

# The Rwandan Genocide: The True Motivations for Mass Killings

MOISE JEAN

What were you doing during the spring of 1994? Were you watching the solar eclipse, following the breaking news of the low speed OJ Simpson Bronco chase, or even better using Yahoo search for the first time? While the world was focused on these events, Rwanda was facing a systematic eradication of a people. During the period of April to June 1994, Hutu extremist massacred hundreds of thousands of Tutsi and their Hutu sympathizers. Many Americans and others in the international community maintained the sentiment that the violence was just part of the never ending Rwandan civil war or a continuation of a “tribal conflict” which was viewed as commonplace in Africa. However, collateral damage of a civil war cannot account for the death of 800,000 civilians in three months. This massacre was premeditated genocide. Regardless of who in the international community was watching or not willing to help stop the genocide, what was the motivating force that would lead to extreme measures such as mass killings? Many scholars believe the long lasting ethnic conflict between the Hutu and Tutsi was the seed to the development of the genocide. In this paper I will investigate the true motivation of the 1994 Rwandan genocide as more than just social divide and ethnic hatred between the Hutu and the Tutsi; but due to the seeds of the economic recession and the civil war, which allowed the Northern Hutu elites to use their manipulating power over the masses and inciting ethnic division in order to maintain political power.

## *Historiography: Other Schools of Thought on the Genocide*

Rwanda is a small landlocked nation in the Great Lakes region in the heart of Africa. It is approximately 10,000 square miles with a temperate climate, and vast topography.<sup>i</sup> The population of Rwanda is made up of three ethnic groups. One percent of the population are Twa (from pigmy hunters), fourteen percent are Tutsi (from Ethiopian pastoralist), and eighty five percent are Hutu (from Bantu farmers).<sup>ii</sup> What is the motivating force of Rwanda’s history? What caused violence between these groups? Some may argue that stress catalyzes human history. Stressors create an environment that makes reactions an essential occurrence. The lack of something, the need for something, or the fear of something, causes humans to respond and attempt to implement a change to that

---

<sup>i</sup> Susan E. Cook, *Genocide in Cambodia and Rwanda: New Perspectives*. (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transactions Publishers, 2006).

<sup>ii</sup> Kingsley C. Moghalu, *Rwanda’s Genocide: The Politics of Global Justice*. (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

situation. In the case of the Rwandan genocide, what motivating force had such a stronghold on people that ethnic cleansing was the answer? Did stressors of ethnic differences, politics, or economics motivate it? Some historians argue that the motivating seeds for this three month massacre began hundreds of years prior. Others believe the seeds developed due to political and economic stressors during a ten year period. In this section I will investigate these contrasting scholarly views and evaluate my historical perspective to the motivation of genocide.

Many scholars have taken on the daunting task of explaining ethnic violence. Older schools of thought emphasize the "ancient hatreds" argument, which relies on the idea that centuries old differences motivate current hatred. However, this argument is not valid due to the likelihood of changes in ethnicity and identity over time. Similarly, the theory of "conflictual modernization," provides an incomplete argument, which argues that ethnic cleansing is influenced by one innovating group's belief that a less innovative group will retard societal innovation as a whole. But this theory does not explain why modernization leads to violent ethnic conflicts in some times and places in history more than others.<sup>iii</sup> Currently, there are two important contrasting points of views in reference to ethnic violence: the symbolist political theory developed by Political Science scholar Stuart Kaufman, and the rational choice theory pioneered by sociologist George Homans.

