



UNIVERSITY OF RWANDA

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

SCHOOL OF ARTS AND LANGUAGES

DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES

**UNIQUENESS OF GENOCIDE TESTIMONIES: TEXTUAL AND THEMATIC
ANALYSIS**

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Modern Languages, University of
Rwanda

By **Vincent NTAGANIRA, MA**

Supervisor: Professor Josias SEMUJANGA, Montreal University, Canada

Director of studies and Co-supervisor: Dr. Augustin RUDACOGORA,
University of Rwanda

Co-supervisor: Professor Déo BYANAFASHE, University of Rwanda

December 12th, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS	III
ABSTRACT	V
CHAPTER ONE: GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. RATIONALE	1
1.3. <i>METHODOLOGY</i>	3
1.4. <i>A SOCIO-POLITICAL HISTORY OF RWANDA AND THE GENOCIDE AGAINST TUTSI</i>	5
1.5. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	23
CHAPTER TWO: TESTIMONIES OF GENOCIDE	24
2.1. DIVISION OF CHAPTERS	24
2.2. ABOUT TESTIMONIES	24
2.3. <i>GENOCIDE TESTIMONIES</i>	26
2.4. <i>UNIQUENESS OF GENOCIDE TESTIMONIES</i>	29
2.5. <i>UNSPEAKABILITY OF GENOCIDE TESTIMONIES</i>	33
2.6. <i>IMPORTANCE OF GENOCIDE TESTIMONIES</i>	34
2.7. <i>ORAL TESTIMONIES</i>	37
2.8. <i>WRITTEN TESTIMONIES</i>	38
2.9. <i>CONCLUSION</i>	39
CHAPTER THREE: THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF <i>LA MORT NE VEUT PAS DE MOI</i> (1997)	40
3.1. <i>INTRODUCTION</i>	40
3.2. <i>Background to La mort ne veut pas de moi</i>	40
3.3. <i>Main themes in La mort ne veut pas de moi</i>	45
3.4. <i>CONCLUSION</i>	73
CHAPTER FOUR: THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF <i>N'AIE PAS PEUR DE SAVOIR</i> (1999)	74
4.1. <i>BACKGROUND TO N'AIE PAS PEUR DE SAVOIR</i>	74
4.2. <i>MAIN THEMES IN N'AIE PAS PEUR DE SAVOIR</i>	76
4.2.1. <i>Betrayal</i>	76
4.2.2. <i>Betrayal by France</i>	76
4.2.3. <i>Betrayal by the international community</i>	82
4.2.4. <i>Betrayal by Faith-based Organisations</i>	88
4.2.5. <i>Betrayal between friends</i>	90
4.2.6. <i>Psychological Trauma</i>	93
4.2.7. <i>Hope in the future</i>	100
4.2.8. <i>Extremism</i>	104
4.3. <i>CONCLUSION</i>	109
CHAPTER FIVE: THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF <i>LES BLESSURES DU SILENCE</i> (2001).....	110
5.1. <i>BACKGROUND TO LES BLESSURES DU SILENCE</i>	110
5.2. <i>MAIN THEMES IN LES BLESSURES DU SILENCE</i>	113
5.2.1. <i>Interaction with the past</i>	113

5.2.2. Unspeakability of genocide	116
5.2.3. Looting	119
5.2.4. Organisation and Preparation of the 1994 genocide	124
5.2.5. Betrayal	132
5.2.6. Resistance	139
5.2.7. Rape	143
5.2.8. Justice and reconciliation	152
5.2.9. Guilt, Remorse, and Repentance	157
5.2.10. Denial	166
5.2.11. Despair	170
5.2.12. Trauma	173
5.3. CONCLUSION	177
CHAPTER SIX: THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF SHAKE HANDS WITH THE DEVIL: THE FAILURE OF HUMANITY IN RWANDA (2003)	178
6.1. INTRODUCTION	178
6.2. THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF SHAKE HANDS WITH THE DEVIL: THE FAILURE OF HUMANITY IN RWANDA	180
6.2.1. Betrayal	180
6.2.2. Failure	196
6.2.3. Naivety	202
6.2.4. Indifference	209
6.2.5. Hatred	218
6.2.6. Inhumanity and evil	222
6.3.	226
CHAPTER SEVEN: GENERAL CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	232
BIBLIOGRAPHY	237

ACRONYMS

APC	: Armoured Personnel Carrier
APROSOMA	: Association pour la Promotion Sociale de la Masse/ Association for the Social Promotion of the Masses
CDR	: Coalition pour la Défense de la République/Coalition for the Defence of the Republic
CHUK	: Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Kigali/University Teaching Hospital of Kigali
CNBC	: Consumer News and Business Channel
CND	: Conseil National de Développement, now known as the Chamber of Deputies, Rwanda’s parliament building
DMZ	: Demilitarised Zone
DPKO	: Department of Peacekeeping Operations
FAR	: Forces Armées Rwandaises/Rwandan Armed Forces
FPR/RPF	: Front Patriotique Rwandais/Rwandan Patriotic Front
ICC	: International Criminal Court
JDR	: Jeunes Démocrates Républicains du MDR/Democratic Republican Youth
MDR	: Mouvement Démocratique Républicain/Republican Democratic Movement
MDR PARMEHUTU	: Mouvement Démocratique Républicain-Parti pour l’Emancipation Hutu/ Republican Democratic Movement- Party for Hutu Emancipation
MILOB	: Military Observer

UNAMIR	: United Nations Assistance Mission to Rwanda
MRND	: Mouvement Révolutionnaire National pour le Développement/National Revolutionary Movement for Development
RD CONGO	: République Démocratique du Congo/Democratic Republic of the Congo
RGF/RGF	: Rwandan Government Forces/Rwandan Defence Forces
RPA	: Rwandan Patriotic Army
SRSR	: Special Representative of the Secretary-General
UNAMID	: African Union-United Nations Mission in Darfur
ONU/UN	: Organisation des Nations Unies/United Nations
UNMO	: United Nations Military Observer
PDC	: Parti Démocrate Chrétien/Christian Democratic Party
PL	: Parti Libéral/Liberal Party
PSD	: Parti Social Démocrate/Social Democratic Party
RTL	: Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines
TV	: Television
UK	: United Kingdom
USA	: United States of America
UNSC	: United Nations Security Council

ABSTRACT

This PhD thesis, *Uniqueness of Genocide Testimonies: Textual and Thematic Analysis*, is a thematic discourse analysis of testimonies of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi in Rwanda. It seeks to analyse main themes that are discussed in four written testimonies on the genocide against Tutsi. Yolande Mukagasana, a survivor of genocide, wrote three of them: *La mort ne veut pas de moi/ Death does not want me* (1997), *N'aie pas peur de savoir/Don't be afraid to know* (1999), and *Les blessures du silence/The Wounds of Silence* (2001). The fourth one, *Shake hands with the devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda* (2003), was written by the Canadian Retired Lieutenant-General Roméo Dallaire, the Commander of the United Nations Assistance Mission to Rwanda (UNAMIR) during the 1994 genocide against Tutsi in Rwanda.

To deeply analyse all themes that are in the above four testimonies, this study used three approaches: socio-political approach, axiological or argumentative dimension and a comparison of themes with each other in order to show similarities and differences in the four testimonies.

The thematic analysis of the above four testimonies helps the audience to easily understand genocide testimonies that are normally not easy to comprehend as they are dealing with unfamiliar stories to the minds of human beings. Selected examples from the testimonies based on their importance vis-à-vis the aim of this PhD research and their accompanying detailed explanations make the audience consider what is unspeakable more expressible.

The results of this study provide a valuable contribution to the study of testimonies in Rwanda of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. It ends by proposing recommendations on how the change of the paradigm on the new leadership of the after 1994 genocide gives hope for the never again to genocide.

Key words: *1994 Genocide against Tutsi, Testimonies, Textual analysis, Thematic analysis, History of Genocide.*

DECLARATION

I declare that *Uniqueness of Genocide Testimonies: Textual and Thematic Analysis* is my own work, that it has not been submitted for any degree or examination in any other university, and that all the sources I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by complete references.

VINCENT NTAGANIRA

December 12th, 2018

SIGNED:

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Without the contribution of different people and various institutions, this PhD project would not have been materialised. At its completion, I would like to deeply thank all of them.

Firstly, I wish to thank the leadership of the University of Rwanda for having approved my PhD project and facilitated my studies. I also thank the leadership of the Prime Minister's Office that I joined in 2012, almost three years after starting my PhD studies that encouraged me to complete my project. Special thanks to the Government of Rwanda, through the Rwanda Education Board, for having accepted to pay all of my PhD research fees, air tickets, and living fees each time I was in need of meeting my Montreal University-based supervisor, Professor Josias Semujanga.

Secondly, I would like to express special thanks to Professor Josias Semujanga, my knowledgeable and ever available supervisor. Without his meticulous and helpful critical comments, I could not finish this PhD thesis. Equally important, I thank Dr. Augustin Rudacogora, the Director of studies and the exceptional co-supervisor of this research, and Professor Déo Byanafashe who was as well the excellent co-supervisor. Thank you so much for your usual encouragement. I owe you all many debts of gratitude.

Thirdly, I wish to thank the library staff at the University of Rwanda, College of Arts and Social Sciences, those of Kigali Public Library and those of the Rwandan National Commission for the Fight against Genocide, for their continuous and friendly assistance.

Fourthly, I would like to thank Yolande Mukagasana for having accepted to discuss with me about her testimonies. Her explanations gave me additional insights that cannot be found elsewhere. I will not forget how she willingly accepted to lend me a copy of her *Les blessures du silence* that I could not find

VIII

in all libraries and bookshops that I had visited at the time of writing this PhD dissertation.

Fifthly, I would like to sincerely thank my friends and colleagues Professor Beth Kaplin, Dr. Pierre Canisius Ruterana and Emmanuel Nzaramba who willingly accepted to proofread the manuscript of my PhD dissertation. Your brilliant observations have helped me to make smarter this project. I owe you many debts.

Finally, I am exceptionally thankful to my wife, Josiane Umwali, and my four children Elvira, Elvis, Elvaron, and Elvan, for their patience during my long absence at home when writing this thesis: with love, I dedicate this thesis to you.

CHAPTER ONE: GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1. Rationale

Testifying one's experience of horror is not an easy task. When the horror reaches the level of genocide, it even becomes more complicated. This is because these testimonies deal with unfamiliar stories to the minds of both their authors and their audience/readers. Because of this nature of genocide testimonies, according to Elie Wiesel (2006:x), "*survivors of genocide have often agreed that words cannot convey the horrors they witnessed and that language is sometimes seen as an obstacle in their attempts at telling [their testimonies]*".

Indeed, genocide testimonies are unutterably presented. An unutterable presentation is used as a means of telling stories, which go beyond the most horrific configurations of human imagination. The latter, as for witnesses, are revelations of unhappy and traumatic experiences (Waintraiter, 2003; Caruth, 1996). A discursive position of a witness from which the unutterable is added to this moral position related to the unbearable nature of massacres. Such expressed nature allows distinguishing an unutterable testimony as a witness' stand, which is willingly oriented to the proximity of events. This also allows considering the testimony of the third witness, which is in general analysed as the heroic one.

The situation described above is at the heart of the study at hand. This research is a thematic analysis of selected testimonies of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi in Rwanda. It goes beyond the usual analysis of testimonies and seeks to understand themes implied in four well written but less studied testimonial thematic discourses of genocide and mass killings. Indeed, in all readings that I have carried out, I have noticed that there is no single critic who has carried out a thematic and comparative analysis of the four testimonies that this study is dealing with.

It has to be pointed out that though this study is dealing with themes, it goes beyond the thematic analysis. Indeed, as Parker (2005:99) points out, whereas

a “*thematic analysis must assume that certain words and phrases really mean the same thing in a close enough way for them to be grouped together; a discourse analysis, on the other hand, is concerned with how words and phrases are linked at the level of discourse*”.

This PhD thesis will break new grounds in thematic analysis of genocide testimonies in Rwanda. It will bridge gaps that were still hindering the understanding and telling of genocide testimonies.

1.2. The corpus

The four written testimonies to be analysed include three of Yolande Mukagasana, *La mort ne veut pas de moi* (1997), *N'aie pas peur de savoir* (1999), and *Les blessures du silence* (2001), and the one of the Retired Lieutenant-General Roméo Dallaire, *Shake hands with the devil: The failure of humanity in Rwanda* (2003).

There is a strong reason that pushed me to analyse Mukagasana and Dallaire's testimonies, among so many testimonies on the genocide against Tutsi such as those written by:

- Esther Mujawayo, *La fleur de Stéphanie: Rwanda entre réconciliation et déni*, 2006 and *Survivantes: Rwanda, Dix Ans Après Le Génocide*, 2004;
- Scolastique Mukasonga, *La femme aux pieds nus*, 2008 and *Inyenzi ou les Cafards*, 2006;
- Immaculée Ilibagiza, *Left to Tell: One Woman's Story of Surviving the Rwandan Holocaust*, 2006;
- Révérien Rurangwa, *Génocidé*, 2006;
- Jean-Marie Vianney Rurangwa, *Le Génocide des Tutsi expliqué à un étranger*, 2000;
- Marie-Aimable Umurerwa, *Comme la langue entre les dents: Fratricide et piège d'identité au Rwanda*, 2000;
- Annick Kayitesi, *Nous existons encore*, 2004;

- Marie-Béatrice Umutesi, *Fuir ou mourir au Zaïre. Le vécu d'une Réfugiée*, 2000;
- Pauline Kayitare, *Tu leur diras que tu es hutue: À 13 ans, une tutsie au coeur du génocide rwandais*, 2001;
- Vénuste Kayimahe, *France-Rwanda, les coulisses du génocide: témoignage d'un rescapé*, 2002;
- Edouard Kayihura, *The hotel Rwanda; The Surprising True Story ... and Why It Matters Today*, 2014;
- and the recent one by Edouard Bamporiki, *My Son, It Is A Long Story: Reflections of Genocide Perpetrators*, 2017.

The three testimonies of Yolande offer a complete understanding of what both survivors of genocide of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi experienced. They go further and reveal the experience of genocide perpetrators. I argue that this is unique and explain that this uniqueness is not found in so many testimonies.

The testimony of Roméo Dallaire is presented in contrast to the testimony of Yolande Mukagasana. It is considered as a heroic testimony that mainly describes how Dallaire and his few remaining African-UN soldiers managed to save some innocent people.

A deep thematic analysis of the four testimonies demonstrates similarities and differences. This is also applicable to other testimonies or works of fiction of various authors on genocide. Semujanga (2016:8) explains it well in his new book: *Narrating Itsembabwoko: When Literature Becomes Testimony of Genocide*. He says that they both “intended to preserve the reality, the corporal traces of the horror sown everywhere in Rwanda by the army, the police, the politicians, and the ordinary citizens and neighbours of the victims”.

Though the four testimonies that are being analysed have similarities and differences, it is not always easy to understand them. Faced with such conflicting and diverging notions, which may necessitate justifications and

proofs, it is necessary to conduct a research that will help readers of testimonies to easily understand the sufferings of survivors.

1.3. Methodology

This PhD project is a thematic analysis of four testimonies that are under study. It seeks to analyse the main themes. As Seigneuret (1998: xix) points out, *“a theme consists of ideas that emerge from the particular structure of textual elements such as action, observations revealing states of mind, feelings, or gestures”*. It is usually not written explicitly or directly, rather it is developed through the plot and actions and attitudes of the characters (as well as of the author).

Furthermore, thematic analysis, according to Greg (2012:93) is:

The most common form of analysis in qualitative research... It is performed through the process of coding in six phases to create established, meaningful patterns. These phases are: familiarization with data, generating initial codes, searching for themes among codes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the final report.

Depending on size, a written work or an oral message may have one or several themes. It is therefore necessary to understand what themes are and how one identifies them. As an example, short stories due to their limited length, usually deal with one or two central ideas. Novels, on the other hand, may have several themes. As far as oral messages are concerned, when they are short, they deal with one theme; when long, they may contain many themes. However, a short written or oral message may sometimes tackle more than one theme.

The main objective of any thematic analysis is to understand what the author intended to speak about when delivering his/her message to his/her audience, either in a written or oral form. According to Braun and Clarke (2006:63), a thematic analysis needs to be grounded in the data but also go some way

beyond the surface level of the data generating an understanding of what is going on in the data:

Thematic analysis produces knowledge that makes the form of themes, built up from descriptive codes, which capture and make sense of the meanings, which characterise the phenomenon under investigation. As the phenomenon under investigation can vary widely between studies, the themes identified on the basis of a thematic analysis can represent anything from research participants' perceptions of something, to the ways the media represent an event.

In order to have a good thematic analysis, literary critics must combine theoretical knowledge and understanding to support a deep analysis of the content of the data to be analysed. They must also be able to systematically become more creative in thematizing and interpreting data. With this in mind, in order to better understand all the main themes that are at work in the testimonies of Mukagasana and Dallaire, I have decided to use three methods.

Firstly, I will use the socio-political approach. This approach will help me to understand the socio-political lives of Rwandans around the time when the genocide took place and previous historical actions that led to that genocide. This will offer more insights into the understanding of people who are found in the testimonies and their experience (Lewis, 1987; Jeppie & Soudien, 1990).

Secondly, I will use the axiological or argumentative dimension. As Semujanga (2006:15) says, this *dimension* "is an argumentative level, which governs and shapes the enunciated values in the work". The axiological/argumentative dimension will enable me to evaluate the actions of both the authors of the four testimonies that are under study in this PhD research and those of characters.

Finally, I will use a comparative research methodology. It will help me compare the themes with each other in order to show similarities and differences in the four testimonies. It is this approach that will for example help me to identify that themes that are discussed in Mukagasana's part one of *N'aie pas peur de*

savoir and those that are at work in her *La mort ne veut pas de moi* are the same.

1.4. A socio-political history of Rwanda and the genocide against Tutsi

Rwanda is a land-locked country of 26,338 square km² with a population of closed to 11,809,295 (National Institute of Statistics) (*when?*). It is located in the heart of Africa. Burundi to the South, Tanzania to the East, Uganda to the North and the Democratic Republic of Congo to the West surround Rwanda. As a nation, the country has a long history of more than 1,000 years. However, as it is the case for many African countries, it has to be pointed out that Rwanda did not have a written history before the XIX century. In that period, historians only relied on oral literature.

The absence of written materials as mentioned in *Histoire du Rwanda: Des origines à la fin du XXe siècle* (Byanafashe, Déo. et al, 2001:23) was until 1960 a handicap to the Rwandan historiography that erroneously considered the Rwanda of before 1900 as a society without history

The Rwandan written history started in 1900, with the arrival of missionaries and explorers like Von Götzen, Richard Kandt, Oscar Baumann and John Hanning Speke. White missionaries like Paulin Loupias (1907), Guy Pagès (1933), Patrik Schumacher (1943), Léon Delmas (1950) and Canon Louis de Lacger (1939) are some of those missionaries who listened to different Rwandan traditional histories and put them in writing. One cannot forget to mention the role of Alexis Kagame, the Rwandan philosopher, linguist, historian, and poet in writing the Rwandan history. However, these early written histories were not very critical. Most of the times, as pointed out in *Histoire du Rwanda: Des origines à la fin du XXe siècle*, “they valued them as people value written story” (Byanafashe, Déo. et al, 2001: 26).

Rwanda is the fruit of a joint project of all its ancestors. The latter created it through their chosen institutions such as *Ubwami*/Monarchy, *Ubwiru*/Constitution, *Ubusizi*/Press, *Ingabo*/Army, and *Ubucengeri*/

Patriotism. These institutions ensured unity, stability, and cohesion before colonisation.

Unlike many countries in the region and mostly on the entire African continent, Rwanda is a nation-state that is composed of one people, Rwandans. These Rwandans speak the same language, Kinyarwanda, and share the same religion, clan systems that are divided into three main social classes/groups, Hutu, Twa, and Tutsi. Rwandans, as Byanafashe D. et al. (2011:26) say also “*share the same culture, myths, and values*”. Des Forges A. (1999:30) clearly describes the above as follows: “*Hutu and Tutsi [and Twa] developed a single and highly sophisticated language, Kinyarwanda, crafted a common set of religious and philosophical beliefs, and created a culture which valued song, dance, poetry, and rhetoric*”.

For many years, Rwanda was a centralized monarchy under the leadership of a succession of kings from Abanyiginya clan who ruled through categories of chiefs like cattle chiefs, land chiefs and military chiefs. The king was the supreme authority who ensured that all Rwandans were in mutual harmony. Alexis Kagame (1945:45) described it when he said that “*The Mwami (king) was traditionally recognized as the incarnation of the deity, the god who cares for humans, god the distributor of benefits, the elected one who does not interfere with the nobility*”. Other writers such as Gonidec and De Lacger (1971:37) described the king as the absolute ruler, the father and the patriarch of his people. Gonidec in pointed out that:

...the absolute ruler of the country and the sole owner of land and livestock, as recorded in a semi-pastoral poem “*Ibirahu*”. The belief in the existence of a charismatic power accounts for interdiction to preserve that power, and the fear inspired by the royal person.

