitarise politics and justice¹⁷ first, before demilitarising the minds of the youth. Democracy can not survive under the guns. It has not proven to be bulletproof. Justice is not bullet-proof either. Therefore reconciliation can not be bullet-proof. In addition armies are competing for resources with human development schemes, in a country where children need schools, not arms. Their parents need them alive. The sick want medicine, not ammunition.

The reconstruction of trust requires handing-over external security to an international arrangement for as long as it is necessary for people to trust new democratic institutions. It remains very difficult to find a rule for creation of a consensual army in a sharply bipolarised society. The Tutsis would not accept an army whose ethnic composition is proportional, and it is understandable that the Hutus would not accept a Tutsi overrepresentation as it is under the present regime.

¹⁷ At present, Rwanda's new military rulers are using the judicial system as one of the tools of subjugation of Hutus. It is estimated that more- than 2% of the country's population are detained without trial. At the present annual rate of trials, it is estimated that it will take 600 years to have judged all the inmates.

4.6 Reconciliation requires efficient instruments for positive interaction

The basic instruments for reconciliation are the rule of law, education for all, and participatory development. Like for democracy, we believe that the rule of law takes shape around the principles of primacy of law, equality before the law, fundamental rights of the individual, Democracy means that people's sovereignty expressed through free elections of representatives, political pluralism, majority rule, minority rights, and separation of powers resources and lack of development, and not ethnicity, are among the most important factors of ethnic conflict. Only a radical transformation of the economy, and not the levelling of demographic parameters practised by the new regime, can lead to sustainable national reconciliation.

If the vicious circle of violence, ignorance, poverty and submission is to be broken, it is high time to reverse national priorities, and invest heavily in the development of man and woman, so that by becoming more free, they may dispose of the necessary initiative to influence their destiny, as well as that of the entire society. It is therefore of utmost importance to guarantee every citizen a basic education, which will help him or her to live a life not haunted by ignorance, famine, illness, and unemployment. A long term effort on education should be generalised on youth so that they may become fully responsible citizens who will not submit to any wicked project of state or to extremist groups. It is important to give hope to the armed youth so that demilitarisation may not make them lose hope.

Democratisation alone (multiparty system, free elections) may not in itself enhance reconciliation or sustainable development Democracy is not an exercise of the élites only- It needs to be democratised through participation. This means there must be a broadbase powersharing, broadbase development, broadbase security, and broadbase human rights. Participation allows the nation to expand its social carrying capacity by ensuring that each group has the possibility of participating to local and national life. It allows people at grassroots level with antagonistic interests and mutual fears to meet in a social space and negotiate matters of return to local and national harmony in order to recognise and restore mutual interests. This requires strengthening local power through the education of citizen in their rights, so that there may be control of governance at grassroots level, participation in mediation of conflicts, and in determination of development priorities.

Reconciliation, as a national project, should not be an empty discourse or top down state process, but one that impacts and is impacted by grassroots level. It must be decentralised in order to be participative. However, participation of the population is still too remote an idea. The new regime is structuring a powerful inequality of chances and opportunities between the few victors and the rest of the population. There is appalling broadbase destitution for the rural masses.

A federal system of government based on limited autonomy of regions and communes is likely to put an end to power and resource struggle based on ethnies, by enhancing participation. The granting of limited regional **autonomy at commune and prefecture** levels can be an efficient instrument against ethnic or regional bipolarisation, totalitarianism and social paralysis.

4.7 Reconciliation requires respect of private property

To reward those who contributed to the war effort, the new rulers confiscated Hutu property including land, houses, and business and gave it to returnees from neighbouring countries. Thus many Hutus became excluded from social, economic and political life. With the urge of land take-over, the system of pastoral domination on the Hutu peasantry is back at its bitterest expression. Farmers were pushed into graveyards or burned in crematories in the Akagera National Park to make space for Tutsi returnees' cattle. Reconciliation is not on the agenda of rulers of the present regime because they want to secure the spoils of war. Members of the ruling Tutsi military extremist faction and their associates have confiscated residential property, business, and administration positions of exiled, detained or slain Hutus. The defence of confiscated property is a powerful factor of widespread human rights violations and crimes against humanity committed by the current regime. Thus villages and villages have been cleaned of their Hutu populations in order to resettle Tutsi returnees who constitute the narrow base of the regime.