### *The Symbolist Political Theory*

The symbolist political theory is based on a social-psychological view, which asserts the critical importance of intangible concerns such a group's emotional state when characterizing motivation behind ethnic violence.<sup>iv</sup> Advocates of this theory believe that extreme acts of ethnic violence such as genocide are caused by "group myths that justify hostility, fears of group extinction, and a symbolic politics of chauvinist mobilization. The hostile myths produce emotion-laden symbols that make mass hostility easy for chauvinist elites to provoke and make extremist policies popular."<sup>v</sup> Symbolists reject the assertion that ethnicity is merely a social construct that elites use to maintain control of masses and that on an individual basis ethnicity is of minor importance. In contrast, symbolists support the idea of "myth-symbol complex" that identifies elements of shared culture and what interpretation of history binds the group and distinguishes it from others. Myths have deep roots in history and culture that cannot be easily ignored.<sup>vi</sup> Furthermore, this model suggests that emotions, not rational calculations, motivate people to act. Elites equipped with long lasting myths can manipulate the emotions of the people and encourage action. Along with the preexisting myths and ethnic contrasts, symbolic politics leads to ethnic war or genocide through a process involving three dynamics—mass hostility, chauvinist political mobilization, and a security dilemma. Symbolists argue that this environment existed in Rwanda and is the motivation of its genocide.

---

<sup>iii</sup> *Stuart J. Kaufman*, "Symbolic Politics or Rational Choice? Testing Theories of Extreme Ethnic Violence," *International Security* 30.4 (2006) 45-86.

<sup>iv</sup> Kaufman, "Symbolic Politics or Rational Choice?" 46.

<sup>v</sup> Kaufman, "Symbolic Politics or Rational Choice?" 47.

<sup>vi</sup> Kaufman, "Symbolic Politics or Rational Choice?" 50.

Contrary to the symbolist theory, the rational choice model emphasizes elite's self interests and security dilemma as the primary motivators for ethnic violence. The desire to maintain power and the threat of losing power in an environment of political and economic instability leads to social deviance and fractionalization. Rational choice advocates propose an elite-predation model, which assumes that masses do not want violence, but elites do. Leaders who fear losing power:

[may] gamble for resurrection by resorting to predation—provoking ethnic conflict to try to change the agenda toward issues that favor their remaining in power. The public notices the violence, so even if they are unsure about which side provoked it, they can rationally increase their concern that the opposing group might be dangerous. The public may therefore rationally support policies leading to war or even genocide, calculating that the costs of violence are lower than the costs of facing threatened violence unprepared.<sup>vii</sup>

Moreover rationalists believe the fact that regardless of what elite official encourages violence all people are rational beings and each individual is responsible for their own actions.

The main proponent for the symbolic political theory is Stuart J. Kaufman, author of "Symbolic Politics or Rational Choice? Testing Theories of Extreme Ethnic Violence". In this article Kaufman contrasts his model with the rational choice model in the case studies of the Sudanese conflict over the past thirty years and the Rwandan genocide of 1994. According to Kaufman, "Rwanda's genocide must have been motivated by an exceptionally hostile, eliminationist Hutu mythology aimed against the Tutsi ... extreme mass hostility against Tutsi, and chauvinist mobilization based on manipulating ethnic symbols—all resulting in a predation-driven security dilemma."<sup>viii</sup> Plainly, Rwanda had a preexisting ethnic divide in an unstable region, which made citizens highly dependant on the government and left it open for governmental elitist manipulation.

The importance of myths and their effect on relations between groups is vital to the symbolist argument. The creation myth of the Tutsi, Hutu, and Twa has many variations, but the same outcome on the hierarchy of the Rwandan society. Kaufman believes, "The Story of the Origins" [below] is the foundation of Hutu hostility toward Tutsi.

...there was Kigwa, who fell from heaven and had three sons: Gatwa, Gahutu, and Gatutsi. When he decided to choose his successor, he entrusted each of the three sons a pot of milk to watch over during the night. At daybreak, Gatwa had drunk the milk; Gahutu had fallen asleep and in the carelessness of the sleep, had spilt the milk; and only Gatutsi had kept watch throughout the night, and only his milk pot was safe. So it was clear to Kigwa that Gatutsi should be the successor and by that fact should be exempt of any menial tasks. Gahutu was to be his servant. The utter unreliability of Gatwa was to make him only a clown in society. As a result, Gatutsi received cattle and command whereas Gahutu would acquire cattle only through the services to Gatutsi, and Gatwa was condemned to hunger and gluttony and would not acquire cattle.<sup>ix</sup>

---

<sup>vii</sup> Kaufman, "Symbolic Politics or Rational Choice? 50.