De Lacger (1971:117) described the king as:

...the father and the patriarch of his people, given to them by *Imana* (God). He is the providence of Rwanda, the Messiah and the saviour. When he exercises his authority, he is impeccable, infallible. His decisions cannot be questioned. They [Rwandans]

trust him, because his judgments are always just. Whatever happens, he remains *Nyagasani*, the only Lord, superb and magnificent.

Rwandans continued to cohabitate under the leadership of their kings and other leaders until the beginning of the colonial period when their unity was destroyed by ethnicity and use of tribal divisions. The latter were created by colonialism. All followed the 1885 negotiations between the European powers at the Conference of Berlin. During these negotiations, Rwanda was given to the Germans as part of their empire. From 1879, Rwanda was incorporated into the German East Africa. It then became a German colony of East Africa under the system of indirect rule. However, German rule did not last long.

In 1916, after Germans were defeated in the World War I, Rwanda was occupied by the Belgian troops. It was then handed over to Belgium under the Treaty of Versailles. In 1923, the League of Nations formally gave a mandate over Burundi and Rwanda. Between 1926 and 1933, as Jha (2003:26-27) puts it, Belgians implemented major administrative reforms, in the same spirit of “divide and rule” as *(the)* Germans. Their strategy was based on building alliances with some Tutsi families who had power as a means of using them in their own interests. This can be illustrated in the 1920’s statement of Pierre Ryckmans (1931:153) when he erroneously said: *“The Batutsi were meant to reign. Their fine presence is in itself enough to give them a great prestige vis-à-vis the inferior races [other Rwandans] surrounding them”*.

The Belgian administration introduced policies based on ethnic identities, which replaced the Rwandan’s traditional socio-economic stratification. The latter was based on ownership of cattle, land or people’s profession. In 1933 Belgians introduced identity cards on which designation of Hutu, Tutsi or Twa was mandatory.

With this destructive policy of dividing Rwandans, White Missionaries who then in Rwanda supported colonizers. As an example, before and after 1926, Bishop Léo Classe stated: “Tutsi are different from Hutu and have a unique origin.

They are born leaders, with leadership skills, which Hutu do not have; hence, endowed with the potential to expand the Gospel” (Kalibwami, 1991:26).

He went on and advised the Belgian administration that it was absolutely necessary for them to take charge of young Tutsi:

If we want to consider the practical point of view, and seek the true interest of the country, we have in Tutsi young people an incomparable element for progress, which all those who know Rwanda cannot underestimate... [T]hese young are a force for good and the economic future of the countryWe believe from our experience that the Mututsi element is [a] better one for us; it is the more active, the more convinced, the more capable of playing a fermenting role among the masses (Kalibwami, 1991:142-143).

Bishop Léon Classe as Kalibwami (1991:177) explains, went on in his instructions to Fathers in charge of schools/education and told them:

Education of the Bahutu is necessary to train catechists, schoolmasters and tutors, and in order to instruct and train youth in general...Schooling for the Batutsi, here, must take precedence over schooling for the Bahutu. The Father in charge of schools must set his heart on the development of this schooling.

In short, to Bishop Léon Classe, to many missionaries and Belgian colonizers of his time, the small Tutsi group in power was seen as a driving force of material evolution, and a condition of the success of Christianity. These ideas are similar to the content of the letter that the French Cardinal Lavigerie wrote to the White Fathers in 1900. In his letter, he claimed that Tutsi have innate abilities to facilitate the spread of the word of God and it was quite imperative for the Catholic Church to work with them in order to effectively and efficiently preach the Gospel: *“Princes have received their own power to make the kingdom of God triumphant on earth. It will be therefore necessary to assure collaboration, which will be an indispensable means for the diffusion of the Gospel”* (Kalibwami, 1991:177).

In the decade that began in 1950 some of the members of the Catholic Church shifted their approach and started to support Hutu in challenging the Tutsi

authority that they had themselves promoted. As an example, Kalibwami cites Bishop Perraudin, a Swiss, who emphasized, in his Lent letter, written on 11th February 1958 that “the Hutu should liberate themselves from the power of the Tutsi, and that they should enjoy the privileges of their Country since they are the majority” (Kalibwami, 1991:368). Given the role of the Catholic Church in the social-political and economic life of Rwandans in that period, one should not doubt the implementation of the above statement from Bishop Perraudin. Indeed, as Melvern (2000:20) points out,

The links between Church and state were close because the Hutu nationalists [They were rather segregationists] were part of a small elite educated at Catholic schools. President Grégoire Kayibanda was linked closely with Monsignor André Perraudin, a Swiss Catholic, who arrived in Rwanda in 1950...He became the archbishop of Kabgayi and Kigali and the leader of the Catholic Church in Rwanda in November 1959... The Church has financed a bi-monthly newsletter, the *Kinyamateka*, with Kayibanda for some years as its editor-in-chief.

Belgian colonizers also followed the above line. It is in this context that in 1957, the Belgian colonisers together with the Catholic Church helped certain Hutu elites to start the campaign that aimed at calling for an end of what they were naming the oppression of the Hutu by the Tutsi. Their demands were compiled in what was known as the “Hutu Manifesto”¹.

According to Byanafashe et al. (2011:391), this “*Manifesto was a declaration outlining the social aspects of the indigenous racial problem and “was used as a mobilization tool by some extremist Hutu leaders whose political speeches fuelled hatred against Tutsi”*”.

Coming back to how Hutu extremists fuelled division between Hutu and Tutsi, one cannot forget to mention the role of Joseph Habyarimana alias Gitera, President of the APROSOMA political party and also Speaker of the National

¹ The exact title as pointed out by Josias Semujanga in his *Narrating Itsembabwoko: When Literature Becomes Testimony of Genocide* is *Notes sur l’aspect social du problème racial indigène au Ruanda. Le Manifeste des Bahutu*. The document was published as a public open letter to the colonial authorities on March 24, 1957.

Assembly of the First Republic. He is the one who drafted the “Hutu Ten Commandments” in which he declared that a relationship between Hutu and Tutsi was impossible. His ten commandments were used to fuel hatred against Tutsi.

In a script of his speech in a meeting of APROSOMA in Ngoma sector of Huye District, on 27 September 1959, he said:

Comrades gathered here today, we cannot have time to talk about everything! Fight against these crooks; get rid of Tutsi oppression in every possible way. The relationship between Tutsi and Hutu is a deep wound on a leg, a leech on your body, and the pain of pneumonia in your rib (Archives of Radio Rwanda).

The Hutu extremists started to implement what was preached in the Hutu Manifesto on 1st November 1959 under what was termed “The Hutu Revolution”. The rise of this revolution coincided with the country’s independence on July 1st, 1962. During this period, as Jha (2003:27) points out, *“There was a civil strife which led to many refugees moving out of the country in hundreds of thousands and tens of thousands of people being killed. Genocide started approximately at that time”*. Some of the Tutsi who survived those organised killings sought refuge in the neighbouring countries of Burundi, Uganda, Tanganyika (now Tanzania), and the Belgian Congo (now Democratic Republic of the Congo). For those who remained in Rwanda, some experienced persecution and internal deportations like those who were deported to Nyamata (Bugesera District) and Rukumberi (Ngoma District).

When, in 1961, some Tutsi tried to come back to their native country by use of force, in what was referred to as the “Inyenzi” (cockroaches) invasion, Grégoire Kayibanda, one of the founders of MDR Parmehutu, and the President of the First Republic, in one of his speeches on April 11th, 1964 1963 stated the following:

Are the Tutsi who remain in the country and who are afraid of popular fury caused by your incursions happy with your behaviour? Let’s talk about your future and your children, we urge

you to think about these innocent people who can still be easily saved from the decline into which you are driving your ethnic group. In particular, we repeat to you Tutsi: your family imposes duties on you.... Supposing you succeed in doing the impossible in assaulting and taking Kigali, how do you measure the chaos for which you would be the first victims? I am not going to waste my time on this, I hope you understand what I mean, something bad would happen to you and you would end up regretting it. It should be obvious to you that what will follow is that all the Tutsi would be killed (*Archives of Radio Rwanda*).

On July 5th, 1973, Major General Juvénal Habyarimana, in a military coup, overthrew the regime of the then President Grégoire Kayibanda. General Habyarimana accused President Kayibanda of failing to take adequate steps to end tribal and regional conflicts in Rwanda. Habyarimana ruled the country for two decades, from 1973 to 1994 when he was killed in an airplane crash, which is discussed later in this work. After taking power, Habyarimana suspended MDR Parmehutu and was officially banned two years. It was replaced by a one-party state under Habyarimana's new National Revolutionary Movement for Development (MRND), which was dominated by Hutu from the western and northern parts of the country.

However, the regime of Habyarimana kept the ideological heritage of MDR Parmehutu. The following extract from his public speeches of November 15th, 1992 illustrates his extremism against Tutsi:

... [T]he Tutsi ruled Rwanda using lies, which said that they arrived in Rwanda from the sky or that they carried seed from their birth. Such assertions created further divisions among Rwandans. The revolution of 1959 had led to the decision that the Hutu should rule over Rwanda because of their majority. These Tutsi who tease Hutu do not know that if violence reoccurs, it would be them who would suffer (*Archives of Radio Rwanda*).

When RPF-Inkotanyi launched the liberation war on 1st October 1990, the regime of President Juvénal Habyariman arrested and jailed about 10,000 Tutsi inside Rwanda, and others were mistreated. They were all allegedly accused of being Inkotanyi accomplices. Between 1990 and 1994,

Habyarimana's regime did everything possible to ensure that Rwandans inside the country and the whole international community consider the RPF-Inkotanyi liberation war as an ethnic clash between Hutu and Tutsi.

In an interview that President Habyarimana held with *Le Soir*, a Belgian newspaper (quoted in Byanafashe et al. 2011:473) on 4th October 1990, in which he declared that Rwanda was filled like a glass full of water and that any additional drop would make the water overflow is another indicator of his negative stand against Tutsi:

We simply have no room to accommodate them. There is a need (...) to remove the label of refugees and allow them to acquire Ugandan or Zairian citizenship. They could then be allowed to come to the country for limited periods on vacation to meet their families.

Instead of accepting to negotiate a peaceful return of Tutsi who were in exile, President Habyarimana continued to insist that Rwanda was too small to accommodate them. His proposal was to request countries that had hosted them to continue to give them asylum. This policy was unjust and did not acknowledge the fact that these refugees were equally Rwandan as the individuals living in Rwanda.

Under the regime of Habyarimana, not only Tutsi were subjected to various forms of injustices but also some Hutu of the South and East were affected. People from the former Gisenyi Prefecture where Habyarimana was from, including those from Ruhengeri and Kigali Prefectures were benefiting more. They were taking the lion's share of the Government's key jobs, places in schools and other advantages that under normal circumstances should be equally shared between all citizens.

The following example is a good illustration picked from Kinyamateka Newspaper of May 1991:9):

During the period from 1978 to 1990, three prefectures (Gisenyi, Ruhengeri and Kigali) had received over 51% of the total budget

allocated to prefectures against less than 25% for the four prefectures of Gikongoro, Kibuye, Cyangugu and Kibungo. Gisenyi prefecture, and to a lesser extent the prefecture of Ruhengeri, had monopolized positions of responsibility in both public and private administrations. In public enterprises, residents of these two prefectures occupied more than 50% of managerial and senior positions. Diplomatic posts and access to regional and international organizations were also areas reserved for these two prefectures.

Another example is in the education sector by Funga (1992:49): “*The Prefecture of Gisenyi whose citizens represented 9.7% of the Rwandan population secured 15.61% of available places in secondary education*”. This led him to effectively conclude by saying that, “*the so-called policy of balance mainly aimed at the control of access to power by access to knowledge*” (Funga, 1992:49).

At the level of higher and university education, as per the 1986-1987 annual statistics that were published by the Government of Rwanda, “*students from Ruhengeri and Gisenyi whose population was 11.08% and 9.76% of the population respectively were given 13.7% and 12.3% of the school places each*” (Funga 1992:49). This was against the principles of the regional balance policy put into force in Rwanda of that time.

In higher education, regarding scholarships for study in foreign countries, the situation was even worse. The students with government scholarships from Gisenyi and Ruhengeri Prefectures alone totalled more than 39.2%, with 23.2% for Gisenyi and Ruhengeri 16%. This indicates an overrepresentation of these two Prefectures and severe discrimination in education.

A summary of the discriminatory policy of ethnic and regional balance that characterised the regime of President Juvénal Habyarimana was well described by André Guichaoua (1995:261):

The Habyarimana regime had institutionalized ethnicity and regionalism through an ostensible policy of ethnic and regional balance, which in fact excluded members of the Tutsi ethnic group and people of the central and southern regions from power, especially in education ...

It is the above politics of hate against Tutsi that motivated Hutu leaders of that time to consistently treat Tutsi as enemies of the country who had to be killed or chased out of the country. This is reflected in a 22nd November, 1992 speech of Dr. Léon Mugesera (Archives of Radio Rwanda), who was the Vice President of the National Revolutionary Movement for Development (MRND), when attending a meeting of MRND in Ngororero, Gisenyi Prefecture:

I am telling the truth, just like it is written in the gospel, if you let a snake bite you, and let it stay on you, you will be the one who suffers. Recently, I told someone who came to brag to me that he belonged to the PL. I told him, the mistake we made in 1959, although I was still a child was to let you leave. I asked him if he had not heard of the story of the Falashas, who returned home from Ethiopia to Israel. He replied that he knew nothing about it! I told him, you don't read nor listen? I am telling you that your home is in Ethiopia and that we will send you back through the River Nyabarongo so that you can get there quickly.

The Habyarimana regime continued to use many ways to try to defeat RPF-Inkotanyi. One of them as Alain Destexhe (1995: Viii) says was the hate media through written newspapers like Kangura and the notorious Radio Television Station commonly known as RTLM:

RTLM set up by associates of President Juvénal Habyarimana in 1993, began broadcasting terrible messages of hate such as “the grave is only half full. Who will help us fill it? After the genocide began in 1994, RTLM announced: “By May, the country must be completely cleansed of Tutsi”. It helped to convince Hutu peasants that they were under threat and urged them to make the Tutsi smaller by decapitating them.

All the actions that were undertaken by the Habyarimana regime between 1 October 1990 and 6 April 1994 aimed at refusing to negotiate with RPF. However, when RPF-Inkotanyi started to show its military superiority to the army of the then government and occupy some territories in the Northern part of Rwanda together with the mounting internal pressure from political parties in opposition against the regime of President Juvénal Habyarimana, the latter finally agreed to negotiate with RPF-Inkotanyi. After different high level negotiations that were held respectively at Mwanza, the United Republic of

Tanzania, on 17 October 1990, in Gbadolite, Republic of Zaire, on 26 October 1990, in Goma, Republic of Zaire, on 20 November 1990, in Zanzibar, United Republic of Tanzania, on 17th February 1991, March 29th, 1991, in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) in N'sele and finally, serious political negotiations to end the conflict and in Dar es Salaam, United Republic of Tanzania, on 19th February 1991, the Peace Agreement was signed in Arusha, on 3rd August 1993.

In this Arusha Peace Agreement, the Government of Rwanda had to have twenty-one Ministers shared between political parties as follows:

- a) *Mouvement Révolutionnaire National pour le Développement*/National Revolutionary Movement for Development (MRND), the formal ruling party was given five Ministries, including the Ministry of Defence.
- b) Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF Inkotanyi) was also given five seats in Cabinet including the portfolio of the Interior and the role of Vice-Prime Minister.
- c) *Mouvement Démocratique Républicain-Parti pour l'Emancipation Hutu*/Republican Democratic Movement- major opposition party (MDR) was given four posts, including the one of the Office of Prime Minister.
- d) *Parti Social Démocrate*/Social Democratic Party (PSD) was given three portfolios.
- e) *Parti Libéral*/Liberal Party (PL) received three portfolios.
- f) *Parti Démocrate Chrétien*/Christian Democratic Party (PDC) was given one portfolio.
- g) The Rwandan Patriotic Front was granted participation in the National Assembly.

- h) The Agreement also provided for establishment of an army composed of sixty percent government troops and forty percent from the Rwandan Patriotic Front with 50% for both RPF and the FAR in command posts.
- i) It also provided for the establishment of a Transitional National Assembly that was to be composed of seventy members called “Deputies to the Transitional National Assembly”. The “Deputies” had to be appointed by their own political parties and their mandate would cover the whole Transitional Period. The Transitional National Assembly would make its own rules of procedure. According to article 62 of Arusha Peace Agreement, the numerical distribution of seats in the Transitional National Assembly among the political parties was as follows:
- a) MRND: 11 seats;
 - b) RPF: 11 seats;
 - c) MDR: 11 seats;
 - d) PSD: 11 seats;
 - e) PL: 11 seats;
 - f) PDC: 4 seats;
 - g) The other registered parties shall have one (1) seat each.

After signing the Arusha Peace Agreement, some Hutu extremists stated that that they did not believe in or agree with the Agreement that was signed. According to Melvern (2000:62-63) in July 1992,

[A]n extraordinary series of secret reports were written by Nsengiyumva and sent to both the army command and President Habyarimana warning of dire consequences should RPF, or as he sometimes writes, “Cockroaches” be allowed to share power [...] The President was advised that he should only pretend to be enthusiastic for the process towards democracy.

Opposition to the implementation of the Arusha Peace Agreement did not start after it was signed. It started during negotiations. Meredith (2006:500) confirms it:

At one point during negotiations, [Col. Théoneste] Bagosora, a fervent anti-Tutsi, had packed his gags. [Patrick] Mazimpaka [The former vice-president of the RPF who participated in the negotiations in Arusha] saw him standing in a hotel lift

surrounded by suitcases and asked why he was leaving. Bagosora said he was going back to Rwanda to prepare “apocalypse deux”, the second apocalypse.

What Bagosora called “the second apocalypse” was the extermination of Tutsi in Rwanda. President Habyarimana followed the advice from the Hutu extremists. The following extract of his speech during a meeting of his political party, MRND, in Ruhengeri on November 15th, 1992 is a good illustration:

One should not go around pretending that because they signed a piece of paper they are bringing peace. Is peace a piece of paper? In my opinion, the campaigns haven’t even started. When they do start, I will call on the *Interahamwe* [The youth of MRND meaning those fighting together or “the solidarity”] and we will certainly reach out to all corners of the Country (Archives of Radio Rwanda).

The above quotation of President Habyarimana is not different from the one of Jean Bosco Barayagwiza, one of the key founders of the Coalition pour la Défense de la République/Coalition for the Defence of the Republic (CDR), a political party of Hutu extremists, and the RTLM radio station. In a political rally at Nyamirambo Stadium on November 7th, 1993, Barayagwiza said the following: “*No one can accept to be ruled by the Inyenzi-Inkotanyi! ... after we overthrow this government, we will put in place a good government that will advocate for the interests of the Hutu, who are the majority...*” (Archives of Radio Rwanda).

What Habyarimana, Barayagwiza and Bagosora said is not different from the October 23rd, 1993 statement of Edouard Karamira, the then Vice President of MDR political party:

We clearly specified what you have to avoid. Don’t fight your fellow Hutu. We have been attacked we should not attack ourselves. Let us fight off the enemy who wants to hijack our power... Hutu Power, MRND Power, CDR Power, MDR Power, *Interahamwe* Power, JDR Power, All Hutu, we are Power available (Archives of Radio Rwanda).

Though it was clear that Hutu extremists who were in the above political parties were not ready to support the Arusha Peace Agreement, they were not able to stop its signature. It was signed in Arusha, on 3rd August 1993.

On 28 December 1993, a battalion of six hundred RPF-Inkotanyi soldiers travelled to Kigali and camped in Rwanda's Parliament building, the then National Council for Development (CND). This battalion had a mission of protecting RPF leaders who had to represent RPF in the transitional government as it was stated in the Arusha Peace Agreement. As the RPF convoy entered the city, many Rwandans gave them a warm welcome. They cheered and showered the soldiers with flowers. Hutu extremists were not happy about it.

The transitional government was supposed to start on December 31st, 1993. Unfortunately, because of disagreements over who should serve as ministers or who should not, the government did not begin on that day. The main source of disagreement was the proposal of Hutu extremists to include the Coalition pour la Défense de la République/Coalition for the Defence of the Republic, commonly known as CDR, a Hutu extremist political party that was a satellite to MRND, in the transitional government. Former President, late Habyarimana as Michael Barnett (2002:75) mentions, CDR “...*was less of a threat inside than outside the government...The RPF and other liberal parties [MDR, PSD, PL, and PDC] stead; fastly seconded rejected its inclusion*”.