The plan to secure the management of war spoils which was already made public in early 1993 in the Uganda press, led to the existence of three geopolitical territories'

- 1) **The East and North East.** this is a conquered territory comprising pastoral lands of prefectures of former Byumba, Kibungo, and parts of eastern Kigali, Gitarama, and Butare, inhabited by a quasi monoethnic Tutsi population. When Hutu extremists were perpetrating the Tutsi genocide, Tutsi rebels were simultaneously perpetrating the Hutu genocide. In Byumba and Kibungo prefectures alone, the number of Tutsi and Hutu victims is about 800.000, that is more than 50% of respective 1994 population. In Byumba, a new Tutsi prefecture of Mutara has been created as an outpost of the conquest. It is here that the technique of crematories to wipe out the culprits of crime has been initiated before its generalisation in an other Hutu genocide in the Zairian jungle.
- 2) **Central and Southern Rwanda:** The agropastoral lands of the prefectures of Kigali, Gitarama, Butare, and Kibuye are an occupied territory. There is a Tutsi administration and a dense military presence. There are rampant selective killings targeting Hutu élites and Hutu youth. The proportions of the victims may reach 30 to 40% of the 1994 populations. The intrusion of Tutsi returnees is intense. In this territory, the new regime aims at establishing ethnic parity before democratic elections can be held. Urban centres such as Kigali, Gitarama and Butare, are conquered zones and there is an urban versus rural apartheid.
- 3) **The North west, South West and Gikongoro:** These territories, comprising in greater part pastoral lands in the prefectures of Gisenyi, Ruhengeri, Cyangugu and Gikongoro, are quasi monoethnic hutulands where Tutsi military presence is dense and aims at imposing the new administration and combating insurrection. There have been the lowest killing rates (10 - 20%), but with rumours of a rising Hutu resistance, the Tutsi army is speeding up indiscriminate massive killings.

This violation of the right of many Hutus to own property has widened the rift between Hutus and Tutsis. Extermination killings to modify ethnic ownership of land alone has caused more than 2 million victims, mostly in the eastern and north-eastern Rwanda where Tutsi returnees from neighbouring countries had to be settled. This uncovered the other aspect of war- the conflict between the "hoe and the horn", that is the acute competition between peasant farming and pastoralism. Spoliation and repression turned the rural poor to nothingness. Hutus who attempt to reclaim their lands, houses and other properties are automatically accused of participation in genocide, and are killed or detained. These words of prophet Isaiah (Is. 3: 14-15) can be addressed to the present rulers of Rwanda: "*It is you who have ruined my vineyard; the plunder from the poor is in your houses. What do you mean by crushing my people and grinding the faces of the poor? Declares the Lord, the Lord Almighty*".

The massive killings to take-over Hutus' lands have created a deep resentment. Instead of appeasing it by settling land ownership issues, the new regime is talking about a villagisation programme by which many Hutus will automatically lose claim on their lands. As most officers of the military high command and high-ranking RPF politicians are involved in these takeovers., the government can not take any initiative for political dialogue with the opposition.

Land confiscation by Tutsi returnees is an unnecessary assault to the fundamental gains of the Social Revolution of 1959 that democratised access to means of livelihood for the rural poor. These gains had permitted to reconcile Hutus and Tutsis for three decades. A return to this lost harmony is impossible without a prior land right resettlement.

4.8 Reconciliation requires dedicated support of church leaders

As the overwhelming majority of Rwandans are Christians, the role that Churches in Rwanda and abroad can play is self-evident. Who else is in a better position to announce to the Rwandans the Promised Land? This role can be positive or negative, but not neutral, nor merely partisan, because the Christ they confess entrusted them the mission of reconciliation (2 Cor. 5: 18-20): "*All this is from God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ and gave us the ministry of reconciliation (...). And he has committed to us the message of reconciliation. We are therefore Christ's ambassadors, as though God was making his appeal through us.*" Therefore if Church leaders are Christ's ambassadors, and as Christ is not indifferent to the plight of Rwandans, the Churches can not afford to remain indifferent, or preach the gospel according to RPF.

The problem they have to confront has got parallels in the Scriptures. These words of Prophet Jeremy (Jer. 10: 12-13) apply to the fate of the poor Hutu peasantry, in particular to that of refugees persecuted in Zaire: "*Your wound is incurable, your injury beyond healing. There is no one to plead your cause, no remedy for your sore, no healing for you.*" Even some churchmen are not pleading with the defenceless. They forget that God is on the side of the oppressed, the shackled, the orphan, the widow and the detainee.

There is a growing alliance, mostly of Protestant Churches., with a regime that committed genocide like the preceding one had. This alliance betrays Christ's teaching. He stood on the

side of the oppressed when he said (Luke 4: 18): " *The Spirit of the Lord is on me, because he anointed me to preach the good news to the poor, (...) to proclaim freedom for the prisoners (...), to release the oppressed, to proclaim the year of the Lord's favour* ". Church leaders in Rwanda and abroad who follow Christ should also stand besides the poor, the survivors of genocides, the prisoners, and the oppressed who constitute the overwhelming majority of their flock, and dissent from the wickedness of the oppressors. They should keep a sufficient distance between them and power in order to play their prophetic role in defence of the weak. With the example of Archbishop Desmond Tutu who led the peaceful battle against apartheid in South Africa, they should take the lead in a similar battle against a black versus black apartheid that has already become a reality in Rwanda. If the Churches proclaim that there is no morality in killing, they must also proclaim that there is no morality in collaborating with a regime that kills innocent people as a principle of government.