<sup>viii</sup> Kaufman "Symbolic Politics or Rational Choice? 70.

<sup>ix</sup> Aimable Twagilimana, *The Debris of Ham: Ethnicity, Regionalism, and the 1994 Rwandan Genocide*. (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2003).

Myths such as “The Story of the Origins” were common knowledge in Rwanda and used to justify the Tutsi minority rule, over the Hutu majority and the marginal Twa. These myths were supported by the European colonizers and extended to fit the Eurocentric idea of superiority.

The Belgian colonizers viewed the Hutu as ignorant, vile, slaves by nature, with no ambition. Hutu features were ugly and indicative of the inferior Negro. A 1925 colonial report describes Hutu as, “generally short and thick-set with a big head, a jovial expression, a wide nose, and enormous lips.”<sup>x</sup> As for the Twa, they were described as being the most primitive of the three groups. “He is small, chunky, muscular, and very hairy; particularly on the chest. With a monkey-like flat and a huge nose, he is quite similar to the apes whom he chases in the forest”<sup>xi</sup> In contrast to the “intrinsically inferior” Hutu and Twa, The Tutsi received much praise from their Belgian colonizers because during this period of Social Darwinism, they felt the Tutsi were the more evolved ethnic group in appearance and intelligence and related to Europeans therefore more superior. The colonial minister in Rwanda in 1925 is quoted as saying,

The Mutusi of good race has nothing of the Negro, apart from his colour. He is very tall, 1.8 m at least, at least 1.9 m or more. He is very thin, a characteristic which tends to be even more noticeable as he gets older. His features are very fine: high brow, thin nose and fine lips framing beautiful shining teeth. Batutsi women are usually lighter skinned than their husbands, very slender and pretty in their youth, although they tend to thicken with age...Gifted with vicious intelligence, the Tutsi displays a refinement of feelings which is rare among primitive people. He is a natural born leader, capable of extreme self control and calculated goodwill.<sup>xii</sup>

These distinctions emphasized by the Belgians became engrained in the Hutu belief system and later developed into jealousy toward the Tutsi that transformed into rage by 1994.

Throughout the many centuries of African exploitation by Europeans, Europeans used the Bible as a justification of the plight of the African. In Genesis, the first Book of the Bible, in chapter nine there is a story about Noah and his son Ham. One night, Noah was in a state of drunkenness and Ham entered his tent, saw his father naked, and did not honor his father by covering his nakedness. Instead, he told his brothers. Because he did not appropriately honor his father Noah cursed Ham and his descendants, which was Canaan. Since the sixth century A.D. Judaic historiography describes Africans as descendants of Ham with the inherited curse. This theory was used to justify slavery and the dehumanization of Africans. In the nineteenth century, Egyptologists revised this “Hamitic myth.” They asserted that Hamites were from northeast Africa and represented a closer blood line to Europeans. The Belgians believed this idea of the Tutsi relation to the Hamities because they felt the most physically and socially superior group in Rwanda could not have their origins in Africa, they had to be of Eurasian decent.<sup>xiii</sup> They used this theory to further divide the Tutsi and

---

<sup>x</sup> Twagilimana, *The Debris of Ham* 45.

<sup>xi</sup> Rapport annuel du Territoire de Nyanza (1925). Quoted in A. Twagilimana, *The Debris of Ham : Ethnicity, Regionalism, and the 1994 Rwandan Genocide* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2003), 45.

<sup>xii</sup> Minstre des colonies, *Rapport de l'administration belge du Rwanda-Urundi, 1925*, 34. Quoted in Aimable Twagilimana, 44.