On 6th April 1994, President Habyarimana gave directives for the establishment of the transitional government to be put in place on Friday 8th April 1994. He then travelled to Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania, to attend a summit on the implementation progress of the Arusha Peace Agreement. He came back on the same day. On board he was with among others, the then Burundian President, Cyprien Ntaryamira, and the then Rwandan Army Chief of Staff, Major General Déogratias Nsabimana. At 8.23 P.M, when his plane, a Dassault Falcon 50, was about to land at Kigali International Airport, it was shot down. All the

people on board perished. Surprisingly, as Melvern (2000:115) describes it, “*In the strangest irony, the wreckage fell directly into the garden of the presidential palace nearby*”.

Immediately after the death of President Habyarimana, Augustin Bizimana who was the Minister of Defence issued a communiqué on his death and asked all Rwandans to remain at home until further notice. The genocide of Tutsi that was planned for a long time, as Melvern (2000:62) describes it, immediately started:

The drawing up of lists was an ongoing process and was organised immediately after the RPF Inkotanyi invasion of October 1990. Later, the army, gendarmerie and local authorities were given orders to prepare new lists or update the existing one. For the hardliners, the logic and the dynamic of the genocide must have been apparent, even then.

In addition to these lists, the Government of Habyarimana had trained and armed Hutu militias who had to kill Tutsi and Hutu who were against this plan. According to Melvern (2000:91-92), this training was an open secret to everybody including the United Nations:

In January [1994], Dallaire was told that *Interahamwe* were receiving military trainings. Then in 1994 someone, whose codename was Jean Pierre had been introduced to the intelligence network, and agreed to meet Colonel Luc Marchal only at night and alone. Jean Pierre had a most extraordinary story to tell. He was a former member of the presidential security guard, who had worked as a chauffeur and was now a senior trainer in the *Interahamwe*... The focus of the training was discipline, weapons, explosives, close combat and tactics. Up until now, Jean Pierre had supposed that the *Interahamwe* had been created in order to protect Kigali from RPF. But he said that since October [1993] he had been ordered to register all Tutsi in Kigali. He was now being trained to kill up to 1,000 people every twenty minutes. Jean Pierre said he could not support the killing of civilians. On Tuesday, 11 January 1994, Dallaire wrote a code-cable to New York to inform the Secretary General’s military advisor and fellow Canadian, Major General J. Maurice Baril, of the details of Jean Pierre’s claims (Melvern, 2000:91-92).

The above preparations helped Hutu extremists to initiate easily their long-planned systematic extermination of Tutsi and moderate Hutu who had refused to participate in the genocide plan. A series of roadblocks that were put in place immediately after the death of Habyarimana helped to identify those who had to be killed. Mass killings started countrywide on 7 April 1994. They were accelerated on 9 April 1994 after the swearing-in of the interim Government. This government was set up on 8 April 1994, in a meeting that was chaired by Colonel Bagosora. In that meeting, Théodore Sindikubwabo, the former Speaker of Parliament, was appointed as President of the Interim government, and Jean Kambanda as Interim Prime Minister. Members of this interim government were catalysts that continued to sensitize and facilitate the Hutu extremists in getting firearms that were used to kill Tutsi and moderate Hutu.

Jean Kambanda, the Prime Minister of the “*Abatabazi*”/ *Liberators*, the self-proclaimed interim government launched the distribution of firearms to civilians. Calling killers/génocidaires *Abatabazi*/liberators is what Josias Semujanga (2007:209) describes as “Tainting the language”. It is a propaganda that “reverses the meaning of the words and creates a new semantic context in which the words will eventually be false so that the only significance they have is as the ideology and the political lie”). The following extract of Kambanda’s speech in a meeting that he held on June 19, 1994 in Nyakabanda, Gitarama when he was launching the distribution of firearms to civilians gives more details:

The war we are fighting is yours. You have noticed how some people were evicted from their homes. Inkotanyi are not only yearning for power, they also want to eliminate you. You must have heard how people are fleeing from areas occupied by them such as Mutara, Bugesera, Kibungo, and Gitarama and those who don’t run are killed. You have to know how to defend yourselves. That is the reason why we are urging citizens to undergo military training. Don’t be afraid; if you hear a gunshot, don’t be scared. Guns are not only for soldiers; do not be scared when you see a gun. Do not think a gun can operate automatically. The guns are not strictly reserved for soldiers everyone can own it. And if

someone fires at you, you have to fire back since you will have your own gun. I also carry my own with me every time, here it is. Do you think that those Tutsi boys who joined RPF are stronger than you? Do you think they are smarter than you? The only advantage they have over you is that they have guns, and that they can scare you whenever they shoot. Get your own gun, learn how to use it, it is not that complicated. And whenever they shoot at you, you have to shoot back. Plus, since we are the majority we will defeat them. I can affirm that we will defeat them at all costs. That is why, like we have been promising you, we already have some guns for you, the citizens. Yesterday we received the first supply. We will give these guns to those who have been trained by the military. If we have more we will give them to the rest of the citizens, and they will have to learn how to use them. However, these additional guns are still on the way. That is the reason I can confirm that we will defeat them as I had predicted. The only advantage they had over us was the guns, and since we now have guns too we will fight them fearlessly. It is a matter of time, just ten days and you'll see. We had avoided giving ultimatum in the past because we didn't have guns. Now that we have arms and ammunitions, we are in a good position to issue ultimatum. We also want them to know that we are not running away anymore. I have been hearing on their radio some people saying that I keep fleeing. I want to inform them that I am returning to Kigali, and I am going to fight them from Kigali. I am not going anywhere else other than Kigali (Archives of Radio Rwanda).

The above hate campaign was earlier used by Théodore Sindikubwabo, President of the self-proclaimed government in a meeting that he held with the population of the former Ngoma Commune, now Huye District, on 19 April 1994 when he was sensitizing Hutu of the area who had not been active enough in the genocide to fully participate in it. Before, people of the former Butare Prefecture (Province) were not actively involved in genocide as was the case in other parts of the country. It was mainly because of their former Governor, Jean-Baptiste Habyarimana who had opposed the killings in his Prefecture (he was later killed by génocidaires and replaced with a Hutu extremist). To mobilise people of Butare to fully participate in genocide, on April 19th, 1994, in a meeting to mobilise them, the interim President, Théodore Sindikubwabo used the following words:

It is as if you did not receive our instructions. Or maybe you ignored them. Those responsible should help us get rid of these bystanders and onlookers quickly so as to let those who want to start the action. Comrades, let us be brief. But I want to reiterate what we are telling you and why we are saying it this way. Jokes aside, start the job (Archives of Radio Rwanda).

Between April and July 1994, the genocide against Tutsi took the lives of more than one million people. In addition, it destroyed almost all the infrastructure that the country had but more importantly dismantled the social relations of Rwandans. It has also to be pointed out that when RPF stopped the genocide against Tutsi and liberated the country over two million Rwandans fled the country. Many of them were taken in hostage by génocidaires. However, the RPF-led government has repatriated most of them, *“in order to motivate new refugees to return to their country, the government deployed serious diplomatic measures which were sometimes combined with military means in the former-Zaire”* (Byanafashe et al, 2011: 630).

The genocide against Tutsi left behind more than 300,000 orphans, widows and widowers. Among them, 7.3% were casualties of that Genocide. Furthermore, after taking the lives of their parents, the genocide left to approximately 85,000 children the difficult task of being forced to become heads of their respective families despite their early age.

1.5. Statement of the problem

Writing about the 1994 genocide testimonies requires the use of language skills, a product of imagination and realism. For a writer to share his/her tragic experience or that of the people that he/she is writing about necessitates the use of narrative techniques and strategies, which are similar to the historical reality.

The sufferings of a writer, a survivor, and a witness, are represented through imagination and precisely through esthetical disposition, which is used to convey truth. For writers of genocide testimonies, failing to understand the

above notions may not allow their readers to fully understand the healing process of genocide and experience and their suffering.

This PhD project aims therefore to analyse the relationships between the psychological and imaginary works in testimonies as revealed by Yolande Mukagasana and Roméo Dallaire through the developed themes.

CHAPTER TWO: TESTIMONIES OF GENOCIDE

2.1. Division of chapters

This PhD dissertation is divided into seven chapters. The first chapter is a general introduction. It deals with the rationale of the study and its methodology. In order to contextualise the study, it gives the socio-political history of Rwanda and the genocide against Tutsi that. It ends by the statement of why the study was undertaken.

The second chapter is about testimonies of genocide. It helps the reader to understand different meanings of genocide testimonies and thus helps him/her to easily comprehend the analysis of the four testimonies that will be discussed in this PhD research. It also deals with the methodology that will be used

The third chapter is a deep analysis of themes in Yolande's *La mort ne veut pas de moi* (1997). The fourth chapter discusses themes in Yolande's *N'aie pas peur de savoir* (1999). The fifth chapter analyses themes in Yolande's *Les blessures du silence* (2001). The sixth chapter explains themes in Roméo Dallaire's *Shake hands with the devil: The failure of Humanity in Rwanda* (2003). The seventh

and last chapter summarises findings of this PhD research and offers some recommendations.

2.2. About testimonies

The word testimony has different meanings. Its meaning is determined by the context and the field in which it is used. In law, testimony is a solemn statement or a declaration of a witness in a court of law or in any other deliberative body, to explain evidence of what he/she has seen. In religion, testimony is a quest for spiritual truth. In philosophy, testimony means statements based on personal experience or personal knowledge. In literature and history in general, testimony is a set of oral or written real-life narratives.

Oral or written real-life testimony aims among others, at depicting the truth. It therefore contributes to the intelligibility of the event. Semujanga (2016:17) describes it as follows: “By eliminating whatever is considered superfluous in the event, the aesthetic/rhetoric conveys that event, thanks to the relationship between narrator and reader, better than a simple narrative testimony”.

Oral or written real-life testimony has a function of keeping memory of the past. In so doing, it may provide a correct record of what happened and this record of past experiences can be used to critically analyse, verify and confront those experiences. In the case of genocide testimony, it may lend support to the fight for “never again” to genocide.

Oral or written real-life testimony serves as an eyewitness testimony narrative. As Semujanga (2016:203) says, it seeks to “address the reader by rhetorical techniques similar to those of fiction. Whether fiction or testimony, the text on genocide aims to convey the emotion to the reader by stressing the danger of destroying society’s ethical values”.

In conclusion, various forms of testimony can be organized under different thematic and formal categories, either as non-fiction or fiction proper. The genocide testimonies in this study fall under the non-fiction category. This

chapter will explain different types of testimonies and give hints of how survivors of genocide or other witnesses can testify to the unspeakable situation that they have experienced. It will also explore how testimonies may be emotions that need to be shared in what regards legitimation, auto-victimisation, accusation, and orientation of the interpretation.

2.3. Genocide testimonies

Genocide testimonies are first-hand accounts of genocide, in case they are not fake ones. Victims, perpetrators or witnesses can give testimonies. The main aim of genocide testimonies, as Bartrop (2001: XV) points it out, is to:

Provide us with a glimpse into the murderous darkness that is just as much as the illumination that acts of goodness can bring... First-hand accounts of genocide play the most crucial role in forming our understanding of what life was during the most horrific times in the human experience. Whether we are considering accounts from survivors, perpetrators, or witnesses, these are our primary links to genocide as seen and experienced at ground level.

A close analysis of the above quotation clearly explains the feelings that come to the mind of any person after reading the written genocide testimonies of Yolande Mukagasana, and of Roméo Dallaire. Through these testimonies, readers are taken to the time of genocide and exposed to abysmal experiences that both Yolande Mukagasana and Roméo Dallaire went through. While the testimony of Yolande Mukagasana is that of a genocide survivor, Roméo Dallaire's belongs to a testimony of witness.

Genocide testimonies boomed since 1915-1918 when different people were trying to establish the truth of what they had seen, heard and perceived in the genocide of Armenians. Prior to this period, there were also different accounts on mass killings such as those in colonial wars.

It has to be pointed out that when people started to narrate the horrific experiences of the Armenian genocide in 1915, they were not using the term genocide. This is because at that time the term genocide was not then known in any spoken human language. It was later coined by the Polish lawyer, Raphael Lemkin either in 1943 or in 1944 as indicated by Bruce Jenkins (2008:140). In coining the word genocide, Raphael Lemkin used two words, *genos*, a Greek word meaning family, tribe, or race, and *-cidere*, a Latin word standing for killing.

While defining genocide, Raphael Lemkin (1944:79) in his book says that,

...speaking, genocide does not necessarily mean the immediate destruction of a nation, except when accomplished by mass killings of all members of a nation. It is intended rather to signify a coordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups, with the aim of annihilating the groups themselves. The objectives of such a plan would be the disintegration of the political and social institutions, of culture, language, national feelings, religion, and the economic existence of national groups, and the destruction of the personal security, liberty, health, dignity, and even the lives of the individuals belonging to such groups.

In 1948, the United Nations that replaced the former League of Nations after it had failed its primary purpose of preventing any future world war, started to use the word genocide officially when it adopted Article II, of the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and the Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. This Article defined genocide as any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group:

- Killing members of the group;
- Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

After being officially recognised by the United Nations, the word genocide started to be used worldwide. It was commonly used to describe the *holocaust* or *Shoah*. The latter means a genocide that took the lives of approximately six million Jews, between 1940 and 1945. This genocide was organised and executed by Adolf Hitler's Nazi regime and its allies.

The word genocide continued to be frequently used to describe the killings Cambodians that occurred between 1975 and 1979. They were carried out by the Khmer Rouge regime under the leadership of Pol Pot. Its victims are estimated to between 1.5 and 3 million people.

Since April 1994, when the genocide against Tutsi took place in Rwanda, a large number of publications have used the term genocide. The genocide against Tutsi, described as one of the fastest and most systematic genocides of the 20th century, as it took the lives of more than one million Tutsi in only 100 days, was organised by Hutu extremists of the core political elite of the regime of the then President of the Republic of Rwanda, Juvénal Habyarimana, known as the *akazu* in Kinyarwanda. *Akazu*, literally means little house. It was an informal organization of Hutu extremists who formed a circle of relatives and close friends to the then president of the Republic of Rwanda, Juvénal Habyarimana and his wife, Agathe Habyarimana. Members of this circle played a leading role in the preparation and execution of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. How the genocide against Tutsi was organised, executed and stopped was clearly explained in chapter one.

Christophe Mfizi, in a statement that he presented to the Arusha International Court for Rwanda, as seen in Melvern's book (2000:58), gives more detail on *Akazu*, "the name given to family members from Bushiru, who were related to the president's wife Agathe...It was not a family mafia but a joint criminal conspiracy".

Since 2003, some writers and reporters from various international organisations especially those dealing with human rights, have started to refer to the mass slaughter and rape of Darfur men, women and children in Western Sudan as genocide. It is argued that the Sudan's government in collaboration with Janjaweed, Arab militias, prepared this genocide. However, it has to be pointed out that UN has not yet decided to call these killings genocide.

2.4. Uniqueness of genocide testimonies

Genocide testimonies are unique. Their uniqueness has been aptly described by Stephen Smith (2001:5) of the Aegis Genocide Prevention Initiative in *Rwanda and South Africa in Dialogue: Addressing the Legacy of Genocide and a Crime Against Humanity* as follows:

All that is unique is that lonely, terrifying feeling when you know you are about to be stripped of your dignity and your humanity, of family and friends, of past, present and future, of hope and love, of values, of a shared humanity. Premature brutal death stares you in the face. That's unique to every individual that suffers it.

People narrating testimonies of their horrific experience in genocide are describing their exposure to a unique situation of being between death and life. Actually, they are in total despair. In their minds, they no longer have any hope or belief that their situation may improve or change. All they can feel and see, at the time near their extermination, either in hiding, for those who manage to get it, or near their killers, is their premature and disgraceful destruction. In their consciousness, victims of genocide, before being killed, are already psychologically dead. The terrible moment that they are undergoing can be compared to that of people who are seated in a television room, watching an action movie, where the main actor with his/her gun, is about to shoot and kill, his or her unprotected and weak victim.

The people who are to be eliminated, at each stage leading to their death, tend to think that all people around them and even those from far abroad but with the ability to save them, have forgotten and betrayed them. To those who

believe in God, almost all of them begin to develop a hostile attitude against Him. Some even go further and condemn God, because of His silence and inaction to protect them, while they are convinced that God in His capacity as Omnipotent and Omnipresent is able to intervene at any time.

The fate of people to be exterminated leaves them at their wits' ends. This is a result of the nature of how genocides are planned. Indeed, the plan of all genocidaires is to ensure that nobody survives to tell the story. To this end, governments that plan genocide go through different stages that help them to reach their inhuman goal of eliminating the targeted people entirely. Gasanabo et al. point out that there are “ten stages” that were developed by Gregory H. Stanton (2013:36) of the American activist of Human Rights. These are:

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Classification; | 6. Polarization; |
| 2. Symbolization; | 7. Preparation; |
| 3. Discrimination; | 8. Persecution; |
| 4. Dehumanization; | 9. Extermination; and |
| 5. Organization; | 10. Denial. |

The stages of genocide were first introduced as eight in 1996. They later increased to ten when Gregory H. Stanton (2013:36) added two more stages, discrimination and persecution. According to Stanton, as quoted in Gasabo et al., the ten stages are predictable but not inexorable:

At each stage, preventive measures can stop it. The process is not linear. Logically, later stages must be preceded by earlier stages. But all stages continue to operate throughout the process. Usually, several occur at the same time. They provide a logical model that is useful to thinking about the genocidal process and what we can do to prevent or stop it.

The uniqueness of all genocides in comparison to other killings lies in the involvement of states in its organisation. No single genocide can be possible if states in which genocides take place are not involved. Indeed, governments or states plan genocides. These states and governments use their armed forces

that work closely with trained militias to exterminate the targeted groups. This nature of organisation complicates the prevention of genocide.

Another uniqueness of the genocide against Tutsi, in comparison to other genocides, is that it required popular participation. The mass population, prepared in advance to exterminate the targeted groups considered as their enemies (whereas it is not the case) actively participates in the execution of genocide, and this speeds up the extermination phase of genocide. As an example, one may give the number of genocide cases that were tried by Gacaca Courts. According to the final report of Gacaca Courts (Mukantaganzwa, 2010:238) “*almost two million cases were tried within a short time*”. Trials began on 10/03/2005 in pilot Sectors.

To be the most rapid genocide ever recorded is the final attribute that made the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi unique was that. As Laura and Canon, (2013:159) point out, “*nearly all the victims were killed in the first ninety days of the Rwandan genocide [genocide against Tutsi], making the rate of genocide five times as swift as the Nazis’ extermination of the Jews during the Holocaust*”. This was mainly due to the organisation and size of Rwanda.

As far as the organisation is concerned, shortly after the beginning of the genocide, ordinary people who were well prepared in advance, were incited by local officials and the interim Hutu Power government led by Sindikubwabo Théodore to speed up the killings of their Tutsi neighbours. The fact that, mainly genocidaires were neighbours to their victims, prevented the latter from have narrow escapes. Indeed, they knew each other. Even victims who narrowly managed to escape killings in their areas of residence had no chance to escape roadblocks that were erected throughout the country. Roadblocks were either controlled by armed military or by *Interahamwe* militias who were mixed with local population.

The Rwandans' identity cards, which were used in that time, helped the génocidaires to easily identify their victims. Each identity card as explained in chapter one, indicated whether its holder was a Hutu, a Tutsi or a Twa.

These identity cards played a key role in facilitating the extermination of Tutsi. To pass through at the roadblock, each person had to show his/her national identity card. As the latter included ethnicity, those who had cards indicating that they were Tutsi, with rare exceptions, were slaughtered on the spot. Even non-Rwandans like French soldiers who were standing guard on a roadblock could easily use the former Rwandan identity cards to recognize the people who were targeted in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi.

The quotation below from Michel Campion, a Belgian national from Wallis Andrew (2006:39) serves a good example:

Michel Campion, the owner of the Ibis Hotel in the southern town of Butare witnessed first-hand French, Noroit troops² in action at the roadblock. "One day, I gave a ride to a Tutsi student. On arriving at the bridge over Nyabarongo River, he was checked by a French soldier who asked him for his identity card. When the soldier discovered that he was a Tutsi, he told him: Get out of the car and go sit with your brothers over there at the edge of the road". There were approximately twelve boys and girls apparently Tutsi, who had been detained by the French soldiers. I stepped in and told these soldiers: "Listen, really I do not understand your position; it is not for you to do that. The Rwandan gendarmes should carry out these checks. Where do you believe yourselves to be? Is this a French territory? I said: You are in an independent state and you come to screen citizens in their own country?" I added, "I will not move from here, and this boy will not leave this vehicle. I asked them to call the officer in charge. They brought a Second Lieutenant who listened to my protest, and, after told me that it was not his business. I answered him that it was my business because I had a passenger that they wanted to get out of my car. In the end, the Second Lieutenant told me: "Listen, go on just leave..."

² Noroit operation is a name that was given to a military intervention of the French army in Rwanda. It started on October 4th, 1990.