What is discouraging is that many church leaders are already either collaborating or showing signs of weakness and fear to stand by the liberating effect of truth. They are not facing the issue of survival of society, a value that does in no way contradict the Christian teaching. Churches are captives of the ruling political system, as they are themselves considered as " liberated " from Hutu clergy in the crushing " tutsisation " process conducted by the new Protestant churches have fallen prey of this process by yielding to pressures of tutsisation of their hierarchies. Protestantism, Anglicanism¹⁸ in particular, with " liberated

dioceses, is used as a tool to assist the encroachment of state in the running of church affairs. They are assisting this state in its effort to hammer the guilt in the heads of all the Hutus, and to make them surrender to the evil oppression. The tutsised " Churches cannot play a reconciliatory role, as they need to be reconciled in their own ranks and files first in order to recover credibility.

As no programme of massive killings can be legitimate, the church should announce that the wrath of God is hanging on Tutsi combatants of RPF and their clones of the Hutu militias. Further, it should announce the same wrath on their accomplices in the international community who can do something but do not do it, or who continue to assist directly or indirectly a genocidist government in spite of its evil plans. The Cross, and not the machete nor the bayonet, being the hope for the Christians, the Churches have the divine order to proclaim to the state authorities the will and the plan of God (Eph. 3: 10). It cannot be otherwise because in the Cross we have a living memory of the Victim of a reconciliation mission, Jesus Christ.

¹⁸ According to the evidence available to us, the Rt. Rev. K. Barham, British Bishop of the "liberated" Diocese of Cyangugu, co-operated with President Bizimungu's advisors to let the Lambeth Palace, Canterbury, accept the replacement of the Hutu Bishop of Kigali by a Tutsi returnee from Zaire. The written request to oust the Hutu Bishop had been sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury by Rwanda's President. According to Bishop Barham, another Hutu Bishop has a " pending file in the presidency ". This is just one manifestation of a burgeoning ethnic Protestantism that is being used by the state as an instrument to neutralise the traditional influence of the Catholic Church in Rwanda. There are fears that confessional tension in the future may- arise from this new axis of tension.

The time for Church leaders to act is overdue. What else can be a more powerful instrument to appeal to their conscience than the extreme suffering and misery endured by the oppressed people themselves? How else do churches understand charity, justice and love of the neighbour, if not by dissenting against an oppressive tyrannical ethnic rule that has caused so much lamentation? How else do they understand their duty if they do not stand up and demand conditions in which Christians can worship their God without fear from being eliminated like 200 persons who were massacred in prayer in an Adventist chapel of Mwiyanike, and 300 who had the same fate in a Protestant chapel of Nanga, in Karago Commune in June 1997? How do they witness love if they cannot feel the need to defend the rights of those who need to reap their crops but are killed so that the Tutsi returnees of their neighbourhood may feed their cattle, and can not advocate for the rights of parents to send their children to school instead of sending them to the bush for cover from the marauding government troops.

4.9 Reconciliation requires international support

With all the crimes the new regime has perpetrated against humanity, the international community should have already abandoned it. Before the eyes of most Rwandans, this regime is just a living memory of its own atrocities. Although an economic boycott and a military embargo imposed by the UN are long overdue, there is an effort¹⁹ supported by some countries to supply development aid to Rwanda. We are still asking what is the moral justification of separating aid and the fundamental right to life? Similarly, we ask what justifies separation of aid and progress towards political dialogue, democratisation and national reconciliation. How can we talk of restoring sustainable agriculture, by investing in production inputs and protecting soil against erosion when farmers' physical security itself is totally eroded, and their lives are unsustainable? Are farmers going to increase productivity if the fertilisers they use are going to be soaked in their blood before they can enjoy the fruit of their toil?

¹⁹ This effort is nourished by a misinformation work carried out by some western diplomats in Kigali. Some of them have harboured frightening feelings against Hutus, refugees in particular, as we can read in this news dispatch by Elif Kaban (Reuter, 3/9/95) quoting their conversation: " *By the end of 1995, we believe the refugees will be gone under a responsible forced repatriation, " said a US diplomat. A senior European diplomat agreed, describing UNHCR's strenuous efforts to persuade Zaire to stop expelling Rwandan refugees as " politically correct but strategically wrong. " " Zaire had just unlocked the door by deporting these people. It was such a window of opportunity " , the diplomat said. " We must make a deal with Zaire and let its troops go into the camps. The UNHCR must pull out and wait for refugees on the Rwandan side of the border. In that way it can remain pure, " he added. " The first thing RPA needs is tear gas and rubber bullets, " said the European diplomat. " They should also start getting ready for at least 100, 000 in prisons. They will need new prisons if these refugees start coming back en masse. " &More bloodshed is inevitable said a senior diplomat in Rwanda's capital, Kigali. " The question is how to minimise " .*

It is self-evident that any assistance from outside that does not respond to these questions will only serve to enhance the capacity of the regime to import weapons from South Africa and the famous deadly MI-24 helicopters from Russia to kill the innocent citizens. It is the external aid given to the new regime that has enabled it to kill scores of innocent citizens, by giving the military rulers the financial capacity to import weapons and other articles that are necessary to maintain an army of more than 60.000 troops at war with unarmed populations. External aid to Rwanda is therefore part of the problems and can not be a solution if there is no political improvement in the country.