<sup>xiii</sup> Twagilimana, *The Debris of Ham* 47.

Hutu by placing control of the resources in the hands of the Tutsi monarchy and systematically oppressing the Hutu.

Kaufman believes myths and their incorporation in all areas of the Rwandan society planted early seeds of angst of the Hutu toward the Tutsi. After the 1959 Rwandan independence revolution, there was a great increase in hate driven sentiment towards the Tutsi by the Hutu, who had gained political control of the country after independence. Based on the myth of origins the Tutsi were viewed as foreigners from northeast Africa with no right to Rwandan land and were invaders of Hutu territory. This ideology along with the massacre of hundreds of Tutsi's in Burundi caused the exile of thousands of Tutsi during the onset of the Hutu rule in 1962. With complete control in the hands of the Hutu and the ousting of many Tutsi's radical discourse toward Tutsi were less accented. However, twenty years later, in 1990 with the invasion by the Tutsi refugee led Rwanda Patriotic Front (RPF), hate sentiment returned and civil war began. The Hutu elite used the idea of another Tutsi invasion as a justification for ethnic cleansing. The ethnic mythology made genocide a fathomable solution.

According to Kaufman, after the RPF invasion Hutu President Juvénal Habyarimana began to engage in symbolist politics aiming to build on the long-standing hostility toward Tutsi. Habyarimana's pro-government propaganda was summed up in the "Hutu Ten Commandments," a 1990 propaganda document. First commandment, "Tutsi are blood and power thirsty. They want to impose their hegemony on the Rwandan people by cannon and sword." Second commandment, "Ever Since the social revolution of 1959 not one day has passed that the Tutsi have let go of the idea of reconquering power in Rwanda and exterminating the intellectuals and dominating the Hutu agriculturists. Tenth commandment, "The Hutu must stop taking pity on the Tutsi."<sup>xiv</sup> These three commandments represent how the Hutu elite would use any means to maintain power, even through genocide.

### *Rational Choice Theory*

The rational choice theory, the older of the two theories, conveys a view of ethnicity as a construct of the elite who use this tool to maintain power and manipulate the masses.<sup>xv</sup> In the case of Rwanda, preexisting ethnic divisions were used as scapegoats to the problems the country faced and to further incite a need for more government control. The economic crisis of the 1980's, resource depletion, dependency on foreign aid, and the pressure to build a democracy in Rwanda put a strain on the government of Habyarimana. The government turned to military mobilization against the RPF as a way to maintain power instead of sitting down for diplomacy. This gave them an excuse to eliminate opposition to their regime both in the RPF and in other Hutu groups in Rwanda.

In April 1994 Habyarimana finally sat at the table with the RPF and signed a treaty called the Arusha Accords. This treaty would bring about a share of government power and result in the decrease of northern Hutu domination. The northern Hutu extremist viewed the declaration of the Arusha Accords as an

---

<sup>xiv</sup> <http://www.onemancult.com/rwanda/hututen.html> (Retrieved 1 November 2006)

<sup>xv</sup> James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin, "Violence and the Social Construction of Ethnic Identity" International Organization 54, 4, (2000): 845-877.

act of treason. Many historians believe these Hutu extremists were responsible for Habyarimana's assassination right after he signed the Arusha Accords, which they blamed on the RPF and ignited the planned violence. Rationalists believe elites foment ethnic violence to build political support; this process has the effect of constructing more antagonistic identities, this favors more violence.<sup>xvi</sup> This idea uses violence to beget violence as a motivating force of continued genocide.