With the above situation, it was not easy to stop the genocide against Tutsi. However, with a rapid and overwhelming armed intervention of armed forces, regional organisations or international ones, it would have been possible. Unfortunately, this did not happen. The main reason was a lack of political decision from both the United Nations, the African Union and other regional organisations. It was only the Rwandan Patriotic Front that intervened and stopped the genocide that took, within three months, the lives of more than one million innocent people.

2.5. Unspeakability of genocide testimonies

Telling genocide testimonies is considered as speaking of the unspeakable. This is because of the extreme nature of the genocide suffering that makes almost impossible for the survivor to be able to narrate his/her inhuman experience.

Indeed, as Twagilimana (2003: x) points it out,

Genocide epitomizes extreme evil, the most heinous of all crimes against humanity because it negates the very idea of human essence. Thus, it is not surprising that, at first glance, the terror, brutality, and annihilation that accompany it defy human understanding and induce silence.

The above experience justifies why survivors of the Holocaust and other Europeans had to wait for four decades before being able to openly and confidently talk about the Holocaust. The same experience also applies to testimonies of the 1945 Second World War, which flourished in literature four decades after the end of that war.

Similarly, there was a delay in talking about or providing testimonies of the genocide against Tutsi. In addition to this, it has also to be added that Rwanda, at that time, had only few writers. A few well-known written testimonies were first published three years later after the end of the genocide; others appeared after ten years. As earlier said, they include testimonies of Yolande Mukagasana, Esther Mujawayo, Scolastique Mukasonga, Immaculée Ilibagiza, Révérien Rurangwa, Marie-Aimable Umurerwa, Annick Kayitesi, Marie-Béatrice

Umutesi, Pauline Kayitare, Vénuste Kayimahe, Edouard Kayihura, and General Roméo Dallaire.

Coming back to the explanation of the unspeakability of genocide testimonies, I would like to borrow the words of Névine et al. (2013:126) to give additional important explanations:

While suffering is a universal predicament often arduous and at times impossible to speak of, trauma is a separating force that can render its victims silent or incapable of grieving. Horrific events experienced in community or individually encounter the victim as they resurge unexpectedly and continually in the present.

The Kinyarwanda proverb, “*Umutima usobetse amaganya ntusobanura amagambo*” translated in English as “it is hard for a grieving person to clearly explain better what he/she things” the above quotation. Indeed, the horrific suffering trauma, excessive physical and psychological cruelty that survivors of any genocide experience prevent them from easily expressing their testimonies.

As Simone Gigliotti (2007:84) correctly puts it, this situation helps perpetrators to remain unknown:

The inability of witnesses to adequately articulate their experiences to listeners and readers can sometimes consign the impact of perpetrator crimes to a perpetually unspeakable condition. Such tensions of rendering the experiential witness are a feature of, for example, Holocaust survivors and their testimonies, whether enunciated in oral, written or video testimony form.

2.6. Importance of genocide testimonies

Although there are many reasons that justify the importance of genocide testimonies, there are two that are the main ones. Firstly, testimonies are good teachers of history. Through them, it is much easier to understand or construct the past of any society that has experienced genocide. As an example, any person who reads the testimonies of Yolande Mukagasana in her *La mort ne veut pas de moi* (1997), *N'aie pas peur de savoir* (1999), and *Les*

blessures du silence (2001) is exposed to the socio-political and historical past of Rwanda.

These testimonies reveal that the 1994 genocide against Tutsi was well planned. It was a culmination of genocide against Tutsi that started in 1959. The reader discovers this when Mukagasana informs her audience that her husband, who was killed in the 1994 genocide, had lost his father in the 1963 killings that targeted Tutsi. At that period he was only 13 year old. Mukagasana herself, when she was 5 years old, was wounded during the 1959 bloody Hutu Revolution, luckily she survived.

In reading Mukagasana's testimony, the reader learns how the so-called "ethnic groups", Hutu, Twa and Tutsi were introduced in Rwanda. The European colonialists introduced them. The latter were used in identifying Tutsi who had to be exterminated in the 1994 genocide. Mukagasana describes the reality of the situation in Rwanda before the arrival of colonialists when Hutu, Tutsi and Twa were cohabiting peacefully. Colonialism intentionally created these divisions in order to effectively govern the population without strong opposition.

The three testimonies deal clearly with almost all the phases of genocide. Indeed, they explain, with examples, how Tutsi were classified, symbolised, discriminated against and later on dehumanized. They also discuss how genocide was prepared and executed without distinction.

In helping readers to understand how the genocide was prepared, Yolande shows her readers that not all Hutu participated in genocide. She revealed this in *La mort ne veut pas de moi* (1997), when she explained how a Hutu saved her. According to her testimony, a Hutu woman, who voluntarily accepted to hide her for a period of three months, saved her.

Felman and Shoshana (1992: xvii) summarised the importance of testimony in the teaching of the history of genocide:

On the basis of a close analysis of concrete examples of historical and autobiographical accounts, the process of the testimony indeed sheds new light, both on the psychoanalytical relation between speech and survival, and on the historical processes of the Holocaust itself, whose uniquely devastating aspect is here interpreted for the first time as radical historical *crisis of witnessing*, and as the unprecedented, inconceivable, historical occurrence of an event without witness- an event eliminating its own witness.

Secondly, genocide testimony has a healing dimension. It allows survivors to express the extreme sufferings that they had gone through during genocide. It also an opportunity for the genocidaires to deeply express their crimes. By letting them do so, genocide testimony addresses both the personal and communal/historical dimensions of their experiences. As a result, they may feel a psychological relief and become able to start a new life.

A description of how survivors of genocide feel before telling their testimonies can be compared to the following life of a Lakota/Dakota woman (Native American) as described by Nabelkopf (2004:7):

I feel like I have been carrying a weight around that I've inherited. I have this theory that grief is passed on genetically because it's there and I never knew where it came from. I feel a sense of responsibility to undo the pain of the past. I can't separate myself from the past, the history and the trauma. It has been paralysing to us as a group.

Mukagasana's courage to testify her experiences during the genocide was fruitful in many ways. This is described in the three books that this study is analysing. In these testimonies she dedicated her post genocide life to all efforts of preserving memory of the genocide against Tutsi, and inspiring Rwandans, Hutu, Tutsi and Twa, to coexist peacefully. This helped her to stand strong despite serious genocide consequences including trauma that she was living with, and she has encouraged other people including killers of her children

(details will be given in the next chapter) to go beyond their differences and live in harmony. What Mukagasana tried to do is what Felman explained when he described the importance of testimony:

The testimony is, therefore, the process by which the narrator (the survivor) reclaims his position as a witness: reconstitutes the internal “thou”, and thus the possibility of a witness or a listener inside himself. In my experience, repossessing one’s life story through giving testimony is itself a form of action, of change (85-86).

2.7. Oral testimonies

Genocide testimonies, as well as other testimonies, can be delivered orally or in writing. Oral testimony, to put it simply, is about giving a verbal statement of what happened. The main purpose of oral testimony is to help people, the audience, to have a clear picture of the situation that the testimony teller has experienced. They also play a healing role in the minds of the genocide survivors.

Oral testimonies are most common in the judicial system and criminal law when suspects or witnesses are being requested to testify so that their testimonies may be used to determine the culprits and decide the outcome of a trial. In this case, interviews of witnesses or suspects are often recorded, and their authors have to sign them.

In general, oral testimonies are shared through word of mouth. They go from one person to another through oral communication. As earlier said, oral testimony is based on personal experiences and opinions of the speaker. Compared to written testimonies, oral testimonies are the most powerful way to present one’s testimony. They are indeed, direct communication between the testimony teller and his/her audience. It is this nature of testimony that, “oral testimony or oral “literature” has its own characteristics and is not to be understood by the application of literacy standards of judgement. In some cases, oral testimony can be more full accurate than written testimony” (Perks,

1998:41). However, oral testimony can also be recorded and then presented in writing either by its author or by a person who helps him/her to put to paper that testimony.

2.8. Written testimonies

Some authors like Gugelberger and Kearney (2001:3-4) place written testimonies in the category of “testimonial literature” that emerged in 1966 from Latin American literature:

In the recent decades there has been a new immergence in Latin American literature, testimonial literature, or the *testimonio*. Testimonial literature is “an authentic narrative, told by a witness who is moved to narrate by the urgency of a situation (e.g., war, oppression, revolution, etc.). Emphasizing popular oral discourse, the witness portrays his or her own experience as a representative of a collective memory and identity.

When any testimony is written, it has to follow known writing rules. As an example, it has to:

- be written lean, meaning that it must be in a readable prose that is clear, brief, and complete;
- favour the active voice over the passive voice which is often anonymous and colourless;
- consider most adverbs poison;
- avoid abstract “ghost” words and use concrete words that are alive;
- be written rigorously;
- dramatize concrete details by understanding and using the sensory path to the mind; that is, sight, smell, sound, touch and taste;
- keep the reader awake, excited, and wanting more; and
- ensure that the grammar is well respected.

The above rules make written testimonies most difficult if we compare them to oral testimonies. However, there are differences between oral and written testimonies. Donalds and Glejzer (2001:74) summarise it as follows:

Noting the differences between oral and written testimonies, Lawrence Langer tells us that, in listening to the former, “we unearth a mosaic of evidence that constantly vanishes, like Thomas Mann’s well of the past, into bottomless layers of incompleteness”. The trajectory of incompleteness is understandable if we acknowledge, as Caruth has of trauma, that the occurrence of the event, and our implication in it, is no more accessible to memory than is the *ursprache*, the source of divinity, in the difficult work of the historian or translator. While oral testimonies, which grapple with the void that is the Shoah as the witness plunges forward, word by word, mark the distance between the occurrence of the event and its experience in memory, “[m]ost written survivor narratives, on the other hand, end where they have been leading—the arrival of the Allies, and the corresponding “freedom” of the victims.

As explained above, writing about genocide testimonies is not an easy task. In addition to difficulties of respecting grammar as an institutional blueprint of community life, the latter has been disrupted by genocide. This is due to the trauma’s influence on memory.

2.9. Conclusion

This chapter on testimonies of genocide aimed to help the reader understand different meanings of genocide testimonies. From the definition of testimonies in general, the more narrowed definition of genocide testimonies emerges. The uniqueness, unspeakability, importance and channels of conveying genocide testimonies were the focus of this chapter. The end objective of this chapter was to prepare the reader with enough knowledge to better understand the third chapter that deals with the thematic analysis of the four testimonies that were analysed.

CHAPTER THREE: THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF *LA MORT NE VEUT PAS DE MOI* (1997)

3.1. Introduction

This chapter deals with the thematic analysis of Mukagasana's *La mort ne veut pas de moi* (1997). To help the reader understand the content of this chapter, it begins by giving a background to the testimony. It further discusses six important themes, namely: (1) revolt against life and nature; (2) culture of impunity as the genesis of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi; (3) exclusion, (4) discrimination and humiliation of Tutsi; (5) incitement to ethnic hatred and (6) inhumanity and evil.

3.2. Background to *La mort ne veut pas de moi*

La mort ne veut pas de moi, roughly translated in English, as *Death does not want me*, is Mukagasana's first autobiographical account narrating her horrible experience in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. The testimony was published in 1997. It has 31 chapters that are written in a chronological order. It is about the deep grief of a mother, who, three years after the genocide, was not able to find anybody who could give her enough time and listen to her genocide testimony. This is what she told me in an interview she offered me on 6 November 2015:

Even those who showed interest, they could not listen to my entire testimony. They were not able to listen for example to the entire sadistic stories of how some génocidaires killed Tutsi and ate their hearts or how women were savagely raped. Whereas it is a correct record of what occurred, some even believed that this could not have happened. This is why I decided to put my testimony on a paper. The paper will not judge me. This is true. I experienced it. Indeed, at the time of writing my testimony, it could happen to me to cry and my tears could erase what I had written. When this happened, I could take another paper and restart rewriting my testimony. A paper never complained about this. With my written testimony I was able to talk to people whom I see today and those of future generations. Additionally, my testimony was also my

weapon to fight against the growing number of negationists and revisionists in Europe at the time of writing my testimony.

Coming back to *La mort ne veut pas de moi / Death does not want me*, it opens by describing how the death of the former President Juvénal Habyarimana who perished in his private Falcon 50 that was shot down near Kigali international airport, was one of the triggers that sparked the genocide of more than one million Tutsi. It continues explaining how Mukagasana's husband and her three children were executed and how she miraculously survived. The testimony ends by a message of hope. This can be read by her decision to leave Belgium and come back to Rwanda and testify of what she had seen and experienced and start a new life. This is how she said it:

Il n'y a sans doute presque aucun survivant Tutsi sur la colline de Cyivugiza. Qui témoignera, sinon Muganga? Mais je sais qu'un jour je retournerai au Rwanda, la tête haute.... Je vais vivre. Puisque la mort n'a pas voulu de moi, eh bien! Tant pis pour elle (Mukagasana, 1997:287-288).

I am quite sure there is no single Tutsi survivor at Cyivugiza hill. If not me, Muganga [nickname of Yolande Mukagasana who was a nurse before genocide] who else can testify? But I am convinced that one day I will go back to Rwanda, with all confidence... I want to live. Indeed, death did not want me! That was its business!

Mukagasana's dream of coming back to her mother country was realized. Through Gacaca Courts, the justice that she had set as prerequisite for her return was established.

Mukagasana, as it was the case for many Rwandans, was happy with the performance of Gacaca Courts. She revealed it when she said in her recent book, *L'Onu et le chagrin d'une négresse: Rwanda/RD-Congo, 20 après* that:

Notre Gacaca était une justice réconciliatrice comme aujourd'hui, même si avant, ce tribunal ne jugeait pas les crimes de sang. Les lois ont été créées pour cela. Tout ce que je peux dire, c'est que cette justice a réconcilié les Rwandais, elle a réhabilité les coupables qui ont purgé leurs peines et tout le monde était satisfait, même si nul n'a pu satisfaire tout le monde. Sans nos Gacaca, la justice moderne

n'aurait rien pu faire, puisque l'on disait que pour juger le génocide, il aurait fallu tout un siècle (Mukagasana, 1997:91).

As it was the case in the past, our Gacaca was a reconciling justice. However, before genocide, Gacaca was not dealing with bloody cases. To try them, new Gacaca laws had to be created. All I can say is that Gacaca has successfully reconciled Rwandans, it rehabilitated the génocidaires who served all their sentences and everybody was happy, even if it is not easy to please all. Without our Gacaca, the modern justice could not try genocide cases. Some say that it would have required a century to try them!

As for security, the other condition for the return of Mukagasana, it was also resolved. The Government of Rwanda after the 1994 genocide against Tutsi set up strong security measures that made Rwanda a safe country. This is even confirmed by various international reports. Among them, one may cite The Gallup Global Law and Order 2015 Report released in September 2015 that named Rwanda among the few countries in the world where people feel safe walking home alone at night.

With the above two conditions, on 30 April 2011 Mukagasana Yolande willingly returned to her country. Since then, she worked in the National Commission for the Fight against Genocide where she was responsible for the advocacy of the welfare of survivors of genocide until her retirement in 2016. Yolande adopted 21 orphans of genocide who live in her house located at Cyivugiza where she was living before genocide. She managed to complete the reconstruction of that house with the Alexander Langer Foundation Testimonial Award that she obtained in 1998, in Italy.

Before analysing themes of Yolande's *La mort ne veut pas de moi / Death does not want me* (1997), it is imperative to first and foremost understand the title of this testimony. Its analysis may give the impression that the author was referring to the death that refused her in 1994. However, a deep analysis shows that the author is even referring to today's life. The use of the verb *vouloir*/want in present tense justifies it. If it was about death in 1994 she should have used

the past. Thus, the title would have been *La mort n'a pas voulu de moi/Death did not want me*.

To confirm whether I was right in my interpretation of the title of *La mort ne veut pas de moi /Death does not want me*, I requested an appointment with Yolande and had an interview with her. The following is what she responded on the title of her first testimony:

It is true many people do not understand the title of *La mort ne veut pas de moi /Death does not want me*. Indeed, as the death did not want me in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, even today it does not want me. Why? For me, survivorship is not a life. Until I am not able to reach where I want to be, I am still in my survivorship. When justice is not completely given to survivors, they are still in their survivorship. Justice will be fully made to them with reparation. Who has to give reparations? The génocidaires and the international community that betrayed Rwandans during genocide, especially those who played an active role like France. With reparation, survivors live their survivorship status and embrace the life per se (My interview with Mukagasana on November 6th, 2015).

When a survivor receives the above reparation, it becomes easier to fully reconcile with herself/himself. It is through this reconciliation that a survivor can smile again and change the bitter and angry consequences of genocide that can be described as a heart and mind cancer and restart a new optimistic life. Mukagasana went through this bitter situation but finally decided to look at the post-genocide life in an optimistic way. This is because as she correctly says in my interview with her, “*Life is stronger than all of us. We have to respect it. Hatred is destructive and it is the most dangerous enemy of any human being*”.

However, Mukagasana is not satisfied with the behaviour of the international community as far as reparation of the genocide against Tutsi is concerned. It is only through the outcomes of the Gacaca Courts and the efforts of the Government of Rwanda in sensitising all Rwandans to live in unity that she was able to reconcile with herself and with killers of her family. She is now

helping Rwandans of all walks of life including the survivors and the génocidaires to live in harmony and build a new Rwanda.

In her own words, in *La mort ne veut pas de moi* (1997) that will be shortned as *Mort* in the next references, she says the following:

Je veux vivre pour les miens, je veux que les humains retrouvent leur dignité, je veux que les Rwandais redeviennent des frères, parmi lesquels Dieu Imana du Rwanda, Gihanga Créateur des hommes, des vaches et de la terre, qui leur a donné l'eau et le feu et rentrera encore tous les soirs, car son vrai repos n'est pas ailleurs....Je veux que la vie redevienne sacrée dans mon Rwanda Rugari, mon Rwanda vaste, comme l'ont appelé nos ancêtres malgré sa taille réduite par le même prédateur (Mukagasana, 1997:185).

I want to earn a living for my folks, my desire is to see human beings recover their dignity. I want Rwandans to become brothers and sisters and have between them the Rwanda's God *Imana*, the Creator of men, women, cows and the earth, the God who provided them with water and fire and who will be returning every evening in Rwanda, His very resting place.... [Yolande was referring to the myth of Rwandan creation]. My wish is to see life recovering its sacred nature in Rwanda *Rugari*, my vast Homeland as our ancestors used to call it despite its size made tiny by the same predator.

The above quotation is a commitment of Yolande Mukagasana for her better future and that of Rwanda. The information provided in this section on the background of *La mort ne veut pas de moi /Death does not want me* will assist the reader to easily understand the themes that the testimony is dealing with.

3.3. Main themes in *La mort ne veut pas de moi*

3.3. 1. Revolt against life and nature

Revolt against life and nature is a theme that starts at the very beginning of *La mort ne veut pas de moi/Death does not want me*. It is also at work in many chapters of the testimony. Firstly, the revolt appears on the cover page with the title of the testimony that is *La mort ne veut pas de moi /Death does not want me*.

Under normal circumstances, saying that death does not want somebody is a pessimistic way of seeing life. It is a revolt against the existing rules of nature. Indeed, it is not as in normal judgments when a person is allowed to appeal against a decision that does not please him or her. For those who believe in God, it is only Him who gives life and takes it back, whenever and wherever He wants. However, with the experience of how people survived genocide, the choice of the title is understandable. Indeed, most of the survivors of genocide escaped miraculously. Killers, who were well-motivated, trained, organized and supported by the then Government of Rwanda had all the time and means to exterminate Tutsi who were targeted. Those who narrowly survived, it was by chance.

Secondly, the theme of revolt against life and nature is illustrated in the epigraph that precedes the testimony of Mukagasana in *La mort ne veut pas de moi /Death does not want me*. She preferred to start her testimony by quoting a Rwandan proverb that goes as follows: “*Iyo amazi akubwiye ngo winkaraba urayabwira uti: nta mbyiro mfite*”/If water tells you: do not use me to wash your body; you respond: I am not dirty. This proverb uses personification, one of the rhetoric styles described as a special sort of metaphor. Personification assigns human qualities or traits to something nonhuman like a plant, an abstraction, or a non-living thing like water in this context.

A close analysis of the above proverb that was used as epigraph to Yolande's testimony, gives a clear message of what Yolande is going to share with her audience: She wants them, at an early, to understand that her preoccupation is to give a testimony of her experience in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. What matters for her is to tell her story and use it to restore her lost dignity: *"J'espère de ce témoignage qu'il me restituera ma dignité perdue, ma dignité de femme, de mère, et d'infirmière"* (Mort 258)/I hope that this testimony will help me to restore my lost dignity, the dignity of a woman, of a mother, and of a nurse. Mukagasana's option is a result of the frustration that all survivors of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi had gone through. They lost trust in almost all people and some even went further and lost trust in God as earlier explained. This attitude is a reflection of revolt against life.