At this Juncture, it appears clear that the ruling ethnocracy is conducting the Rwandan society to utter doom. It has compounded its problems and it lacks the necessary political will and human resources to tackle them. The only morally Justifiable initiative from aid donors and mediators could be to urge the rulers to declare a cease-fire in their war against the defenceless population. Obviously Rwanda needs crutches from the international community, not to make its rulers jump faster to their victims, but to move faster to political dialogue, consensus and reconciliation. Otherwise there is no justification for any cooperation programme with a governing system whose army eliminates the productive forces. In particular, any programme that intends to rely on external expertise is an encouragement for the killings of trained manpower, as those who order them would find that the international staff is a means to fill the gap.

We see therefore that the international community holds important stakes. We can no more ignore the existence of a superpower polarisation on the issues of the Great Lakes region, and on the Rwandan conflict in particular. In this polarisation, the US which imposed the international recognition of a non elected regime, is on the side that is determined to offer unconditional backing to the Rwandan ethnocracy that is responsible for the unending bloodshed. With scandals that are already known as Rwandagate and Congogate, the Clinton Administration has an enormous responsibility for whatever continues to happen on the Rwandan people because of deteriorated governance.

Let's add on these sad facts that the Clinton administration has not yet publicly sent any signal of disapproval, neither of the massive killings perpetrated by RPF nor of detention without trial, and under the most degrading conditions, of more than 120.000 men, women, and children. It is supplying military equipment and advisors to stabilise the rule of a fanatical ethnic minority faction. This US involvement is part of the factors of the Rwandan tragedy, and of the crimes against humanity perpetrated against Hutu refugees who died in Congo-Zaire in 1996/97. It is for this US backing that the Rwandan authorities show no will for political dialogue. In Appendix II, we give a detailed chronology of some facts to those who may still have doubts about the negative role played by this country since the Tutsi rebellion started.

Years after the end of the cold war, no one can imagine what in the Great Lakes Region could constitute a threat to the US democracy. It is hard to justify such an unholy alliance against a powerless and marginalised peasantry, between a world model democracy and the most tyrannical regime on the planet today. The continued recognition and support of a tyrannical regime by democratic nations is utterly shameful and irresponsible. The backing of a regime

born of a military conquest by men who fought without any vision of a reconciled society is nothing short of a political recuperation of a human tragedy, the Tutsi genocide. Equally shameful is the accelerating marginalisation of Rwandan democrats, of inside and outside Rwanda, even by those who had undertaken a noble mediation task since 1994. It has become evident that most architects of a new hope in Rwanda are excluded from the talks on the country's future. As long as they can not be given an opportunity to contribute to the return of harmony, reconciliation effort can not succeed.

The international community should urge the government of Rwanda to accept dialogue. It should wake up and recognise the importance of the tragedy and not continue to downsize it. It must send strong messages to the military high command in power that the average rate of kill of 40 victims per RPF combatant since 1994 is too much. It is important to empower those who work for reconciliation and the democratic opposition, internal and external, so that a meaningful dialogue may start.

5. THE PROBLEMS THAT PEACEMAKERS FACE IN THEIR WORK

The great misfortune of our torn society has been to have bred two lethal extremisms: Hutu extremism embodied in Hutu militias, and Tutsi extremism embodied in their clones of the Rwandese Patriotic Army, allied in both cases to political élites lacking in a human view. These extremisms are further enhanced by a conspiracy of silence in the international community. Hence a killer political deadlock, inspite of reports on fresh crimes against humanity that have been perpetrated recently in Zaire against Hutu refugees. In this context, we face several needs and problems to start a meaningful dialogue for reconciliation. First there is a need of opportunities for members of different groups who work for peace in Rwanda to meet and build mutual trust, so that they can work together to assist their brethren. There is an equal need for a space where different enemy factions can meet for dialogue.

Second, in Rwanda there is a rhetoric of insurgency and ruthless counterinsurgency that fills the entire space for healing the wounds. The official approach to run a country that has lost peace is a policy of shoot to kill. Reconciliation is still officially considered as a disease. In the military ethnocracy that rules the country, there are no leaders of vision who care for all ethnic groups, and who can lead them towards a shared national purpose. In addition, social tension has become an important trade for powerful groups of the winner ethny, and a product for export to neighbouring countries. The barrier to reconciliation is made of those who, against all ethical standards, wish to gain political advantage from the Rwandan tragedy, saying that reconciliation would make people forget it. For this reason violence is a principle of government, and it is filling all the space of the rule of law.