Rationalist thought provides the possibility that leaders are not so much deceiving followers as taking advantage of "constitutional and other institutional rules and norms that allow them to centralize or arrogate power if they can claim that the group faces a security threat."<sup>xvii</sup> By fomenting violence with an out-group, the leaders of the in-group may be able to "tie the hands" of their co-ethnics. In-group leaders increase their co-ethnics' demand for protection from the out-group and at the same time make sure there is no alternative set of leaders to protect them.<sup>xviii</sup> Now individuals are caught in a security dilemma, spurring violence neither side may want. Therefore, risk-aversion is enough to motivate murderous violence.

Symbolists view the ethnic divide and its ability to be manipulated by elites to instill fear within the masses is the most important tool used to motivate genocide. Rationalists view the desire of self preservation from all levels of systemic genocide as the motivation. I agree more with this view. The Rwanda's dire situation during the genocide was beyond social stratification, more importantly it was economic desperation and wartime instability. People who feel they have no other options will go to the extremes, and the Hutu elite knew that.

### *WHY: Rwanda Genocide Motivated by Money and Power*

Rwanda has a rich history and to begin to understand the Rwandan genocide one must first understand the economic and political influence over power.

#### *Economics*

With the wake of the Cold War the western community began to place pressure on Belgium to give up its colonies and grant Rwanda its independence. In 1962 Rwanda was granted its independence and became an ambitious developing nation. Independence led to the seizure of power by the Hutu majority away from the Tutsi and Tutsi were exiled from Rwanda. In 1973 Hutu military leader, Juvénal Habyarimana and a group of his followers, executed a successful coup of the government. Habyarimana and the Hutu elite led Rwanda through almost two decades of economic prosperity; however, from the late 1980s onward, economic growth began to decline and poverty rates began to increase exponentially. Several areas of the country suffered from severe drought and the population to food production ratios were not balanced. In addition, the

---

<sup>xvi</sup> Fearon, "Violence and the Social" 853.

<sup>xvii</sup> Fearon, "Violence and the Social" 855.

<sup>xviii</sup> Fearon, "Violence and the Social" 855.

international coffee crisis of the 1980s severely affected Rwanda due to the fact that coffee was its primary export and provider of revenue. Coffee prices fell by 50% in 1989 and hundreds of thousands of households lost 50% of their cash income.<sup>xix</sup> Coffee revenues fell from \$144 million in 1985 to \$30 million in 1993. Furthermore, Rwanda's aggregated gross domestic product (GDP) decreased from \$355 million in 1983 to \$260 million in 1990.<sup>xx</sup> With the devaluation of the Rwandan franc by 40%, the International Monetary Fund stepped in to provide economic aid. The Habyarimana government was incapable of solving the economic woes of the country. However the government, plagued by corruption, maintained their personal economic prosperity by mishandling the relief funding through its distribution amongst themselves and other Hutu elite. Common hard working Hutu and Tutsi alike were forced to live in poverty.

### *Politics*

Early in the 1990s the economic hardships in Rwanda began to take a toll on the political power of the Habyarimana government. The power of this dictatorial government was concentrated between Habyarimana and the northern Hutu elites. He created a one party stronghold state. A mafia-like organization that had close ties to Habyarimana's wife Agathe—the Akazu of northern Hutu, backed this government for keeping Habyarimana in power was in their best interests.<sup>xxi</sup> Money, power, and respect motivated Habyarimana and his government. He lived in a large villa in Kigali equipped with tennis courts, swimming pools, white and gold French décor, and a private Catholic chapel all in between army barracks and the airport.<sup>xxii</sup> In contrast, as the coffee monoculture that brought Rwanda prosperity in the 1970's and early 1980's failed internationally, a great economic and foodstuff crisis settled throughout the country leading to 85% of the Rwandan population living well below the poverty line in the late 1980's and early 1990's. When international relief funds came, absolute power corrupted absolutely. Money and food relief was not distributed to the people; instead it stayed in the hands of the government and the Akazu, while the people suffered of hunger and economic despair.