Thirdly, the theme of revolt against life and nature is in the warning of Yolande to her audience prior to reading her testimony. She says:

Je suis une femme rwandaise. Je n'ai pas appris à déposer mes idées dans des livres. Je ne vis pas dans l'écrit. Je vis dans la parole. Mais j'ai rencontré un écrivain. Lui, racontera mon histoire. Mon histoire? Celle d'une femme Tutsi qui a traversé le génocide rwandais de 1994. Depuis cette date, je n'ai plus qu'un ami, c'est mon témoignage. Mais peut-être qu'un jour je serai à nouveau capable d'avoir des amis (Mukagasana, 1997:14).

I am a Rwandan woman. I was not trained on how to write my ideas in books. Writing is not my field. My oral work is better than my written one. However, I met a writer and told him my story. But which story? A story of a Tutsi woman who witnessed the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. Since then, I have only one friend: my testimony. But perhaps one day, I will again be able to have new friends.

Mukagasana does not understand how she can qualify her genocide testimony. According to the above quotation, finding words to express her extreme suffering through writing is quite impossible. Mukagasana's thinking changed when she met late Patrick May, a journalist, and a writer. Patrick assisted her to write her testimony. This was a long-awaited relief to Mukagasana to the

extent that she became a best friend of her testimony. Considering her testimony as the only best friend to trust is another indicator of a feeling of revolt against all human beings that comes to the mind of any survivor after escaping genocide.

Fourthly, the theme of revolt against life and nature is almost in all chapters of the testimony. In chapter one, for example, Yolande revolts against God:

Imana vient-il encore dormir tous les soirs dans mon pays? Et était-il chez nous le soir du 6 avril 1994? Ne nous a-t-il pas abandonnés dans la gueule du diable? Peut-être, ce jour-là, n'a-t-il pas eu le temps de revenir au Rwanda tant la nuit est tombée vite? (Mukagasana, 1997: 15).

Does really God still return every evening in my country as Its very resting place? Was He in Rwanda in the evening of 6 April 1994? Didn't He leave us in the hands of the devil? Perhaps on that day, as the day ended early, He did not have time to come to Rwanda.

After surviving genocide, Yolande who was a member of the Catholic Church although not a devout one as she had had bad experiences with some Hutu extremists who were leaders of the Church who sympathised with the policy of the then Government oppressing Tutsi, was in deep revolt against her God. She could no more believe in His mercy. She was questioning why God described as omnipotent and omnipresent did not prevent the genocide against Tutsi to happen. What made Mukagasana angrier was the fact that when she grew up she was always told that God used to travel to other countries but could not sleep there as Rwanda was His favoured country to spend a night.

What happened to Yolande happened also to many survivors of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi and to survivors of previous genocides such as the Jewish one. Indeed, after the Holocaust, in Jewish theology, there were so many debates on the role of God during that Holocaust. Some Jewish writers were asking themselves the whereabouts of God when six million perished in the Holocaust. Others were questioning why God who is omnipotent and omnipresent did not intervene and stop the Holocaust. There are even those

who blamed God: “*How then could God have allowed it to happen. Are the Jews his chosen people-how can he allow his elect to be treated in such a terrible way?*” (Sherbok, 2002:174). However, other Jewish like Bauer has argued that a God who inflicted the Shoah to His Chosen People, Jewish, is neither good nor just (2001).

In chapter two of *La mort ne veut pas de moi*, Mukagasana expresses internal revolt against herself and her late husband Joseph who did not accept her plan to have their family out of Rwanda as it was clear that Tutsi could be exterminated anytime. This is how she said it:

En fait, j'avais déjà commencé à préparer en secret notre fuite hors du pays....Chaque jour je tençais Joseph pour que nous prenions la décision de partir. Mais chaque jour cela tournait en de longues discussions au terme desquelles on reportait les décisions... Cela fait trois ans que tout le monde connaît les plans de Habyarimana. Cela fait huit mois que la radio incite les Hutu à massacrer les Tutsi. Et depuis trois mois, on sait que Habyarimana est débordé par l'aile extrémiste de son propre parti. On sait que le massacre se prépare. On le sait. Et moi je n'ai pas voulu voir (Mukagasana, 1997:24-25).

In fact, I had already started to prepare, in secret, how to flee my country....Every day I was reminding Joseph [her husband] to agree with my proposal of leaving the country but in vain. All the time we ended in long discussions without reaching any agreement....For three years everybody is aware of the [President] Habyarimana's plans. It is now eight months that a radio [RTLM] is sensitising Hutu to exterminate Tutsi. And as of now, it has been three months since it has become an open secret that the extremist wing of his own party overwhelms Habyarimana. We know that the preparation of mass killings is underway. We know it. But I did not wish to witness it.

The above quotation shows how Mukagasana was in revolt both against her late husband and against herself. As for her husband, she was blaming him since it was because of his refusal to accept her proposal of going into exile that Joseph himself and their three children were not able to survive the 1994 genocide. It has to be made clear that Mukagasana knows that her husband was not ill intentioned. The same applies to Mukagasana when she condemned

herself saying that she did not want to witness genocide. What she is expressing is a normal revolt of any survivor who tends to condemn himself/herself or his/her close relatives about their fate in genocide. Their disappearance makes them think that they are guilty of not having done enough to save their relatives. This revolt is normal in the survivors' lives.

In chapter four, the theme of revolt against life appears again. It is shown in the discussion between Mukagasana and her husband:

Tu sais, Yolande, tant qu'ils ne t'auront pas trouvée, ils me laisseront en vie. Pour que je puisse te dénoncer. Mais pourquoi c'est moi qu'ils veulent? Parce que tu es la femme la plus en vue dans le quartier.....Peu importe, finalement qu'ils me tuent! Cela n'a plus d'importance (Mukagasana, 1997:47-48).

Do you know Yolande, as long as they have not found you, they will not kill me. They will keep me so that I may tell them of your whereabouts. But why do they want me? Because you are the most known woman in the area... Anyway, let them kill me! Death is meaningless to me.

When Mukagasana said that death was meaningless to her, she wanted to express that she had run out of strength to resist and survive the killings of génocidaires. In fact, faced with her inability to fight against the génocidaires, she had given up and resigned herself to her fate. A deep analysis of her resignation to death shows that she had already died psychologically. Only her body was still struggling in those last moments. Rejecting life, not because of serious sickness and seeking assistance of doctors to intentionally end his/her life in order to be relieved from pain and suffering (euthanasia) is an indicator of one's despair of life.

In chapter five, Mukagasana comes again to the theme of revolt against life. She does it when she refers to her discussion with her late husband who was tired of his life in hiding and was ready to hand himself to génocidaires: *“Un cri se fait entendre à la barrière, un homme suppliait. Joseph tremble un peu, il ne veut plus se cacher. J'arrive à le convaincre. Nous décidions de regagner la*

brousse le plus vite possible” (Mukagasana, 1997:62)/At a nearby roadblock, somebody cried for help. Joseph is a bit terrified. He no longer wants to continue hiding himself. I managed to convince him to do so. We decided to quickly return to our hiding in the bush.

Joseph’s words are those of a disappointed person. Instead of continuing his lost struggle of hiding himself, he willingly wanted to offer his life to killers. For him, the life had no more meaning. As his words indicate, his inner man had died. He did not want to have a body without a mind. Joseph’s way of seeing his life as useless is nothing else than a result of frustration of the most dangerous and terrible situation that he was going through.

The theme of revolt against life is also described in chapter ten when Mukagasana met for the first time her children who were wounded by génocidaires:

J’ai retrouvé l’usage des larmes. Mais je ne sais plus très bien si c’est pour mes enfants que je pleure, à cause de leurs blessures, ou à cause de la lâcheté des hommes. Celle de Côme, bien sûr. Celle de la communauté internationale, sans doute, qui nous a abandonnés, préférant soutenir jusqu’ au bout un régime génocidaire et rendre précaire l’avancée des forces rebelles (Mukagasana, 1997:92).

I established the importance of tears. But I do not know exactly whether I was crying for children because of their injuries, or whether it was because of men’s cowardice like Côme of course; or with no doubt, because of the international community that instead of protecting us against the hands of the génocidaires had preferred to continue to support the genocidal government and make difficult the advance of rebel forces.

Mukagasana was condemning herself, the génocidaires and the international community. She was angry with herself because at her age she was not able to determine correct reasons behind her tears. Combined possible causes confused her. This confusion is a result of frustration of her inability to assist her children, husband, relatives, and friends to escape the genocide. Mukagasana also condemned the génocidaires who were killing innocent

people. The animosity made her hates all people. As for the international community, she could not understand how all countries had decided to ignore various calls for help from Tutsi who were not yet killed, and instead some of them were preferred to support the génocidaires. Melvern (2000:24) illustrates well how Rwanda was betrayed:

Rwanda's violent divisions might have been easier to heal and its tragic history somewhat different had it not been for the involvement of outside interests. None had more dramatic effect than that of France, for without France the dictatorship of Juvénal Habyarimana would never lasted as long as it did.

Some French newspapers, including the Paris-based *Libération*, revealed the role of France in the preparation of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. On 9 February 1993, one year before the execution of the 1994 genocide, a journalist wrote in *Libération*:

In the far hills of Rwanda [...] France is supporting a regime which for two years, with a militia and death squads, has been trying to organise the extermination of the minority Tutsi... the death squads, organised in a Réseau Zéro [Network] by the president's clan, are operating a genocide against the Tutsi, as though it were a public service (Melvern, 2000:43-44).

Chapter twelve describes another scenario in which Mukagasana is in revolt against her God. This took place when Emmanuelle asked her to pray: “*Si nous prions?*” fait-elle. *J’ai envie d’hurler. Prier! Prier! J’en ai assez de cette religion chrétienne. J’ai perdu mon mari et ne sais pas où sont mes enfants. Et l’on me demande de prier* (Mukagasana, 1997:120)/“What if we pray? She said. I want to scream. Pray! Pray! I have enough of this Christian religion. I lost my husband and do not know where my children are. And they ask me to pray! This quotation explains how Mukagasana had lost hope in everything including her own God. As earlier explained, this was caused by the most horrifying actions of human madness, genocide that she was experiencing.

In chapter thirteen, there is another passage that illustrates Mukagasana's revolt against life.

Que je viens de comprendre le sens du génocide. Que je me plie avec à la nouvelle loi. Que je ne mérite pas de vivre. Que je dois payer pour les fautes anciennes. Que les miliciens ont raison de vouloir nettoyer le pays. Que le Rwanda est leur patrie, pas la mienne. Que, s'ils m'aiment un peu, ils doivent me tuer (Mukagasana, 1997:130).

I have understood the meaning of genocide. I have to comply with the new law. I have no right to life. I have to pay for old mistakes [that she was not responsible for]. I have understood that militias were allowed to exterminate all Tutsi because Rwanda belongs to them and not to me. The only thing they could do for me if they somehow like me, is to kill me.

The above quotation proves once again how Mukagasana was desperate. Having no other means to escape from the hands of génocidaires, her remaining option was to have an internal revolt against her existence and thus hate her life. Instead of continuing to suffer, she wished to be killed by génocidaires; she said that if they really liked her, the best gift they could give would be killed her. The use of the verb “like” needs special attention. Génocidaires could not have any sympathy for Mukagasana or other Tutsi who were their target. In using this verb, Mukagasana wanted to show that she had completely lost hope for her life to the extent that she was confusing her enemies with her friends.

Passages that describe how Yolande had begun to hate life and everything that was surrounding her because of what she was experiencing are many and occur in almost all chapters as indicated in the introduction of this chapter. Let me give the last two examples.

The first one is from chapter twenty-one when Mukagasana was wondering about her fate when she was hiding at the house of Colonel Rucibigango:

Toute la nuit, je cherche une solution. Tout y passe: me suicider, me présenter à une barrière, me cacher sous un camion à destination du Zaïre [République Démocratique du Congo], me cacher dans un faux plafond chez ce militaire, beaucoup d'autres solutions encore, toutes

plus absurdes les unes que les autres. J'imagine même que j'entre dans une boîte de conserve et qu'Emmanuelle me fait passer ainsi en Ouganda. Je ne sais plus si je dors, si je rêve ou si je délire. Par moments, j'essaie d'imaginer la lame d'une machette sur ma nuque. J'espère que ce jeu m'aidera à avoir moins peur le jour où cela m'arrivera (Mukagasana, 1997:184).

During the whole night, I look for the solution. Different proposals come to my mind: commit suicide, report myself to a roadblock, hiding in a truck heading to Zaïre [now Democratic Republic of Congo] or look for a hiding place in the roof of the house of that soldier. There were also other various possible solutions in my mind. They all had one thing in common: one after another was absurd and worse. I even thought that I could enter into a canned box so that Emmanuelle could send me secretly to Uganda. I don't know if I was sleeping, dreaming, or totally delirious. At all times, I tried to imagine the blade of a machete on my neck. I thought that this way of seeing things was going to help me to have less fear when this would happen to me.

The above quotation is another proof that justifies how Mukagasana had lost trust in her own life. Circumstances of her would-be imminent death were the only dominating idea in her mind. Mukagasana was, in other words, a psychological dead person. What was remaining was the death of her physical part, her body.

The last illustration of how Mukagasana had lost interest in life and nature is found in the last chapter: *“Je vis en Europe, parce que la justice n'a pas encore été rendue dans mon pays. De machettes attendent dans l'ombre de s'abattre sur ma nuque pour me faire taire à jamais”* (Mukagasana 1997: 257)/“I am living in Europe because in my country justice has not yet been given. Killers are waiting in hiding to put an end to their unfinished genocide and eliminate me”.

Mukagasana wrote this book in 1997, three years after the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. She was still, Rwanda. However, she could not return to Rwanda as she thought that she could be killed by génocidaires from whom she had miraculously escaped. Her fear is an indicator that she had no more trust in human beings. This mistrust was a result of the consequences of in Europe but

her heart was in her mother country genocide that all survivors experienced after the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. Fortunately, as explained in the introduction of this chapter, Yolande's dream of returning back home was realised.

3.3.2. Culture of impunity as the genesis of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi

Culture of impunity as the genesis of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi is another theme that Mukagasana Yolande discusses in her *La mort ne veut pas de moi* (1997). She explains how the 1994 genocide mushroomed from the injustice of all kinds orchestrated against Tutsi since the bloody revolution of 1959 to 6 April 1994 when the genocide of Tutsi reached its climax. As explained by Erny, during this period of thirty-five years, Tutsi were considered as foreign invaders who had to be treated as enemies of their own country! Hutu extremists who led Rwanda in this period had two options to deal with Tutsi: *“to incorporate them into the country under certain conditions as they integrated foreigners or to hunt them down and exterminate them”* (Erny, 1994 58).

In *La mort ne veut pas de moi*, Yolande gives examples that explain how the 1994 genocide against Tutsi was a culmination of various unpunished unhuman actions by Hutu extremists against Tutsi. She describes how at the age of five years, she was wounded by Hutu who wanted to kill her father (the father who was later killed by the same extremists when Yolande was 13 years old:

Quand je pense à cette cicatrice, je vois des hommes torse nu, les reins habillés de feuilles de bananier séchées, un brassard rouge au bras, vert pour certains. Ils brandissent des lances et des machettes. “Où est ton mari?” demandent-ils à ma mère. Elle ne répond pas. Ils fouillent la maison. Ils cassent une cruche de lait, je me mets à pleurer. J’ai cinq ans: je pleure dans les jupes de maman. “Où est to mari?” Redemandent-ils. Ils m’arrachent à ma mère, me jettent au sol, m’immobilisent en posant sur ma poitrine un pied nu et sale, durci par le frottement avec la terre et zébré de crevasses

coupantes comme des ongles. Ils hurlent à maman: "Tu ne veux pas parler? Tu ne veux pas parler? Regarde!" L'un des hommes m'enfonce dans la cuisse une lance effilée. Le sang jaillit, je ne pleure pas. "Tu ne veux pas parler?" Ma mère garde le silence. L'homme retire sa lance, tous s'enfuient, terrorisés peut-être par la fermeté de ma mère. Cela se passait en 1959, dans le village où je suis née, au moment de la révolution hutu qui porta Grégoire Kayibanda au pouvoir. Je n'oublierai jamais cette grande jatte de lait brisée. J'ai cru que je ne boirais plus jamais de lait de toute ma vie (Mukagasana, 1997:35-36).

When I think of this scar, I see bare-chested men, some wearing dry banana leaves at their waists, some with a red armband on their arms and others with a green one. They brandish their spears and machetes. "Where is your husband?" they ask my mother. She does not respond. They search the house. They break a jug of milk and I start crying. I am five years old: I am crying into the skirt of my mother. "Where is your husband?" They ask again. They snatch me from my mother, throw me on the ground, and immobilize me by putting a bare dirty foot on my chest. They squeeze me on the ground and I suffer as if striped sharp cracks cut into me like nails. They yelled to my mother: "You don't want to speak? You don't want to speak? Look!" One of the men used his highly sharpened spear into my thigh. The blood flows and I do not cry. "You do not want to speak?" My mother keeps her silence. The man withdraws his spear, they all run away, frightened perhaps by the firmness of my mother. This occurred in 1959, in the village where I was born and it was during the time of the Hutu revolution that took to power Grégoire Kayibanda. I will never forget this big broken milk bowl. In my entire life, I thought that I would no more drink milk.

The above quotation is a good illustration of how Mukagasana, at an early age, experienced the beginning of the culture of impunity that later on played a key role in the extermination of Tutsi in 1994. While Yolande was both physically and psychologically tortured, the torture of her mother was at the psychological level. Both Mukagasana and her mother had committed no crime.

Their silence when they were being tortured needs special consideration. Under normal circumstances, it is not possible to see a kid of five years old have such self-control and stop crying when ill or even non-ill-intentioned people stick a highly sharpened spear into his/her thigh causing terrible pain and bleeding.

The same applies to a mother seeing her suffering kid and preventing herself from crying or trying to protect him/her. The explanation to this is that when people are in the hands of their enemies with no possibility to be rescued, and when their enemies are stronger than them, their only remaining option is to become inert and wait for their fate. This is what happened to Mukagasana and her mother.

The culture of impunity is also revealed in the discussion that Yolande held with her husband, Joseph:

Nous ne parlons pas. Joseph s'exclame soudain, me sortant de ma torpeur. "Cyanika! Si j'étais mort à Cyanika!" Joseph m'a raconté mille fois. Cela se passe en 1963, le matin de Noël, il a treize ans. Des hommes armés de machettes et de gourdins font irruption dans la maison de ses parents. Ils ligotent solidement son père et son frère aîné. Peu après les hommes reviennent, emmènent les filles, laissant la mère seule avec Joseph (Mukagasana, 1997:37).

We are silent. Suddenly, Joseph exclaims and brings me out of my torpor. "Cyanika! If I were dead in Cyanika!" Joseph repeated this a thousand times. It happened in the morning of Christmas in 1963, he was then thirteen years old. Men armed with machetes and sticks burst into the house of his parents. They tightly bound his father and his elder brother. Shortly after, the men returned, took girls and left the mother alone with Joseph.

The genocide experience that Joseph was going through made him regret why he was still living. He even wondered why he was not killed in 1963 when Hutu extremists murdered Tutsi. This reaction to seeing life in a pessimistic way was analysed in the previous section when I was explaining the theme of revolt against life and nature in *La mort ne veut pas de moi*.

It is important to give further clarifications on how the culture of impunity became one of the root causes of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. Since the 1959 blood revolution of Hutu extremists to April 1994, all extremists Hutu who planned and executed the successive massacres of innocent Tutsi were not punished. The then leaders of the country granted them an amnesty (the First and the Second Republic); some of them were even promoted to higher

positions! This made those Hutu become proud of killing Tutsi. Moderate Hutu who did not support this plan were in conflict with extremist Hutu who were accusing them of being traitors and allies of Tutsi.

When the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) launched the liberation war in October 1994 as it was explained in chapter one, the simmering hatred that Hutu extremists had for Tutsi became worse. These extremists started to prepare the genocide against Tutsi. Having in mind that in all previous killings of Tutsi there had never been any legal action against Hutu who had participated in the killings of Tutsi, Hutu extremists were motivated more than ever to kill Tutsi. At that time they had a strong false excuse: Rwanda was attacked by RPF and it was imperative for them to exterminate Tutsi who were inside the country whom they wrongly accused of being accomplices of RPF. I will not elaborate on this as it was well captured in chapter one.

Mukagasana is very frustrated by the culture of impunity that went unnoticed by the UN between 1959 and 1994. Here is how she puts it:

Il y a au Rwanda un génocide permanent, fait de massacres incessants. Celui-là, j'avais cinq ans. Celui de 1963 à Bufundu Gikongoro, j'avais neuf ans. Celui de 1967 dans le Bugesera, j'avais treize ans. Celui de 1973, dans tout le pays, j'avais dix-neuf ans. Les massacres de Kibilira en 1990, ceux du Bugesera en 1992, ceux de Ruhengeri, chez les Bagogwe, en 1993, et tant d'autres, ponctuels. Autant de génocides impunis et ignorés par l'ONU (Mukagasana, 1997:36-37).