Third, the state feels immune from pressures for dialogue with its opponents, because it is encouraged in that by certain western superpowers. With the military assistance it continues to receive from them, it is stronger than the people it is expected to serve and it can ignore their will without being questioned. For this there is an absolutisation of politics and a general infantilisation of the population considered to be ignorant. When there are invitations for dialogue, the Rwandan authorities send junior staff or militant Tutsi émigrés with instructions

to impede talks. On the side of the regime's participants, discussions are characterised by unusual arrogance, aggressivity, contempt against Hutu interlocutors, distortions and deceit. In many cases, even the mediators have been labelled as pro-genocidists if they refuse to be manipulated by the tyrannical regime.

Fourth., there is abandonment by advocates of human rights and justice, particularly the NGOs, who may be ready to let the new regime strengthen its anti-dialogue position. Others have made their own racist radical choices, and may act as militants who share the same interest as their chosen camp in the competition. International moral standards seem to have been severely eroded in our times. For the first time in recent history, states, organisations, and NGOs are co-operating with a government that has perpetrated an immense genocide, giving an other genocide as justification. Even those who accept to play the role of mediation are too complacent with the new rulers, and do not come forth with at least bold proposals of rules of the game for a meaningful dialogue with excluded Rwandans. Some give the impression that not much can be done. others give even a worse impression that nothing needs to be changed, if not for the oppressed to accept their condition. For the latter, after the Tutsi genocide any, crime against humanity perpetrated by the new regime must be pardoned.

Fifth, there are scepticists both in Rwanda and outside who raise fundamental questions. but in the objective of using them as a pretext for their inaction, acceptance or active support of the present bad situation. How to convince the heavily armed victors that the solution to a social conflict is dialogue? How to convince frustrated losers that dialogue is the only acceptable means to resolve the conflict and avert further death? How to tell those who have lost their beloved relatives to violence to give up revenge schemes?

Sixth, Tutsi democrats are notoriously absent on the democracy and human rights front. Although they are courageously denouncing the rampant corruption of the new regime, they are not coming forth enough to proclaim their own position on criminal aspects of RPF's military rulers. They do not proclaim that they are taking the side of the oppressed.

6. CONCLUSION

"In the whole lan", declares the Lord, two-thirds will be struck down and perish; yet one-third will be left in it. This third I will bring into the fire; I will refine them like silver and test them like gold They will call on my name and I will answer them; I will say, " they are my people", and they will say, " the Lord is our God ". Zech. 13: 8-9.

More than three years after the April-July 94 government that led Hutu extremists in the awful sin of genocide against Tutsis, their Tutsi successors committed an equally awful sin of genocide against the Hutus. As this century draws to a close, the new regime strives to widen the gap between these two ethnic groups, and a situation of structural injustice is consolidating. Progress in human rights respect is too remote to be expected by thousands of those who are languishing in overcrowded prisons. As a consequence of its strong criminal character, the new rulers are severely handicapped by lack of legitimacy; they resort to massive extra-judicial killings of Hutus, terror, and wide ranging detentions. It is very hard to describe to non-Rwandans the extreme agony, which those who have no blood relations with

men in military uniform have to bear. The regime that is maintained by unending killings is truly in conflict with the Law of God "*You shall not kill*" and with the teaching of the Gospel. It is a matter of urgency to replace it by a government that is chosen by the people, because only structural solutions can put an end to the institutionalised structural injustices and to bloodshed.

The limits of the agony that a people can bear have been exceeded and the Rwandans need a leadership that is willing to set as its top priority to heal society's wounds. They need a leadership of vision, not just "strong men", a leadership that recognises the need shared by all Rwandans, Hutus and Tutsis, of the right to life, security, prosperity, equality, justice, the rule of law, and participation in the shaping of their country's destiny. Instead of military generals, it needs reconciliation generals, men and women from all ethnic groups, regions and creeds, who can lead society towards a shared national purpose. However, after three years of fruitless work for an end of the Rwandan conflict, we recognise that in a country where the traditions of reconciliation between rival socio-political factions are unknown, peace engineering is a difficult task for those who are unarmed. Today, there is a serious question whether there can be any dialogue between them and the government while they sternly oppose armed ethnic extremisms, and propose the country's demilitarisation. But we too ask whether the wickedness of the present regime must be allowed to constitute an excuse for despair and resignation.

In spite of the lack of response to our efforts to provoke dialogue, we believe it is not yet time to prepare the coffin for national reconciliation. Can God allow the agenda of wicked ethnic factions to be implemented until the country is emptied of the majority of its inhabitants? Our hope is that all the factions will feel the need to choose between two risks. the risk that the worst is yet to come, and the risk of trying reconciliation as the only path to a shared safe future. Although reconciliation sounds utopia to many, it is the most realistic approach because mutual extermination has proven to be too easy. It must of course involve only those who have clean hands. They are more numerous than what the present regime makes the external opinion believe.