As the country went into debt and the land decreased in value the Hutu elites from the South and West of Rwanda began to demand money, land, and similar benefits as the Northern Hutu. This began the challenge to Habyarimana's power. Southern and central Hutu elites began to feel marginalized and increased in dissent towards the regime. Also the guerilla group comprised of a majority of Tutsi refugees trained in Ugandan camps, Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), invaded Rwanda and attempted to reach the capital Kigali. The threat from the RPF and the weakening of the Habyarimana regime led to an intense civil war. In the midst of all the internal opposition, the international community placed pressure on Rwanda to democratize, share power

---

<sup>xix</sup> Villia Fefremovas, "Socioeconomic Conditions, Not Ethnic Hatred, Led to the Genocide," in Christina Fisanick, *The Rwandan Genocide*, (Farmington Hill, MI.: Greenhaven Press, 2004), 30.

<sup>xx</sup> Peter Uvin, "Rwanda's Lack of Resources and Extreme Poverty Provided the Breeding Grounds for Genocide," in Christina Fisanick, *The Rwandan Genocide*, (Farmington Hill, MI.: Greenhaven Press, 2004), 53.

<sup>xxi</sup> Melvern, *Conspiracy*, 12.

<sup>xxii</sup> Melvern, *A People Betrayed*, 41.

with the RPF, and have free and open elections. With his monopoly of power in jeopardy Habyarimana reached out to ethnic hatred and propaganda against the Tutsi to bring about further instability to win support of the Hutu majority. The civil war lasted several years throughout the early 1990s with many cease-fires and ethnic massacres as common occurrences.

In light of the escalation of violence on the ground, the international community encouraged peace talks and initiatives to satisfy both sides of the conflict. In April 1994, Habyarimana agreed to negotiations with the RPF and its leaders. They met in Arusha, Tanzania and created a satisfying peace agreement called the Arusha Accords. With this document powers were split and the RPF were included in the government. Upon returning from signing this agreement the plane carrying Habyarimana and regime members was shot down over the skies of Kigali. The culprits of this attack are still unknown, but many speculate Hutu extremist executed it. The extremist felt the Arusha Accords were invalid, the idea of sharing power with Tutsi “cockroaches” was impossible, and they could not support a Hutu leader who would sign a document willing to compromise with the RPF. The assassination of Habyarimana led to a cascade of small violent events in the capital, Kigali. The concentrated violence quickly trickled out to throughout the country and for one hundred days 800,000 Tutsi were raped, beaten, and murdered. The same Hutu extremist militias also massacred 30,000 Hutu during the three months of violence. The violence was not focused on just Tutsi, but also those Hutu who would not participate in the violence. The mass murders were not spontaneous happenings, but they were well calculated and had been contemplated by the extremists since the onset of the civil conflict in 1990.

As the United States continued to encourage a move for all nations to democratize, this idea became more and more unappealing to Habyarimana. Democracy would mean a reduction of his political power that he held tightly for almost twenty years. He and the Akazu would not comply, but instead decided to eradicate all opposition. Early genocide sentiments were not kept a secret. On October 1, 1990 the Rwandan Patriotic Front, a group representing all of the Rwandan refugees forced out of the country (Tutsi and Hutu) in the 1960s and 1970s, attempted an invasion where they demanded,

[an] end to the ethnic divide and the system of compulsory identity cards, a self sustaining economy, a stop to the misuse of public offices, the establishment of social services, democratization of the security force, and the elimination of a system that generated refugees.<sup>xxiii</sup>

The RPF wanted democracy, an end to discriminative government, and more than anything else to return home. The RPF invasion was a failure. France and Zaire sent troops to help Habyarimana and quickly crushed the attempt in a single day. RPF guerillas returned and overthrew the prison in Ruhengeri, the most notorious prison in Rwanda. Again the revolt was crushed, but this time Habyarimana’s regime responded with a mass killing of the Bagogwe who were of Tutsi origin. These events spawned the civil war and the ultimate challenge to Northern Hutu elite power.