In Rwanda, there is a permanent genocide. It is a result of continuous massacres. That one [when a Hutu extremist used his highly-sharpened spear into Yolande's thigh as explained in the previous quotation], I was five years old. That of Bufundu Gikongoro in 1963, I was nine. The one of 1967 in Bugesera, I was thirteen. The genocide of 1973 that took place in the entire country, I was nineteen. The massacres of Kibilira in 1990, those of the Bugesera in 1992, those of Ruhengeri in Bagogwe in 1993, and many others, on a sporadic basis. All of those genocides went unpunished and were ignored by the UN.

This quotation emphasises this culture of impunity. In addition, it gives more examples of how under the First and Second Republic Hutu extremists were allowed to oppress and kill Tutsi without facing any legal punishment. A close analysis of the above quotation shows also that the 1994 genocide against Tutsi was planned for a long time. The killings that preceded were a test to see how the general genocide would be executed. Lastly, this quotation ends by mentioning how the United Nations betrayed Rwanda in all the mentioned series of killings that led to the 1994 genocide.

3.3.3. Exclusion, discrimination, and humiliation of Tutsi

Any reader who closely analyses *La mort ne veut pas de moi* realises that the theme of exclusion, discrimination and humiliation is repeatedly mentioned in the testimony. Exclusion as pointed out in chapter two, is one of ten stages of genocide as developed by the American human rights activist, Dr. Gregory H. Stanton. Yolande shows how Tutsi were considered as strangers in their own country. Compared to other Rwandans, they had limited rights, and in some cases they had even no rights.

The following quotation is a good example of how Tutsi were excluded and discriminated:

Mes enfants devront-ils vivre dans un pays que le génocide revient visiter de manière cyclique, comme un ange exterminateur? Eux qui ne savaient pas avant douze ans qu'ils étaient Tutsi! Eux qui ne l'ont appris [que] le jour où le ministère [de l'Education] a décidé de séparer dans les écoles les enfants Tutsi des enfants Hutu (Mukagasana, 1997:37).

Will my children live in a country in which genocide occurs cyclically as an exterminator? Them who did not even know before twelve that they were Tutsi! Them who discovered it when the ministry [of Education] decided to separate Tutsi children from Hutu children in schools.

Separation of Tutsi children from Hutu children in schools was in the framework of implementing the ethnically discriminatory policy that was introduced by Hutu extremists of the First Republic and widely enhanced by leaders of the Second Republic who added to it the regional discrimination as earlier explained in chapter one. Separating Tutsi from Hutu aimed at helping both leaders of the First and Second Republic to prevent Tutsi from accessing, in large numbers, employment, schools and other national opportunities. Under this exclusion and discrimination policy, Rwandans were sharing advantages that they were entitled to, as inhabitants of the same country, not on the basis of their abilities, skills, and experiences but on the basis of who they were and where they were born from.

Leaders of the First and Second Republic were discriminating Tutsi, conducted different population censuses and used their results as a justification. The 1978 census indicated that Tutsi were representing 10.6% of the population and that their admission in secondary schools should not exceed that number. The 1978 census that was carried out by the National Census of the Population (ONAPO), showed that the number of the Hutu had reached 89.7%; the Tutsi were 9.77%, and the Twa 0.46%. Those who were naturalised as Rwandans were 0.07%. Some people consider these statistics as pure manipulations. But even if they were accurate, there is no reason that justifies that the rights of people should be determined by their number. In democracy, people have to be equal irrespective of their origins. Only their abilities should matter.

Coming back to the exclusion and discrimination of Tutsi, it has to be pointed out that this went hand in hand with humiliation. In schools, when innocent Tutsi children who did not even know that they were Tutsi were asked to stand up, the majority Hutu children who were studying with them would deride them. Tutsi who were lucky to finish their studies were embarrassed each time they applied for jobs. They could not be employed, even if they were the best candidates. This left them with a general feeling of discomfort and they wondered why they were facing these injustices and why they had studied. The

humiliation of Nadine, Mukagasana's daughter in class and that of Yolande herself are a good example of how Tutsi were humiliated:

Nadine, qui n'a jamais compris pourquoi sa meilleure amie en classe était Hutu, qui ne comprenait même pas quelle différence il pouvait y avoir entre le Hutu et le Tutsi. Elle qui se faisait régulièrement humilier en classe, parce que elle était Tutsi. Comme moi, tout au long de ma scolarité, j'ai été humiliée. Des directrices pro-Hutu en arrivaient même à diminuer mes notes, à l'insu des professeurs. Plus tard, des ministres Hutu m'ont proposé des postes d'infirmière, interdits aux Tutsi, en échange de quelques services spéciaux que j'ai toujours refuser d'accomplir (Mukagasana, 1997: 37).

Nadine who never understood why her best friend in class was a Hutu, and what difference was there between Hutu and Tutsi, was regularly humiliated in class, because she was a Tutsi. Even myself, throughout my studies, I was humiliated. Pro-Hutu headmasters used to reduce my school marks without the knowledge of my teachers. Later, some Hutu Ministers proposed me a nurse job that was forbidden to Tutsi but in exchange for some special services that I always refused.

Another example of humiliation to both Mukagasana and her children is when she met her them after they were wounded by génocidaires who wanted to kill them but luckily survived though it was for a short time: "*Blessés, mais vivants. Torturés, mais vivants. Humiliés, mais vivants. C'est dans cet état que je retrouve mes enfants*" (Mukagasana, 1997:92)/Injured, but alive. Tortured but alive. Humiliated but alive. It is in this state that I found my children.

When Mukagasana saw her wounded children, she was psychologically humiliated. She could not digest why Hutu extremists had wounded her innocent children. The same frustration was also in the minds of her hopeless children who despite what had happened to them were still strong to resist the hardships of their new lives.

In addition to the frustration that Nadine and Yolande experienced as previously explained, it is important to note another frustration that was unique to Yolande. This uniqueness is in the revelation that Yolande made when she explained how some Hutu Ministers offered her their assistance to

get nurse jobs in exchange for having sex with them. Indeed, under the First and Second Republics, some Hutu leaders used their political influence as a weapon to have sex with Tutsi ladies so that they could, in turn, help them get what they were not allowed to have as per the then existing exclusion and discrimination rules. It is known that Tutsi ladies who accepted to have sex with those Hutu leaders got some advantages, which were even extended to some members of their respective families. However, it has to be made clear that Hutu leaders, especially those in military and security organs were not allowed to marry Tutsi women. Those who disobeyed were treated traitors by the Government and as a result, they could not be promoted anymore or get other advantages that they were entitled to.

To force Hutu soldiers to never attempt to marry Tutsi, in December 1990, two months after RPF had launched its liberation war, *Kangura*, a newspaper that was used by Hutu extremists to mobilise all Hutu to stand up and fight Tutsi, published “Hutu Ten Commandments”, an anti-Tutsi propaganda. Among these commandments, the seventh one went as follows: The Rwandan Armed Forces should be exclusively Hutu. The experience of the October 1990 war has taught us a lesson. No member of the military shall marry a Tutsi.

Humiliation is also seen in dialogue between Yolande and Colonel Rucibigango. The latter was a colonel in the defeated former Rwandan Army Forces (FAR) who volunteered to protect and hide Yolande. Mireille who was a soldier in FAR introduced her to him. It is Emmanuelle, a Hutu lady who had arranged this rescue plan for Mukagasana. To escape the génocidaires roadblocks, she gave to Mukagasana a false identity card that indicated that she was a Hutu. It was agreed that Yolande would tell the génocidaires that she was the aunt of Emmanuelle. On their way to Colonel Rucibigango’s residence, Mireille assured Yolande that though she was taking her to a senior officer in the army, nothing bad would happen to her. This is how she said it:

Ne t'inquiète pas, Yolande, je te conduis chez mon supérieur. Quoique Hutu et quoique colonel, il accepte de t'héberger, car il te connaît un peu. Par ailleurs, c'est un homme du Sud. Et il sait que sa peau ne vaut pas beaucoup plus que la tienne (Mukagasana, 1997:173).

Don't worry, Yolande, I am taking you to my supervisor. Although he is a Hutu and a colonel, he somehow knows you and has accepted to protect you. By the way, he is from the South and he knows quite well that his life may be in danger like yours.

The cause of this fear felt by the senior officer is explained in the Rwandan socio-political assessment of that time as clearly pointed out by Nkunzumwami (1996:95):

Since 1973, revenge by the citizens from the North recently installed in power against those from the South of the former regime, started immediately with arrests, imprisonment, torture, and executions of Hutu from the South, those who were former officials of the First Republic. Regionalism in favour of the North intensified in schools, the army, recruitment in the public and private services, and the management of economic affairs in the country. The political, military and economic power was concentrated in a few families close to the authors of *the coup d'état* from the Northern part of the country. Repression and injustice increased and became institutionalized. There was a fracture between the North and the South, which kept on increasing, resulting in Tutsi becoming stateless and being excluded from every area.

Mukagasana's frustration with Colonel Rucibigango is exemplified in a simple statement he was mentioning to Mukagasana that her husband was killed in genocide: *"Mes condoléances, madame. Nous vous avons coupé les seins....Quant à votre mari, nous pouvons tous le remplacer valablement"* (Mukagasana, 1997:179)/Madam, please receive my condolences. We have exterminated members of your family.... As for your late husband, we can all correctly replace him.

This message that Colonel Rucibigango was addressing to Yolande who had just lost her husband and children in the then-ongoing genocide was a sadistic provocation. It was even an insult. To Yolande who was aware that Colonel

Rucibigango was living with the Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (HIV/AIDS) as she said it “*Ce type a le sida, et il court après tout ce qui bouge!*” (Mukagasana, 1997:173)/That man is HIV positive! He is a skirt chaser; he goes after anything that moves. It was hard to digest his statement. As she was in a weaker position, she managed to control her anger and kept quiet. However, inside her mind, she was undergoing dramatic psychological trauma.

To clearly understand the inhuman behaviour of Colonel Rucibigango, one needs to read the 1996 report of Human Rights Watch that dealt with the sexual violence during the 1994 genocide against Tutsi and its aftermath. This report pointed out that the rape of Tutsi women was used as a weapon to terrorize and degrade them.

The same report indicates that in some cases, the génocidaires carried out rape in sadistic ways:

Although the exact number of women raped will never be known, testimonies [HRW and other aid organizations gathered] from survivors confirm that rape was extremely widespread and that thousands of women were individually raped, gang-raped with objects such as sharpened sticks or gun barrels, held in sexual slavery (either collectively or through forced “marriage”) or sexually mutilated (Accessed on June 20th, 2016).

The frustration of Mukagasana after the insult of Colonel Rucibigango became worse when a few minutes later, Charles, a soldier in the former génocidaire army added a hurtful statement:

Charles était en train de me raconter son travail. Vas-y, continue ton histoire. Alors, mon colonel, j’ai juré devant tous les soldats que, si un seul de ces cancrelats s’en tirait, je n’habiterais plus ce pays. Car la théorie selon laquelle nous n’arriverons jamais à exterminer les Tutsi serait encore une fois confirmée (Mukagasana, 1997:180).

Charles was narrating how he participated in the killings. Go on, continue your story. My Colonel, Sir, I swore before all soldiers that, if one of these cockroaches [meaning Tutsi] survives, I will never live

in this country. If this happens, it would confirm the theory that we will never be able to exterminate Tutsi.

Charles was not aware that Yolande was a Tutsi. Having seen the fake identity card indicating that Yolande was a Hutu, and having in mind that Colonel Rucibigango as a Hutu and senior officer in the FAR could not hide a Tutsi, he was confident that all his audience was Hutu. Yolande who knew that she was a Tutsi and whose heart was still bleeding because of the death of her children and husband; she was very desperate and already psychologically dead.

3.3.4. Incitement to ethnical hatred

Incitement to ethnical hatred is one of the themes that Yolande Mukagasana develops in her testimony, *La mort ne veut pas de moi*. This theme is an illustration of the implementation of the fifth stage of genocide, i.e preparation that was mentioned in chapter two of this thesis. In this stage, planners of genocide identify their victims, draw their lists and force them to wear identifying symbols. In the genocide against Tutsi, the identifying symbols were the then identity cards that indicated the “ethnic” belonging of Rwandans.

The most fervent incitement to ethnical hatred was disseminated by *Radio-Television des Milles Collines* (RTLTM):

The birth of Radio-Television des Milles Collines (RTLTM) in 1993 could not have come at a better time for Rwanda’s Hutu elite. Finally, here was a radio station they could use as a mouthpiece for their ideals and a means to propagate their ethno-political war against the Tutsi dominated Patriotic Front (RPF) [...] The general picture painted of the Tutsi community by RTLTM was that of a treacherous people, people who had hoodwinked the Hutu, living with them in apparent peace, while all the while planning an attack (Thompson, 2007:110-112).

In *La mort ne veut pas de moi*, Yolande describes RTLM as a “hate radio” whose main objective was to incite Hutu to exterminate all Tutsi. She gives an example of how RTLM used to read names of Tutsi who were killed countrywide in order to motivate those who had not started to kill Tutsi to do so:

Elle [RTLM] égrène les morts de nuit. “Préfecture de Kigali rural, commune de Kanzenze, secteur de Ntarama, morts: quatre noms prononcés avec une haine joyeuse. Préfecture de Byumba, commune de Kibali, secteur de Buhambe, morts: trois noms, Préfecture de Gitarama, commune de Mushubati, secteur de Remera, morts: dix-sept noms, une famille entière.” Cela ressemble à des résultats électoraux, diffusés par des radios de nuit, après un scrutin démocratique (Mukagasana, 1997:42-43).

It [RTLM] goes through the victims of the night. “Prefecture of Kigali rural, Kanzenze district, Ntarama sector, deaths: four names read with a joyful hatred tone. Byumba prefecture, Kibali district, Buhambe sector, deaths: three names are read, Prefecture of Gitarama, Mushubati district, Remera sector, deaths: seventeen names are given, an entire family”. This looks like a publication of electoral results broadcasted by radio stations operating in the night, after a democratic election.

As earlier mentioned, the publication of names of Tutsi who were victims of genocide and the accompanying messages explaining how these murdered Tutsi were enemies of all Hutu and allies of RPF aimed at tarnishing the image of Tutsi and sensitizing Hutu who had not yet decided to actively participate in the extermination of Tutsi, to do it with immediate effect. To motivate Hutu to kill Tutsi, RTLM used the following inciting words:

D’une voix de stentor, Kantano, le meilleur animateur de la station [RTLM], appelle au meurtre. Un de ses tristes comparses appuie la démonstration. “Vengeons, dit-il, l’immonde assassinat par les cancrelats du bien-aimé Juvénal Habyarimana et vengeons en même temps celui, le 21 octobre 1993, de Melchior Ndadaye, le regretté président du Burundi. Traquez partout le serpent [Tutsi] et tuez-le. Que le monde, par votre magnifique travail, soit à jamais libéré du mal!” (Mukagasana, 1997:33).

In a loud voice, Kantano, one of the best presenters of the radio [RTLM], campaigns for genocide. One of his sad stooges supports his demonstration. He says, "Let's revenge, the foul murder of our

beloved Juvénal Habyarimana and let's revenge at the same time, that of Melchior Ndadaye, the late president of Burundi that occurred on October 21st, 1993 who were both killed by the cockroaches. Hunt down the snake [Tutsi] and kill it. May the whole world, through your brilliant work, be released from evil and forever!"

Referring to Tutsi as cockroaches or snakes as described in the above quotation, was a way of dehumanising them, increasing the ethnic hatred in the minds of all Hutu and making Hutu feel not any remorse or sympathy when killing Tutsi. Indeed, the aim of Kantano's ethnically hateful words was to ideologically "ensure" Hutu extremists that killing Tutsi was equal to eliminating dangerous animals that could harm the lives of human beings. According to Kantano, only Hutu were described as human beings. Tutsi were considered as non-humans!

In order to increase the hatred that Hutu had against Tutsi, Kantano's propaganda as per the above quotation points out three main inciting ideas that need further analysis. The first one was to convince, without any investigation, that the Tutsi killed President Juvénal Habyarimana when he was later coming back to Rwanda from Tanzania on April 6, 1994. As Hutu were the majority and were prepared in advance to carry out genocide as earlier explained, Kantano's timely message was a catalyser that Hutu extremists were anxiously awaiting for a long time. It became a trigger and justification for Hutu extremists who immediately obeyed his instructions and started to exterminate Tutsi with no mercy and remorse.

The second idea of the Kantano's message was to intentionally link the death of Habyarimana to that of Melchior Ndadaye, the first democratically elected and first Hutu president of Burundi that occurred on 21 October 1993. The late Ndadaye who spent only three months in office was killed in a failed military coup. It is believed that Tutsi soldiers killed him. His death was followed by pitiless mass killings between Hutu and Tutsi, which resulted in the civil war that lasted for a decade. During this civil war many Burundian Hutu who had

exiled in Rwanda were very angry with the Tutsi of Burundi. When they reached Rwanda, they found a country that was at war with the RPF. The then government as explained in chapter one, had wrongly succeeded in convincing almost all Rwandan extremist Hutu of the conspiracy or falsehood that all Tutsi who were inside the country were the allies of the Tutsi who attacked (from RPF) the country in 1990.

By asking Hutu of Rwanda to kill Tutsi as a revenge to the death of Habyarimana and that of Melchior Ndadaye who was not Rwandan (and intentionally not referring to the death of the Burundian Hutu Cyprien Ntaryamira who died in the same plane with Habyarimana), Kantano wanted to show to Burundian Hutu refugees that the Hutu of Rwanda were sympathetic to them. However, the main purpose behind Kantano's message was to show to those Burundians that both the Tutsi of Rwanda and those of Burundi were bad people who hated Hutu in the two countries. Indirectly, Kantano was sensitising the Hutu Burundian refugees in Rwanda to closely help the Rwandan Hutu extremists to exterminate the Tutsi of Rwanda. Kantano actually succeeded. Indeed, during genocide many of the Burundian Hutu refugees, especially those who were living in Butare (Huye) Gitarama (Ruhango) and Byumba (Gicumbi) actively participated in the genocide against Tutsi. Some of them were even tried in the Gacaca courts, in absentia, and found guilty (Mukantaganzwa, 2010:256-257).

The description of incitement to ethnic hatred is almost everywhere in Mukagasana's *La mort ne veut pas de moi*. Another example is in the following quotation:

Comment distinguer le cancrelat du Hutu? Plusieurs moyens sont à votre disposition: le cancrelat a les incisives écartées. Le cancrelat a le talon étroit. Le cancrelat a huit paires de côtes. La femme cancrelat a des vergetures sur les cuisses, près des fesses. Le cancrelat a le nez fin. Le cancrelat a le cheveu moins crépu. Le crane du cancrelat est long derrière, et son front incliné. Le cancrelat est grand et il y a

de la morgue dans son regard. L'homme Tutsi a une pomme d'Adam prononcée (Mukagasana, 1997:43).

How to distinguish the cockroach [the Tutsi] from the Hutu? Here are several ways: the cockroach has gap incisors. The cockroach has small heel. The cockroach has eight pairs of ribs. The cockroach woman has stretch marks on her thighs, near the buttocks. The cockroach has a fine nose. The cockroach has less frizzy hair. The skull of the cockroach is especially elongated at the rear, and its forehead is slanted. The cockroach is tall and there is arrogance in his/her face. The Tutsi male has a prominent Adam's apple.

The above quotation from radio RTLM, is a good example of how Hutu extremists dehumanised Tutsi before killing them and how they [Hutu extremists] were considering themselves as the “pure race” while they were describing Tutsi as unhuman. Their strategy is like the one that was used by Nazis when they were preparing and executing the holocaust. As Waller (2002:246) says, Nazi propagandists routinely employed terms like “*Vermin*”, “*bacilli*”, “*parasites*”, “*demons*”, “*cancer*”, “*excrement*”....to refer to the Jewish population of areas under their control”. Indeed, the use of the dehumanising rhetoric based on inappropriate assumptions was a step that permitted Hutu extremists to kill Tutsi with impunity. As explained in previous chapters, Hutu extremists were calling Tutsi “cockroaches”, and other dehumanising words like snakes that any human being has to squash and get rid of.

3.3. 5. Inhumanity and evil

The last main theme discussed in Mukagasana's *La mort ne veut pas de moi* is that of inhumanity and evil. Whereas according to the Cambridge English dictionary, inhumanity is defined as an extremely cruel and brutal behaviour, evil is defined as an absence or opposite of that which is recognized as being good. In *La mort ne veut pas de moi*, Yolande portrays scenarios that indicate how during genocide the behaviour and actions of génocidaires were inhuman and immoral. Simply put it, génocidaires had lost the qualities of human

beings. They were behaving like animals in a jungle. Here are some examples of how she said it:

Je les entends régulièrement discuter entre eux.