Urged by the cry of the oppressed Rwandan people, we send a message to those who respect the teaching of the Gospel, recalling the enlightening question "*who is thy neighbour?*". To them we say that tyrannical rulers who say no to dialogue and proclaim that reconciliation is a terrible disease, are a manifestation of the evilness of Satan himself They should realise that RPF's regime is irreformable and is worthy of rebellion, but a rebellion resorting to non-violent means that allow winning over the tyrants themselves to society's cause. Don't they have a moral obligation to call for an end to the barbaric killings of innocent populations and to support those who work for the return of peace in Rwanda?

As Christ is living, the Churches have the obligation to pursue his reconciliation work. They have to remind their followers that the way to God passes by the homes of genocide survivors, by the homeless refugees and the orphaned children, through Rwanda's prisons, the killing places in its countryside and in Zaire. To all of them we address the following specific demands:

- a) Take a special time in the Christmas week of this year 1997 to pray for national reconciliation in Rwanda.
- b) Take a concrete initiative to start a meaningful dialogue between the country's different social and political actors in order to set in motion a reconciliation process.
- c) Support our demand of the imposition of a total arms embargo on Rwanda, and our call for an economic boycott and an end to foreign aid.
- d) Write to President Clinton to ask him to withdraw the US diplomatic and military support to the present Rwanda's non-elected regime.
- e) Write to the Secretary General of the UN to request that the leaders in Rwanda, Uganda and Zaire who have the blood of innocent people on their hands because of the genocides they made their armies perpetrate in Rwanda and Zaire be brought before the International Tribunal for Rwanda.
- f) Write to different governments to ask them not to supply visas to Rwandan officials, travelling abroad if the RPF's rulers do not put an end to killings, arbitrary detention. and start a meaningful dialogue with the opposition.

We seize this opportunity to send a message of brotherhood to all peace loving and God fearing Tutsis in the army, administration, politics, and Church leadership, to come forward in force and dare to take the risk of working for national reconciliation. To them the Scriptures warn. (*Better to be lowly in spirit and among the oppressed than to share plunder with the proud* " (Prov. 16: 19). They should dissent against ethnic discrimination and denounce an ethnic fanaticism that is leading the country to its ruin. We ask them to recognise that the upper hand that those of their kinsmen in power, who are addicted to revenge may enjoy now part of the problem because it does not solve the resentment of the others. Structural injustices being built today will be solved tomorrow by bloody revolutions, whatever the type of demographic parity is established, because a repressive system can not be manageable in the long run.

Peace loving Hutus must condemn the genocide of Tutsi Rwandans perpetrated by Hutu extremists, and recognise the suffering of the survivors. They must be prepared to give pardon to RPF criminals for the ominous crimes they committed against Hutu population. They must know that there will be no interethnic reconciliation if they do not recognise the understandable fear for survival that many Tutsis express indirectly by their bizarre hostility to democratic rule. The Tutsis too must do likewise, condemn the genocide of Hutu Rwandans perpetrated by combatants of RPF and recognise Hutu fear for their survival if the Tutsi military extremist faction continues to monopolise power.

With a divine order to seek reconciliation with the enemies, the followers of Christ among the Rwandans have, an enormous responsibility in solving their conflict. We have to change first and cultivate a new relationship if our society must change. But we are dealing with fear and enmity between two groups lacking a third one that could buffer or mediate. The democrats

and all men and women with moral or spiritual authority must constitute that third group- A special effort by Tutsi peacemakers is therefore required because their kinsmen in the army and power are at present the major stakeholders. The best detonator of the time bomb would be a sincere initiative on their side to give up support to the use of violent means to subjugate the Hutu populations. The international community, in particular leaders of Catholic, Anglican and Protestant churches, can help to speed up such an initiative.

If reconciliation is not feasible, desperateness will be the only force that can operate changes. For there is no left cheek to turn to the oppressor who has already taken away millions of lives with impunity. So great has been the suffering of the masses, so great will be the explosion of the liberating love of God. Did not the hope of believers come from the extreme suffering of our Lord on the Cross?