### *Hate: Government Created Hatred*

---

<sup>xxiii</sup> Melvern, *Conspiracy*, 13.

Habyarimana and his Hutu elite took advantage of the attempted invasions and brought back to Rwandan mainstream a blitzkrieg of propaganda that would go on well into the 1994. The RPF were referred to as the Tutsi invaders who were there to steal their scarce land just as they did hundreds of years earlier. With the economic struggles the Southern and Western Hutu elite were experiencing they believed the propaganda and sentiment that the RPF truly were out to get the miniscule land that they had. These elites were willing to support Habyarimana and his regime against the RPF and all Tutsi. Habyarimana continued to say that the Tutsis were the cause of all Rwanda's problems and to regain some support of his Hutu challengers. In actuality the Habyarimana elite was fearful of the formation of alliances with Tutsi, southern Hutu, or anyone attempting to create a democratic system of government that would reduce their political power.<sup>xxiv</sup>

Throughout his rule Habyarimana often reinforced the differences between the Hutu like himself and the Tutsi "cockroaches." Whenever necessary he could tap into his Tutsi hate reserve and incite people to follow his views. Hate propaganda became more widespread with the use of media, in particular radio. The main perpetrator of this hate radio was the privately owned Radio-Television Libre de Mille Collines (RTLNC) owned by Hutu extremists Ferdinand Nahimana and Joseph Serugendu who had political and economic connections that they wanted to maintain. The radio station influenced the thinking of the unemployed, delinquent, and gang thugs in the militia throughout the country.<sup>xxv</sup> The message from RTLNC was clear: Tutsi, Arusha Accords equals bad, and Hutu, and militia equals good. During the onset of the killing RTLNC broadcasted the names of certain government opponents, individuals who "deserved to die." The brainwashing of the hate propaganda did not reach all people. The audience was those who already had nothing to lose. However, there came a point where a normal Hutu had to kill or be killed. If one was a Tutsi sympathizer one was regarded as worse than a Tutsi.

Average people, neighbors, and friends, participated in the killings. A forty two year old inmate at the Gitarama prison speaks out about his participation in the genocide. He identifies himself as a cultivator:

Respondent: Our Responsible [person in charge] was the leader of our cell (akarenge). The Responsible said to me, "so you there, you are the one keeping that person whom we could not find?" ... They also chose a person who would kill me...Responsible then said to me, I told you that you would kill this person by all means." They told me that there was no other way except dying with that person... They brought the person who was supposed to kill me. Then they told me, "kill that person first and then they will kill you too." Then nothing happened. They snatched a club from one person and handed it to me then I killed that one... Whenever I slept, I would see the person I had killed. I saw him in front of my face. Later, they put me in prison. I was imprisoned on August 12, 1994.<sup>xxvi</sup>

---

<sup>xxiv</sup> Melvern, *Conspiracy*, 18.

<sup>xxv</sup> Melvern, *A People Betrayed*, 70.

<sup>xxvi</sup> Cook, *Genocide in Cambodia and Rwanda*, 166.

Power was of great importance to the Hutu elite. Power blinded them so much that they believed took to a systematic extinction of a people as a tool to maintain that power.

### *Final Thought*

According to Article 2 of *Resolution 260 (III) A of the United Nations General Assembly on 9 December 1948*, genocide means,

any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.<sup>xxvii</sup>

The perpetrators of the genocide systematically committed most of these acts. A women's blood drips down her legs as she cries holding on to half of her dead husband's seared upper body. As she strokes his head she can feel the infection attacking her body and sees the image of her unborn child dieing from AIDS. There was a little girl, aged about six with a machete wound in her head, and a boy with a gaping hole in his shoulder from a bullet. The militia brandished their machetes and hand grenades as they cruised around in their jeeps drinking beer, hurling vulgarities and chanting "Pawa, pawa, power, for Hutu power".<sup>xxviii</sup> Images like these occurred at schools, in homes, and even at churches. Extremists unjustly shed innocent blood for over 100 days. The blood was not Hutu or Tutsi it was Rwandan. A people divided by manipulation and propaganda and some sent on a course toward extinction all in order for the power hungry to maintain power.