Tu te souviens? La fille du ministère qui passait chaque matin sans nous saluer? Une secrétaire, assez jolie du reste....

-La maigre qui avait des lunettes dorées?

-Oui, elle. Tu sais ce qui s'est passé?

-No.

-Eh bien! Ce matin, elle est arrivée vers moi en pleurant. "Sauvez-moi, me dit-elle, sauvez-moi!"

-Et qu'est-ce que tu as fait?

-Ce que j'ai fait? Mais mon devoir de militaire, bien évidemment! Je lui ai demandé ses papiers. J'ai vu qu'elle était hutu. Mais j'ai eu un doute. Tu sais, c'est une fille assez grande. Alors, je l'ai interrogée. Je voyais qu'elle avait peur. Elle m'a finalement avoué que son père était Tutsi. Tu vois la suite....

-Qu'est-ce que tu as fait?

-Je l'ai traité de cancrelat. Je lui ai dit qu'elle n'était qu'un serpent qui avait pris la place d'un Hutu. Et je lui ai logé une balle dans la tête. Tu aurais dû voir. Tous les passants se sont arrêtés et ont commencé à l'injurier et à lui donner des coups de pied (Mukagasana, 1997:187-188).

I often hear their discussions. Do you remember the lady who works in the ministry and who every morning passes here without greeting us? I mean the beautiful secretary...

-The slim one with golden glasses?

-Yes of course! Do you know what happened?

-No.

-Well! This morning, she came to me crying and shouting: "Save me, save me!"

-And what did you do?

-What I did? Of course I accomplished my military duty! I asked her for her identity card and noticed that she was a Hutu. However, I was not convinced. As you know, she is a taller lady. I then

questioned her. I realized that she was afraid. She finally admitted that her father was a Tutsi. You guess what followed...

-What did you do?

-I treated her like a cockroach. I told her that she was a snake who had taken the place of a Hutu. And I shot her in the head. I wish you should have been there to witness it! All the passers-by stopped and started to profane her by kicking her.

The inhumanity and evil are described in the above quotation in twofold. Firstly, they are found in the inhuman behaviour of the soldier who refused to assist the lady who came to him requesting to be rescued. This refusal to assist a person in danger violates the common principle of duty to rescue. The soldier who was in a good position to assist the lady who had escaped the génocidaires failed to help her. He instead treated her as an enemy and was suspicious of her; he asked her questions to justify why he had to kill her. He finally killed her and was happy to narrate the story to his comrade. He even went further and wished his comrade were present to witness how the lady was killed.

Secondly, inhumanity and evil are in the concluding sentence of the quotation where the author shows how all the passers-by near the body of the killed lady stopped to profane her body. Profaning a body of a dead person is punishable in all laws. The profanation of her body became worse when they started to kick her dead body. This misbehaviour is a testimony to the inhumanity and evil that characterized some of the génocidaires. During the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, cases like these were reported in different places.

Inhumanity and evil continue in the conversation between the two soldiers when the one who was being told the story of how his comrade had killed the lady explained to him how he would have killed her in the most inhuman and dreadful way:

-Tu n'aurais pas dû la tuer tout de suite. Tu aurais dû la dénoncer d'abord, laisser les gens la frapper, et ensuite l'abattre.

-C'est vrai. Tu as raison, Mais j'étais tellement furieux d'avoir été trompé des jours durant, par le fait qu'elle travaillait au Ministère.

Les deux militaires s'embrassent. "De toute façon, tout est bien qui finit bien" (Mukagasana, 1997:188).

-You should not have killed her immediately. You should have first denounced her, let people punch her, and finally shoot her.

-It is true, you are right! However, I was very furious for having discovered late her identity as I was misled by the fact that she was working in the Ministry. The two soldiers hugged each other [and said]: "In any case, all's well that ends well".

The misbehaviour of the two soldiers is yet another justification that proves how the theme of inhumanity and evil is at work in Mukagasana *La mort ne veut pas de moi*. These two soldiers appear to be very "proud" when discussing how Tutsi had to be exterminated in the most merciless and immoral way. It is a pity to see soldiers who were supposed to protect all Rwandans without any distinction having such discussions. However, as many of the members of the defeated former Rwandan Army Forces (FAR) were involved in the execution of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, this should not be a surprise to any person.

The hug between the two soldiers as a way of celebrating the death of the lady and how they used the words "All's Well That Ends Well", words that were used in the title of one of the famous plays of William Shakespeare, is another indicator of the presence of the theme of inhumanity and evil in Mukagasana's testimony.

Another example that portrays the theme of inhumanity and evil is found in a reaction of one of the two soldiers to the idea of the cook who was telling them that killing Tutsi who had not committed any crime was not good as God could punish them:

-Tu dis que le sang versé nous portera malheur? Tu dis cela? Tu ne serais Tutsi, mais par hasard? Le cuisinier pâlit. Non, il n'est pas Tutsi, mais il a peur de la vengeance d'Imana. Les soldats rient. Mais le sang Tutsi porte bonheur, au contraire! Tous ceux qui l'ont versé sont aujourd'hui ministres, ambassadeurs, ou au moins cadres dans la fonction publique! Je vois bien que tu n'as pas versé de sang Tutsi. Sinon, tu ne serais pas cuisinier!

-Imana est le seul juge!

-Imana! Imana! Tu es trop drôle! Imana ne se s'occupe plus du Rwanda depuis longtemps. C'est l'armée qui s'en charge (Mukagasana, 1997:188-189).

You are saying that blood of Tutsi whom we have killed will bring us misfortune? Why are you saying this? Aren't you perhaps a Tutsi? The cook looked pale.

No, he is not Tutsi, he only fears God's vengeance. The soldiers laughed and one of them said that on the contrary, the blood of Tutsi brings happiness! All people who killed Tutsi are now ministers, ambassadors, or occupy good positions in high offices! I am now convinced you did not kill any Tutsi. If you have done it, you wouldn't be a cook!

-You mean God is the only judge! God! God! You are too funny! For a long time, God is no longer in control of Rwanda. Rwanda is in the hands of the army.

As the above quotation reveals, the inhumanity and evil of the génocidaires had even gone beyond limits! To them, God could not even stop them from exterminating Tutsi. In addition, as earlier explained, under the First and Second Republic, killing Tutsi was rewarding. Hutu who excelled in killing Tutsi were promoted to higher positions. Planners of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi used this strategy in order to prompt all Hutu to participate in the killing of Tutsi.

3.4. Conclusion

In a nutshell, the testimony of Yolande Mukagasana in *La mort ne veut pas de moi* contains five main themes: revolt against life and nature; culture of impunity as the genesis of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi; exclusion, discrimination, and humiliation of Tutsi; incitement to ethnic hatred and inhumanity and evil. Through these themes, though Mukagasana's *La mort ne veut pas de moi* has not to be considered as a historical reference, the reader is able to understand the preparation of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, its execution as well as the suffering of victims during that genocide.

CHAPTER FOUR: THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF *N'AIE PAS PEUR DE SAVOIR* (1999)

4.1. *Background to N'aie pas peur de savoir*

N'aie pas peur de savoir, loosely translated in English as *Don't be afraid to know*, is the second testimony of Yolande Mukagasana. She wrote it in 1999 and published it in Paris at Editions Robert Laffont. The testimony is divided into two main parts. The first part is a rewriting of her first testimony, *La mort ne veut pas de moi /Death does not want me* (1997), with more details. The second part is a clear description of the role of the international community, especially France, in the genocide against Tutsi and justice.

As it was the case in her first testimony, *La mort ne veut pas de moi* (1997), in writing *N'aie pas peur de savoir* Yolande had to look for an experienced writer as she is not a trained author. She again chose Patrick May, the Belgian journalist, and author who had helped her to write her first testimony. Contrary to *La mort ne veut pas de moi* in which Yolande's participation was nearly invisible, in *N'aie pas peur de savoir*, her participation is very clear. The following quotation is a good illustration:

*Mon écrivain s'est lancé à corps perdu dans le travail. Il reprend tout à zéro. Nous travaillons ensemble tous les jours pendant cinq ou six heures. Nous lisons un chapitre de mon manuscrit, puis mon écrivain me le fait raconter à nouveau, examine mes mimiques, mes réactions, mes chagrins, mes révoltes. Il couvre des centaines de pages de notes. [...] Et la nuit, mon écrivain lit des ouvrages sur mon pays. Notre livre est presque aussitôt en chantier. Mon écrivain rédige la nuit, avec fièvre. Il me téléphone parfois à trois heures du matin pour me demander un détail, quelle tête faisait le colonel Rucibigango lorsque je lui ai rendu sa grenade ou s'il y a des crocodiles dans la Nyabarongo. Son ignorance me fait rigoler, sa passion m'émeut. [...] C'est la première fois que je parviens vraiment à pleurer sur mes enfants. J'ai l'impression que ce manuscrit est la première pierre de la nouvelle maison que je vais construire, une maison pour tous les enfants du monde, les vivants et morts. Ma parole a été faite le livre et le livre parle en mon nom. Le livre sort enfin, sous le titre *La mort ne veut pas de moi* (Mukagasana, 1999: 272-273).*

My author was heavily involved in my work. He revised everything from zero. We worked together every day for five or six hours. We read a chapter of my manuscript, then my author asked me to repeat it again. He observed my facial expressions, my reactions, my sorrows, and my revolts. He edited hundreds of pages of my manuscript. [...] And during the night, my author was reading books on my country. Writing our book was already in high gear. My writer wrote tirelessly over the night. He used to call me at late hours, often around three A.M to ask me additional details: what was Colonel Rucibigango doing when I gave him his grenade or he wanted to know whether there are crocodiles in River Nyabarongo. His ignorance made me laugh, and his passion impressed me. It is my first time to be able to mourn and cry for my lost children. I have the impression that this manuscript is the first stone of the new house that I will build, a house for all living and dead children of the world. My testimony becomes a book and it speaks on my behalf. The book is finally published under the title *N'aie pas peur de savoir/Death does not want me*.

The above quotation is a clear indicator of Mukagasana's full participation in the final manuscript of her second testimony. It also shows the role of Patrick May, Mukagasana's writer, who in addition to his editing added new ideas from his different readings on historical and critical publications about Rwandan history and genocide against Tutsi. As Névine and Amy point it out, "*this is suggestive of May's desire to remain faithful to Mukagasana; narrative in the writing of the text, foregrounding her lived experiences*" (Mukagasana, 1999:126).

As earlier said, the second part of *N'aie pas peur de savoir*, mainly exposes, with frustration and anger, the role of France in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. In this part, Yolande also condemns the United Nations, the Media and the Faith-based Organisations, which until now are still reluctant to acknowledge their role in that genocide.

In order to avoid boring readers, in analysing the main themes that are discussed in *N'aie pas peur de savoir*, the analysed shared themes in the *La mort ne veut pas de moi* will not be dealt with. Only new themes will be examined.

4. 2. Main themes in *N'aie pas peur de savoir*

4.2.1. Betrayal

The theme of betrayal is found on four levels: betrayal by France, betrayal by the international community in general and the one of France in particular, betrayal by the faith-based organisations and betrayal between friends.

4.2.2. Betrayal by France

The French betrayal starts at the very beginning. It appears in the “avertissement aux lecteurs”/Warning to readers. In the latter, Mukagasana directly addresses her French audience whom she wants to clearly understand how their leadership, under President François Mitterrand, played a key role in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. What is more frustrating for Mukagasana, is to see French authorities continuing to deny their responsibilities in spite of a sea of evidence apparent to anybody who cares to see. In warning French citizens prior to reading her testimony, she wants them to open their eyes and have a critical reading so that they may decide themselves who is correct and who is wrong, between Yolande herself who experienced genocide and lost her three children, husband, almost all her relatives and friends, and a fabricated version of genocide by French leaders who want to hide their role.

This is how specifically Yolande addresses the French audience:

Chers amis français,

Votre nation est le pays des droits de l'homme. Ce livre vous déplaira peut-être, parce qu'il pointe du doigt un dysfonctionnement de votre démocratie à éclipses: un exécutif qui, aux termes de la Constitution de 1958, n'a pas de comptes à rendre sur la politique extérieure, africaine en particulier, devant l'Assemblée Nationale.

Si cela avait été le cas, mes enfants n'auraient peut-être pas été assassinés. Je ne demande que ceci: vérité et justice. Pour les miens et pour mon peuple....

Français, la France ne veut pas savoir. ...Parce que la France a peur de découvrir qu'elle est coupable de complicité dans le génocide rwandais. Je cherche seulement à vous informer.

.....Je ne vous demande que ceci: vous, femmes de France, mères, jeunes filles, vous, hommes de France.... je ne vous demande que d'écouter mon histoire et de juger ensuite. De juger si votre pouvoir, incarné par votre président de la République, François Mitterrand à l'époque, s'est montré digne d'une amitié revendiquée depuis un quart de siècle avec mon peuple.

... Je n'ai qu'une chose à vous dire: mes enfants sont morts et ce n'est pas sans cause. Lisez et jugez. Et que Dieu nous départage si nous ne trouvons pas le moyen de renouer le dialogue (Mukagasana, 1999:13-14).

Dear French friends,

Your nation is a country that respects human rights. You may not like this book. This is because it reveals an eclipsing dysfunction in your democracy: A Government, which in conformity with the Constitution of 1958 has no accounts to make before the parliament, on external politics, especially on Africa.

If this was the case, perhaps my children could not have been slaughtered. I only ask this: truth and justice. For my family and my people... French, France does not want to know. ... Because France is afraid to discover that it is guilty of complicity in genocide against Tutsi of Rwanda. I would only like to inform you.

You, French women, mothers, young girls, you, men of France... I only request you to listen to my testimony and judge after. Judge if your government, represented by your president at that time, François Mitterrand, behaved in conformity with the warm relations that our two countries had enjoyed since a quarter of the century.

...I have only one request to you: my children are dead and it is not without a cause. Read and judge yourselves. And may God help us if we are not able to find a way to renew our dialogue.

The above quotation makes it clear that Yolande is an eyewitness of the role of the French government in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. Without the involvement of France, she is convinced that the 1994 genocide against Tutsi would not have happened. As a result, her children, husband, relatives, and friends would have all been alive. In addition, the quotation shows that Yolande

is familiar with the French constitution. She was well informed that the French government, because of its conflicts of interests in the genocide against Tutsi would use all its powers entrusted to it by the 1958 French Constitution to hide the truth to its innocent citizens who had nothing to do with what their leaders did in Rwanda.

The innocence of common French citizens is illustrated in the opening greetings of Yolande's "avertissement aux lecteurs" when she says: "*Chers amis français*"/*Dear French friends*. These friendly words aim at ensuring French citizens that Yolande did not hold a resentment against them. Her problem was with the French leaders.

Yolande Mukagasana's suspicion may be explained by the statement of the then French president, François Mitterrand who in his speech of 8 November 1994 during the France-Africa Summit of Biarritz referred to what had happened in Rwanda as "genocides" (AGIR ICI-SURVIE, 1996:29). The use of "genocide" in the plural form had a special meaning: denying the genocide against Tutsi by opposing to it a genocide against Hutu! In so doing, he wanted to hide the active role of his government, cover the wrongdoings of the former Rwandan government that he supported and tarnish the image of RPF that stopped the genocide. He deliberately accused RPF of committing genocide even though it is well-known that for genocide to happen it has to be planned by a government and the identity of people who have stopped it has to be known.

Coming back to the role of France in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, there are various publications and testimonies that support Yolande's accusations against France leadership during the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. One of them is Melvern (2000:47-48).

This is how she says it:

In spite of Rwanda's ever-worsening situation the regime in Kigali received ever-increasing support from France. And while propping up the regime, France managed successfully to leave the French public and the rest of world in the dark about the extent of its help and interference. It continues to do so to this day. France armed, financed and trained the Presidential Guard, the elite force, which comprised northern Hutu recruited from president's home region of Bushiru. It was French technical and military training that allowed the Rwandan army to increase from 5,000 to 28,000, equipping it with modern weaponry. France tripled financial aid to Rwanda. And all these decisions concerning Rwanda were secret; the French remained uncountable for them.

To help French people know the truth Mukagasana developed an excellent strategy. She decided to directly talk to French mothers. The use of the direct speech was not an accident. Yolande used it because it provides a verbatim account of what was said and because of its emotional and psychological impact on the minds of those who read her testimony. She prefers so because she knows that mothers who suffer a lot in giving births after nine months of pregnancy would be quickly sympathetic to her grief. Once convinced, that would, in turn, convince the whole France and the entire world. The old saying that goes "*a woman's will is God's will*" motivated Mukagasana.

This is how she addressed herself to France mothers:

Ce soir, je sais que la France n'est pas l'amie du Rwanda. Et je songe à toutes les mères de France qui maternent leur enfant et qui regardent la télévision égrener nos douleurs. Savez-vous les mères de France, que vous êtes trompées, que ceux qui vous disent déplorer notre génocide sont ceux-là mêmes qui l'ont permis? Savez-vous, mères de France, que votre président Mitterrand a soutenu notre président Habyarimana, celui qui a préparé le génocide des Tutsi? Savez-vous, mères de France que vos maris et vos enfants soldats sont venus entraîner les soldats rwandais qui ont perpétré le génocide? Savez-vous, mères de France, que les soldats de votre pays, grimés pour paraître africains, se sont battus contre les rwandais qui réclamaient le droit de rentrer dans leur patrie? Savez-vous, mères de France, que des soldats français commandaient l'armée rwandaise, celle qui préparait le génocide? (Mukagasana, 1999:119).

Tonight, I know that France is not a friend to Rwanda. And I think of all French mothers who are spoon-feeding their children and watching the television that is describing our agony. Do you know, mothers of France, that you are being cheated? Those who are trying to tell you to condemn our genocide are those who have made it possible.

Do you know, mothers of France, that Mitterrand, your president supported our president, Habyarimana who prepared the genocide against Tutsi? Do you know, mothers of France that your husbands and children soldiers came to Rwanda to train our soldiers who perpetrated the genocide? Do you know, mothers of France that soldiers of your country, trying to appear more Africans, fought against Rwandans who were fighting for their rights to return to their mother country? Do you know, mothers of France, that French soldiers commanded the Rwandan army that was preparing genocide?

In the above quotation, Yolande uses epiplexis and epimone to attract the attention of her readers. The epiplexis, a rhetorical device in which the speaker reproaches the audience in order to incite or convince them, is found in different questions that Yolande asks to challenge her French audience with the aim of rebuking rather than eliciting answers. For the epimone, a rhetorical term for the frequent repetition of a phrase or question, it is found in frequent repetitions for emphasis, "*Savez-vous, mères de France*"/Do you know, mothers of France. Yolande intentionally used these epiplexis and epimone to directly touch the hearts of French mothers, and have their empathy. The reasons that pushed her to do so were earlier explained.

In addition to epiplexis and epimone, Yolande uses sarcasm, a literary and rhetorical device that is meant to mock, often with satirical or ironic remarks, with the aim of amusing and hurting someone, or some section of society, simultaneously, to expose the role of French leaders in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi.

This is how Mukagasana did it:

Merci François Mitterrand, Mitterrand, merci Edouard Balladur, merci Alain Juppé, merci d'avoir permis à des tueurs d'exercer leur art sur mes enfants. Mais surtout merci, merci du fond du cœur, de me faire comprendre que le génocide des Tutsi n'a pas pu se faire sans votre aide, qu'il suppose votre complicité... (Mukagasana, 1999:161).

Thanks François Mitterrand, thanks Edouard Balladur, thank you Alain Juppé, thank you for having helped the génocidaires to exterminate my children. But above all, from the bottom of my heart, thank you, for having helped me to understand that without your support and involvement, the genocide against Tutsi could not be possible...

In the above quotation Mukagasana was not thanking François Mitterrand, Edouard Balladur and Alain Juppé for a job well done. It has to be remembered that at the time of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, François Mitterrand was the president of France; Edouard Balladur, Prime Minister and Alain Juppé was the Minister of Foreign Affairs. The three played a key role in supporting the then Rwandan government that prepared and executed the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. When the genocide occurred, they were the first to deny it. A good example is Alain Juppé, who, referring to the genocide against Tutsi, in a confidential Elysée meeting, said; "They [Rwandans] have always killed each other like that! Why do you want it to stop?" This position of Alain Juppé is a carbon copy of how François Mitterrand termed the genocide against Tutsi as described in this section.