APPENDIX I

Cost in human lives of the Rwanda conflict

<i>PHASE OF THE CRISIS</i>	<i>REGION IN RWANDA</i>	<i>AIM OF MASSACRES</i>	<i>NUMBER OF VICTIMS</i>
October 1990 -march 1991	Kibilira and Bugesera	Exactions by Hutu extremists on Tutsi and Bagogwe populations	500
October 1990 - February 1993	Byumba and Ruhengeri	RPF/NRA ²⁰ open up a territory, « Tutsiland », for repatriation of Tutsi refugees, and power negotiation.	20.000
February 1993	Byumba and Ruhengeri	- idem -	40.000
April - June 1994	All for Tutsi genocide; Byumba, Kibungo and East Kigali for Hutu counter-genocide	Tutsi and Hutu genocides in a war waged by the RPF/NRA on the RAF for power restructuring, land, and ethnic security.	1.180.000
June-August 1994	Centre and South of the country	Strengthening of the Tutsi military ethnocracy and take-over of Hutu land property.	400.000
July - August 1994	Refugee camps in Zaire	Epidemics, diseases, hunger.	100.000
August - December 1994 ²¹	All	Selective killing of Hutu élites and males; take-over of victims' property.	580.000
1995 - October 1996	All	- idem -	250.000
November 1996 - February 1997	Zaire	Hutu genocide ²² by the Rwandese Tutsi Army and Kabila rebellion	500.000
March - May 1997	Zaire	Hutu genocide by the Rwandese Tutsi Army at Tingitangi and Kisangani ²³	80.000
TOTAL²⁴			3.150.500

20 Meaning of acronyms: RPF = Rwandese Patriotic Front; NRA = National Resistance Army (Uganda); RAF Rwandese Armed Forces (defeated).

21 According to the December 1994 report of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Division of population census, there were 2.101.250 victims of the 1994 massacre.

22 See the report of a witness published by the French newspaper Libération of March 10, 1997, under the heading " Zaire: un témoin raconte les massacres ".

23 Of the 160.000 surviving refugees who had reached Tingitingi and Kisangani, only 80.000 were still alive at the beginning of May 1997 (see Time of the week of 12 May 1997, ((The Highway to Hell ", p. 28-3 3).

24 At the rate of killings of 500.000 to 1.000.000 victims per year, the extremist wing of RPF rulers may establish an ethnic parity of Hutus and Tutsis at the turn of this century.

APPENDIX II

A chronology of US involvement that catalysed the Rwanda tragedy

Period or date	Observations
1962 - 1973	The Hutu. regime of the first Republic was protected by Belgium and the US against the rebellion of Tutsi refugees supported by communist countries.
1973-1990	The second Republic too enjoyed support from western countries but Habyarimana failed to strike an adequate balance in his ties to the US, Belgium and France, preferring a relative closeness to the latter. At the end of the cold war, the US put an overdue pressure on Rwanda to democratise.
Prior to 1990	The Pentagon trains RPF commanders under the IMMET programme. Major P. Kagame, then Uganda's interim military intelligence chief, is trained at the military academy of Leavenworth, Kansas.
1989-1992	US provided 183 million US\$ in economic aid to Uganda, an amount equal to aid it gave to that country in the previous 27 years, to enable to finance RPF war.
1989	US tolerate repeated RPF/NRA attacks on Rwanda to exert political pressure on Habyarimana.
1 October 1990	RPF/NRA get approval of Anglo-Saxon superpowers for a military assault on Rwanda.
January 1992	Emissaries of " Prayer Breakfast " try to mediate between Habyarimana and Museveni in order to rally the former into the American strategy on Sudanese islamism.
August 1992	At Orlando, Florida, US authorities arrested men who were illegally attempting to send to Uganda military equipment worth 18 million US \$, partly destined to RPF
1st semester 92	CIA considers fomenting a military coup to topple Habyarimana.
July 1992	US observers in Arusha negotiations demand that RPF officers be included in the OAU's Neutral military observer group. These officers

	turned out to be an advanced spy group that planned the internal destabilisation of Rwanda.
2nd semester 92	The <i>Pentagon for</i> missions, frequently sends the officer who was in charge of IMMET, colonel Tony Marley, to RPF Headquarters at Mulindi.
9 January 1993	The US observers and other Western observers in the Arusha negotiations impose an agreement that gave to RPF more share in power than its real political base.
4 August 1993	Habyarimana signed the Arusha Agreement, yielding to pressure by the US and other western countries, to give excessive power share to RPF.
January 1994	According to the Swiss magazine L'Hebdo, a CIA expert worked out three scenarios of evolution of Rwandan crisis; One of them involved 500.000 victims.
March 1994	A delegation of State Department and the Pentagon officials comprising P. Bushnell, A. Render and P. Irving visit Zaire, Rwanda, Burundi, and Uganda. After their visit Museveni asks President Mwinyi of Tanzania to host a summit to examine political situations of both Rwanda and Burundi.
5 April 1994	Colonel Marshal is informed by the US Embassy to Rwanda that a special force is stationed in Bujumbura.
6 April 1994	The US military attaché based in Cameroon colonel Vukovic, arrived in Kigali. He supervised the evacuation of American citizens on 8 April 1994.
6 April 1994	The Presidents of Rwanda and of Burundi, Habyarimana and Ntaryamira, were killed when the plane in which they travelled from a summit in Dar Es Salaam was shot down near Kigali. Unlike in other instances of air terrorism, the US did not seek to investigate a conspiracy reminiscent of Lockerby.
April 1994	The UN security council of which the US is a leading member decides to pull out the Blue Helmets when it was clear that there was a speedy Tutsi genocide. The Department of States forbids US representatives to qualify the Tutsi massacres as genocide.
July 1994	The US who had supported withdrawal of Blue Helmets deploy 4000 troops, seemingly to outbalance the French Turquoise.
15 July 1994	The US decides to close down the Rwanda Embassy in Washington, before the victory of RPF.
July 1994	US Secretary of defence, W. Perry, visits Rwanda.
1995	The US influenced the UN security council to lift the arms embargo on Rivanda. It sent military advisors and equipped RPA with gunboats to be used against Hutu refugees on Lake Kivu islands (ex. massacres on Iwawa island).
September 1995	Elif Kaban (Reuter 3.9.95) quotes a US diplomat in Kigali saying: " By the end of 1995, we believe the refugees will be gone under a responsible forced repatriation ".
1996	The US sent Afro-American officers to train and advise RPA special forces that perpetrated the Hutu genocide in ex-Zaire.