The ethnic myths that established the relationship between the Hutu, Tutsi, and Twa, along with the mass hostility toward the Tutsi, economic distress, the chauvinistic political mobilization of the northern Hutu, and the resulting security dilemma of the RPF, made Rwanda a fertile ground for such a genocidal atrocity that occurred. Investigating the motivation of such a heinous act of human history encourages one to think about do people truly learn from such occurrences. Similar massacres continue to happen currently in places like Darfur, Sudan. After such an act of violence like 1994 Rwanda we all say "never again" but it happens anyway. What do we do to discourage genocide? Is there anything that can be done? All the scholarly motivation we find for genocide, people still do not understand there is no justification for it. But in our overpopulated planet is genocide needed to save the species? Currently Rwanda has improved economically and has adopted a full democratic government. Now as a developing nation it has a greater potential for success and a better future.

### *References*

Chalk, Frank, and Kurt Jonassohn. *The History and Sociology of Genocide*. New Haven, CT:

---

<sup>xxvii</sup> [http://www.un.org/Depts/dpa/prev\\_genocide/convention.htm](http://www.un.org/Depts/dpa/prev_genocide/convention.htm) (Retrieved 26 November 2006).

<sup>xxviii</sup> Linda Melvern, *A People Betrayed: The Role of the West in Rwanda's Genocide*. (New York, N.Y.: Zed Books, 2000).

- Yale University Press, 1990.
- Cook, Susan. Genocide in Cambodia and Rwanda New Perspectives. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2006.
- Fearon, James D. and David D. Laitin, "Violence and the Social Construction of Ethnic Identity" *International Organization* 54, 4, (2000): 845–877.
- Fefremovas, Villia, "Socioeconomic Conditions, Not Ethnic Hatred, Led to the Genocide," in Christina Fisanick, The Rwandan Genocide, (Farmington Hill, MI.: Greenhaven Press, 2004), 30.
- Fisanick, Christina. The Rwanda Genocide. Farmington Hills, MI: Greenhaven Press, 2002.
- Kagura, Hassan Ngeze. First published in December, 1990, (Retrieved 1 November 2006) <http://www.onemancult.com/rwanda/hututen.html>.
- Kaufman, Stuart J, "Symbolic Politics or Rational Choice? Testing Theories of Extreme Ethnic Violence," *International Security* 30.4 (2006) 45-86.
- Longman, Timothy. "Placing Genocide in Context: Research Priorities for the Rwandan Genocide." *Journal of Genocide Research* 6.1 (2004): 29-45.
- Melvorn, Linda. Conspiracy to Murder: The Rwandan Genocide. New York, NY: Verso, 2004.
- Melvorn, Linda. A People Betrayed: The Role of the West in Rwanda's Genocide. New York, NY: Zed Books, 2000.
- Moghalu, Kingsley C. Rwanda's Genocide: The Politics of Global Justice. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Pottier, Johan. Re-Imagining Rwanda: Conflict, Survival, and Disinformation in the Late Twentieth Century. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Twagilimana, Aimable. The Debris of Ham: Ethnicity, Regionalism, and the 1994 Rwandan Genocide. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2003.
- Uvin, Peter, "Rwanda's Lack of Resources and Extreme Poverty Provided the Breeding Grounds for Genocide," in Christina Fisanick, The Rwandan Genocide, (Farmington Hill, MI.: Greenhaven Press, 2004), 53.
- Article 2 of Resolution 260 (III) A of the United Nations General Assembly on 9 December 1948 (Retrieved 26 November 2006) [http://www.un.org/Depts/dpa/prev\\_genocide/convention.html](http://www.un.org/Depts/dpa/prev_genocide/convention.html).