- 11 October 1996 US Secretary of State, Warren Christopher, declared that it would be safe for Rwandan refugees to return home. A few days later, the Rwandan Tutsi Army invaded the refugee camps.
- 21 November 1996 Amid a political combat on refugee statistics, the US ambassador to Rwanda, Robert Gribbin, announced that no international assistance and protection of humanitarian workers in refugee camps in Zaire was necessary, as most refugees had returned to Rwanda.
- End of 1996 The US opposed the sending of international military force to protect refugees in Eastern Zaire. It supplied military equipment and Afro-American military advisors to RPA and Kabila rebellion for their anti-Mobutu and anti-Hutu operations.
- June 1996 At a round table in Geneva, the US delegation opposes proposals to link financial aid to Rwanda to respect of human rights and national reconciliation.
- March 1997 French President J. Chirac denounces the conspiracy of silence, and points at the financial support of the US to wars in the Great Lakes Region.
- 15 August 1997 The Washington Post publishes details on US military involvement in Rwanda.
- 28 August 1997 The Belgian Newspaper *Le Soir*, reporting on the Washington Post article, further discloses how Afro-American marines of the US Army were used to train and advise the Rwandan Tutsi army that perpetrated crimes against humanity in Hutu refugee camps in Zaire.

APPENDIX III

The project " New Hope for Rwanda " - NOUER- and its promoters

NOUER aims at submitting analyses for a vision of Rwanda's society, making proposals for national reconstruction, monitoring the state of human rights and civic liberties, and creating a forum for debate and civic action.

The project was initiated in April 1995 with the release of the document "Building New Hope for Rwanda " which contains a sociological analysis of implicit and explicit factors in power exercise that led to the 1994 Rwandan tragedy. In addition, this document makes proposals on the ways of building a new social contract that is inclusive and consensual. Other NOUER's documents of this series are:

- *Les voies pacifiques de la résolution de la crise politique Rwandaise: propositions pour la relance du processus de réconciliation nationale. Lausanne, mai 1996.*
- *D'un génocide l'autre: plaidoyer pour une justice juste et pour le rétablissement dans l'autorité d'un courant démocratique au Rwanda. Lausanne, mai 1997.*

NOUER welcomes contributions of whoever wishes to support and respect its objective. Whoever wishes to be accepted to be a member of this project can apply by writing to the promoters, James K. Gasana and Nkiko Nsengimana.

M. **James K. Gasana** holds a B.Sc.(For.)(Hons) from Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda, an M.Sc. (Forest management) from the Andes University, Mérida, Venezuela, and a Ph.D. (Forest Science) from the University of Idaho, USA. He got experience in rural development from professional practice as manager of rural development projects in his country, Rwanda. In March 1990, the President of Rwanda gave him the presidency of the National Agricultural Commission. In July 1990, he joined the Government as minister of Agriculture, Livestock and Forests. In April 1992, he was minister of Defence. He resigned from Government in July 1993, and is living in Switzerland since then. M. Gasana is honorary canon in the Episcopal Church of Rwanda. He has been given the Alumni Achievement Award, University of Idaho, and is an honorary member of the Swiss Forest Engineers Society.

M. **Nkiko Nsengimana** holds the degree of Licentiate in political science from Lausanne University, and Doctor of political science from the High Institute International Studies, Geneva. He is a specialist of co-operative movement and peasantry problems. He got a large experience in the private sector and in activities of the civil society. In particular, he served with the Peoples' Banks in Rwanda, and was the Co-ordinator of the Centre for Training and Co-operative Research - IWACU. He was Chairman of Rwandan NGOs and was active in the human rights movement. He got involved in peasant emancipation movement and in the structuring of the civil society. He had to leave Rwanda because of the 1994 human catastrophe, and is living in Switzerland.