Mukagasana's description of the involvement of France in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi is supported by the findings of Melvern (2000:48-49):

Five days after the 1994 genocide began; the French embassy in Kigali was abandoned. Left behind was a huge pile of shredded documents, almost filling a room. But some documentary evidence about French military involvement has survived, found in a military archive in Kigali. There is a letter for example from Colonel Déogratias Nsabimana, commander-in-chief of the army, dated 9 December 1992, paying tribute to French soldiers helping to improve the defences against RPF in the north. "The French work has been good but they must be more discreet". Nsabimana wrote to his minister of defence...French soldiers were seen controlling check-points in Kigali, demanding to see identity cards, arresting

Tutsi and passing them over to the Rwandan army. There were complaints about the anti-Tutsi behaviour of the French soldiers. In October 1992, the supporters of an extremist Hutu party took to the streets to demonstrate against a peace agreement with RPF, they were chanting, "Thank you, Mitterrand. Thank you, the people of France." In Kigali, the French president was laughingly called "Mitterahamwe".

4.2.3. Betrayal by the international community

Different authors criticise the international community for having betrayed Rwanda in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. One of them is Linda Melvern (2000:4). She describes this betrayal as follows:

The whole of the international community was involved while genocide was being planned: the United Nations and many of its agencies, independent aid groups, and two of the most powerful international institutions, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

Mukagasana also highlights the role of the United Nations. She gives many examples. The best one is the following:

Devant ces tueries, le silence de la communauté internationale est total. Malgré les avertissements lancés par les intellectuels, François Mitterrand en particulier a feint de ne pas avoir connaissance de massacres. Indifférence? Ou la nécessité de masquer les dérives d'un régime qui sourit si gentiment à la France? (Mukagasana, 1999:23).

Faced with those [genocide] killings, the silence of the international community is total. Despite warnings by intellectuals, François Mitterrand in particular pretended not to have knowledge of those exterminations. Indifference? Or, there is a need to hide abuses of a regime that was a close friend to France?

The silence of the international community, and the United Nations in particular, was observed on 15 March 1994 when Lieutenant-General Roméo Dallaire, Commander General of UNAMIR Forces in Rwanda asked the UN headquarters for reinforcements and for permission to seize militia arms caches. He requested these reinforcements after he had received intelligence reports that Rwanda was going to experience genocide. I will shortly provide

more explanations. This request, the fifth since his 11 January 1994 fax to the UN Secretariat, was refused. Under normal circumstances, with such credible intelligence reports from their representatives in Rwanda, the UN Security Council should not have refused to reinforce the mission in Rwanda in order to allow it to stop the genocide that was imminent. However, due to the complicity of powerful nations in the UN such as France, the UN failed to take the appropriate decision.

Another example that proves how the international community in *N'aie pas peur de savoir* betrayed Rwanda is the revelation of Jean Paul to Mukagasana. Jean Paul, was a cook in one of the Western Embassies in Kigali, Rwanda, for a period of between twelve and fifteen years before genocide. When he was about to die after being burnt alive by the génocidaires, he made the following revelations to Mukagasana:

Jean Paul pense qu'il va mourir. Il veut me confier un grand secret. Je promets de ne le révéler à personne. "Tu ne peux pas savoir, Yolande. Tout le monde était au courant qu'un génocide se préparait. Et personne n'a rien fait." Il me cite en vrac quelques expressions qui émaillaient les télex: "solution finale", "plan machiavélique". "Plan de déstabilisation machiavéliques". "Tu sais, mon patron, il me racontait parfois des choses. Même le mot génocide a été employé. C'est dire si tout le monde sait. Tout le monde savait ce qui se préparait dans notre pays. Et personne n'a rien fait. Tu sais ce qui me rend si triste, c'est la lâcheté des hommes". C'est un secret de Polichinelle (Mukagasana, 1999:159-160).

Jean Paul thinks that he is about to die. He wants to confide to me an important secret. I promise him that I would not share it with anybody. "Yolande, you can't understand. Everyone was aware that genocide was being prepared. And nobody did anything". He gives me, in bulk, some examples that were in the telex: "final solution", "Machiavellian plan", and "Machiavellian destabilization plan". "You know, my boss sometimes used to tell me certain things. He even used the word genocide. This means that it was known. Everyone knew what was prepared in our country. And nobody did anything. You know what makes me so sad, it is men's cowardice". This is an open secret.

Jean Paul's comments to Yolande explain how before the execution of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, the international community had received an intelligence report indicating the readiness of the then government of Rwanda to commit genocide. Even the UN was informed as the following quotation from Dean (2015:34) reveals:

Belgian intelligence appears to have been more aware than most of the growing tension in the country; in December officers warned that youth militias were being trained, and in January 1994 Belgian intelligence officers worked with Jean Pierre, the Hutu informant who led Dallaire to send what has infamously become known as the "Genocide Fax". This fax, sent to UN headquarters in New York, has since been held up by some as the "smoking gun" that proves that genocide could have been foreseen. In December 1993 Jean Pierre approached Belgian officers with intelligence about the planning of genocide; he claimed that he was a senior military instructor involved in training the Hutu militia and he had seen lists of intended victims. In return for asylum, he promised to lead UNAMIR to a number of arms caches across Kigali. On 11 January Dallaire faxed New York with this information and requested authority to carry out raids on the caches based on Jean Pierre's intelligence. The request was refused by the Department of Peace Operations, which evidently feared a repeat of the Mogadishu fiasco, without ever discussing with or officially bringing this issue to the attention of the Security Council members.

By refusing to intervene in Rwanda and stop the genocide that could have been prevented, the United Nations failed to respect and implement its resolution of 9th December 1948 in Article one of the 260 A (III) related to the Convention on the Prevention of the Crime of Genocide).

The same international community that betrayed Rwanda by refusing to stop genocide did the same after genocide. Instead of supporting survivors of genocide who were suffering from the consequences of the aftermath of genocide, they supported génocidaires who had gone in exile after RPF had stopped the genocide.

Mukagasana describes this betrayal as follows:

Nous les rescapés du génocide, nous sommes en train de crever de faim dans un pays exsangue, tandis que les organisations humanitaires envoient chez nos assassins des camions pour les nourrir..... Mais pourquoi les organisations humanitaires oublient-elles les rescapés? L'abandon est sans fin. C'est comme si le monde entier nous en voulait (Mukagasana, 1999:204).

We survivors of genocide, we are dying of hunger in a country on its knees, while humanitarian organizations are sending to our killers trucks [full of food] to feed them... But why humanitarian organizations are forgetting survivors? The betrayal is endless. It is as if the whole world was against us.

Mukagasana was not alone in describing how the international community was interested in génocidaires. She shares the same views with many authors who published books, dissertations, and articles on the genocide against Tutsi, especially those who studied the role of the international community. One of them is Gilbert Catherine (2013:142), an American author, who, in her PhD dissertation on *Writing Trauma: The Voice of the Witness in Rwandan Women's Testimonial Literature*, says: “Not only the international community had abandoned us, but also it took care of our killers, as if humanity was reserved to some and not to others”.

Furthermore, Patrick de Saint-Exupéry (2009:166-167), in his analysis of France's involvement in the genocide, emphasises how the attention of the international community focused on the refugee situation in Zaïre [the current Democratic Republic of Congo], ignoring the fate of survivors in Rwanda: “*Les fosses communes de Goma furent assimilées à celles du génocide. On ne voyait qu'elles. Les assassins furent métamorphosés en victimes*”/The mass graves of Goma were assimilated to those of genocide. Only génocidaires were taken care of. They were metamorphosed into victims.

It has to be recalled that in July 1994, in Goma, Eastern Congo, where nearly more than two million Rwandan refugees, mainly génocidaires had fled the country with the military victory of RPF, a massive cholera epidemic had broken out. The United Nations High Commission for Refugees estimated that

nearly 12,000 people died during that epidemic (www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov) / They were buried in different mass graves which were later found when Rwandan forces entered Congo to stop the military invasion of génocidaires who were about to attack Rwanda with the aim of retaking power, in Rwanda. Those who were supporting the false assumption that the victims in the mass graves were killed by Rwandan forces, wanted to mislead people so that they would not think of their responsibility in the genocide against Tutsi.

The above described betrayal of the international community as seen by Catherine and Patrick de Saint-Exupéry are also pointed out in *N'aie pas peur de savoir*:

Jusqu'à quand accepterez-vous que les Boutros Boutros Ghali et des Kofi Annan chantent en cœur la honte des organismes internationaux dont ils sont les principaux acteurs?...Et que les Balladur, les Juppé et leurs amis expliquent un jour, devant leurs juges, pourquoi ils ont contribué les yeux fermés à un génocide soutenu par leur président Mitterrand?...(Mukagasana, 1999:268).

Until when will you agree that Kofi Annan and Boutros Boutros Ghali will express their shame, as main actors of the international agencies betrayal? And will one day Balladur, Juppé and their friends be brought before judges to explain themselves why they blindly contributed to a genocide that was supported by their president, Mitterrand?

What was frustrating to Mukagasana was to see that even after the 1994 genocide, the international community continued with its hypocrisy. Instead of repenting because of their responsibility, they continued to play a two faced game:

Depuis quelques mois, les responsables politiques occidentaux sont allés pleurer à Kigali. Pleurer à Kigali, c'est la version moderne d'aller à Canossa. C'est aller reconnaître ses erreurs passées. Erreur, erreur, erreur. C'est la politique de reconnaître ses erreurs. Cela leur évitera-t-il que soient pointées leurs responsabilités? (Mukagasana, 1999: 276).

In recent months, Western politicians went to Kigali. Crying in Kigali, is the modern version of go to Canossa. Mourning in Kigali,

is like going to Canossa. It is going to recognize their past mistakes. Error, error, error. It is the strategy of recognizing their mistakes. Will this take away their responsibilities?

All the given examples in this section have supported the theme of international community betrayal in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi that Mukagasana describes in her *N'aie pas peur de savoir*. As she says, the international community was aware of every step of genocide. However, they kept silent: "*Ils savaient. Ils savaient tous. Ils ont laissé faire*" (Mukagasana, 1999:74)/They knew. They all knew. They betrayed us.

In conclusion, it has to be made clear that the betrayal of the international community was done in different ways. As Melvern (2000:5) correctly summarises it: There are "*those whose actions contributed directly to the events. There are others who helped to conceal the reality of what was taking place. And there are some who covered it up. There is evidence that points not just to negligence, but to complicity*".

4.2.4. Betrayal by Faith-based Organisations

In *N'aie pas peur de savoir*, Mukagasana discusses the ways in which faithful based organizations betrayed Rwandans. Before giving details, I would like to borrow Bartov and Mack's (2001:157) summary on the role of the clergy and that of Christians in particular in the genocide against Tutsi:

The results of the participation by the clergy and the silence of the official church are clear. Many Christians clearly believed that in

participating in the massacre of Tutsi, they were doing the will of the church. In a number of cases, people apparently paused in the process of carrying out massacres to pray at the church altar.

Having in mind that before the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, 90% of Rwandans were Christians with 48% members of the Catholic (Des Forges, 1999:11), it is easy to understand the role of churches and their adherents in genocide. The fact that “Rwandans were taught to follow religious leaders unquestioningly, and when their religious leaders participated in the killing, this was a sign that they were morally free to do the same” (Mbanda, 1997:86) facilitated the participation of the then “so- called Christians” in genocide. I am calling them “so- called Christians” because they were not true Christians. A good Christian cannot kill a human being who is created in the image of God! In Rwanda it was even worse because Christians killed other Christians and some of them were killed in churches, sacred places that have to be respected. For those who believe in the Catholic Church, it is sacrilege to see génocidaires killing innocent people in churches!

A good example of the role of religious people in denying the genocide against is the following one:

D'autres religieux, plus explicites, m'appellent de leurs couvents. L'un fait même le voyage depuis Afrique. “Il ne faut pas que tu écrives sur le Rwanda, Yolande, car ta parole ne peut être animée que de rancœur. Ce n'est pas chrétien. Le plus urgent pour toi, c'est de faire le deuil des tiens. Te dire qu'ils sont partis. Et d'accepter. Après cela, tu verras, tu n'auras plus besoin d'écrire” (Mukagasana, 1999:272).

Other religious, more specifically, called me from their convents. One of them even travelled from Africa. Yolande, you must not write on Rwanda; what you write will only be motivated by resentment. It is not Christian. What is most urgent for you is to mourn yours and accept that they were exterminated. After that, you will see, you will no longer need to write.

Yolande was very frustrated by the above advice that aimed at covering up the role of the Church. She angrily and desperately said:

Pourquoi ne veut-on pas que j'écrive sur le Rwanda? Parce que le rôle de l'Eglise catholique n'est pas des plus propres dans le génocide? Combien de prêtres ont-ils trahi et laissé tuer les Tutsi, parfois tué eux-mêmes? Ils sont en liberté, aujourd'hui, protégés dans des couvents. Il y en a en Belgique, en France, en Suisse (Mukagasana, 1999:272).

Why don't they want me to write on Rwanda? Is it because the role of the Catholic Church is not the cleanest one in the genocide? How many priests have betrayed us and caused the death of Tutsi, sometimes even some of them being directly involved in the killings? They are free today, protected in convents. Some are in Belgium, France and Switzerland.

This behaviour of "men of God" who were supposed to be the first to condemn génocidaires and their supporters is a disaster. However, Mukagasana who was committed and was determined to write her testimony was not discouraged. With the assistance of her author, Patrick May, she went on and wrote her testimony. Shortly after its publication, the same religious individuals called her and tried to convince her that she was not allowed to publish some of the parts that revealed the role of the Catholic Church:

Peu après sa sortie, je reçois le coup de téléphone d'un religieux. "Tu as dramatisé la situation, Yolande.Je... euh... tu m'aurais pas dû dire les choses ainsi. Et puis tu as blasphémé. Tu as dit du mal de Jérôme. Je dois avouer que je suis déçu".

-Mais Jérôme a tué, mon père. J'en suis témoin... Vos valeurs chrétiennes, c'est de protéger les assassins». Je cite en vrac quelques noms de prêtres notoirement impliqués dans le génocide. Le bon père blanc me raccroche au nez (Mukagasana, 1999:272).

Shortly after its publication, I was called by a religious member. "Yolande, you have dramatized the situation"... "I... uh... you should not have said it that way. And you even have blasphemed. You have said bad things on Jerome. I must say that I was disappointed."

-But Jérôme killed my father. I am a witness... Your Christian values are to protect killers. I give him some names of priests who were extremely involved in genocide. The great white father hung up on me.

The above behaviour of the priest confirms the close links between the Church and the former Rwandan government that prepared the genocide as earlier explained in Chapter I. However, it has to be pointed out that not all religious individuals were partisans of the genocide ideology. There are those who were against and who were victims of genocide.

4.2.5. Betrayal between friends

Betrayal between friends is another theme that Mukagasana discusses in *N'aie pas peur de savoir*. She shows how in genocide friendship had fallen apart. Normally, friends are meant to stand by their close friends through good and hard times. This rarely happened in genocide. Yolande Mukagasana (1999:201) gives the following example as an illustration:

Un attroupement s'est formé à une quinzaine de mètres. Un enfant moleste un homme d'une cinquantaine d'années. La gifle. Lui crache au visage. L'homme se défend à demi. "Je n'ai pas tué tes parents! Si, tu les as tués. Je t'ai vue. Tu es venu avec quatre autres personnes. Tu as frappé à la porte. Papa t'as ouvert comme d'habitude, pensant que tu venais dire bonjour. Et tout à coup, tu as sorti de ton imperméable une machette. Et tes amis aussi. Tu as égorgé mon père, puis ma mère, puis mes frères, les uns après les autres.....Tu sais bien que je ne t'ai échappé que parce que j'ai pu m'enfuir....".

A crowd was formed at 15 meters. A child manhandles a man of around fifty years old. He slaps him and spits on his face. The man half-heartedly defends himself. "I didn't kill your parents"! No, you killed them. I saw you. You came with four other people. You knocked on the door. As usual, my father opened, thinking that you were coming to say hello. And suddenly, you pulled out your raincoat a machete. And so did your friends. You killed my father, then my mother, and then my brothers, one after another... You remember I escaped your killings because I was able to run away.

During genocide, cases like the above one were many. Several Hutu refused to rescue their Tutsi friends whose lives were in danger. However, few of them did it. There are even some Hutu extremists who were married to Tutsi women who killed them. Some Hutu extremists went further and killed their own children accusing them of resembling their mothers.

Another convincing example is the following:

Le jour où tes enfants ont été assassinés, tu t'en souviens peut-être, on m'a déshabillée et on m'a chassée. Je marchai nue sur la piste, comme une folle, mes vêtements en boule sur la tête. Je suis rentrée chez moi, mais toute la maison était déjà détruite et pillée. Alors je me suis rhabillée et je suis allée chez Cécile. Cécile? La femme de Côme? Oui! Mais tu es folle. Côme est un des pires génocidaires. Il m'a chassée de chez lui en plein génocide.Où aurais-tu voulu que j'aie? Et puis, je ne savais pas qu'il était génocidaire. Après tout, c'est un de tes amis, avant le génocide. ...Alors je lui [Cécile] ai demandé de me loger quelques jours. Elle a été d'accord. Mais au même moment arrivent Interahamwe. J'ai pris un balai et je me suis mise à balayer la cour pour faire semblant de faire partie de son personnel. Mais Cécile m'a pris le balai des mains et a déclaré haut et fort qu'elle ne savait pas qui j'étais (Mukagasana, 1999:247).

The day when your children were murdered, you might remember, they undressed me and threw me out. I was walking naked as a fool. My clothes were rolled up in a ball on my head. I went home, but the house was already destroyed and looted. Then I dressed again and went to Cécile's house. Cécile? The woman of Côme? Yes! But you're crazy. Côme is one of the worst génocidaires. During genocide, he chased me out his home.... Where else would I have gone? And then, I didn't know that he was a génocidaire. After all, before the genocide, he was one of your friends.... Then I asked her [Cécile] to hide me for a few days and she agreed. But at the same time the *Interahamwe* arrived. I took a broom and started to sweep the house yard giving the impression that I was one of her domestic staff. But Cécile took the broom out of my hands and shouted loudly that she did not know who I was.

In the above quotation, Spérancie, the cousin of Yolande, is explaining how Cécile betrayed her. The latter was a wife to Côme who was a renowned killer. However, Spérancie was not aware of that that Cécile's husband was a killer. She relied on the strong relationship that was between her cousin, Yolande, and that of Côme's family and thought that Côme's family, who were not among the targeted groups to be exterminated because they were Hutu family could save her life by hiding her from génocidaires. The betrayal of Cécile is on two levels.

Firstly, Cécile pretended to agree to offer Spérancie a place of refuge at her house when she did not refuse Spérancie's request to be hidden in order to escape from the killings of génocidaires. Cécile kept quiet. Her silence is an indicator that she was not really willing to protect Spérancie. Cécile was too naive, she did not understand how she was indirectly being betrayed.

Secondly, the direct betrayal occurred when Cécile took the broom out of Spérancie's hands and shouted loudly that she did not know who Spérancie was. If Cecile had not denounced Spérancie, the génocidaires would have thought that she was of the house and left her in peace. However, she did not. She betrayed her and exposed her to génocidaires who immediately started to harass her physically. They even introduced a grenade into her mouth. This grenade damaged her teeth. However, by God's mercy the génocidaires left before the grenade exploded and she was saved by a man who took it out of her mouth.

A last example that helps to understand how the theme of betrayal between friends is at work is the following:

Je voudrais faire une chose, Yolande. Je voudrais que nous allions ensemble voir Cécile. -Aller voir Cécile? Tout de suite! Et je ne veux pas me priver de lui raconter avec force détails le calvaire qu'elle nous a fait endurer.....Nous sommes devant la porte du bureau de Cécile. Elle arrive par-derrrière, nous salue machinalement, sursaute.... "Dieu soit loué, tu es encore en vie! Je suis si contente." Je ne me laisse pas embobiner. "Tu reconnais ma nièce Spérancie?" Cécile se met à trembler. Spérancie enfonce un regard dur dans celui de notre bonne femme. "Tu te souviens de moi?"- Je... vaguement. Mais j'ai caché Muganga chez moi.... Je vais de dire. Tu m'as cachée pendant un quart d'heure, parce que je m'étais introduite de force sur ta parcelle. Et quand ton mari est arrivé, tu lui as dit que je me cachais sur ta parcelle (Mukagasana, 1999:249-250).

Yolande, I would like to do one thing. I wish that we would go together to see Cécile. Go and see Cécile? Right now! And I don't want to miss the opportunity of telling her with all details, the Calvary that she caused us to go through... We are at the door of Cécile's office. She comes from behind. She mechanically greets us and jumped with fright. "Thanks God, you are still alive! I am so

glad". I do not want to be cheated. "Have you remembered my niece Spérancie?" Cécile starts shaking. Spérancie fixed a hard look in the eyes of our poor woman. "You remember me?" I... vaguely. But I offered a hide place to Muganga [Yolande] in our home... I want to tell you. You hid me for a quarter of an hour, and you did it because I came into your house by force. And when your husband came, you betrayed me and told him that I was hiding in your plot of land.

This last example reveals that Cécile in addition to betraying Spérancie also betrayed Yolande. What is worse is to see her denying her inhuman actions. However, her inability to express herself and her hesitation in responding betrayed her and proved her culpability. Indeed, when someone has good points, ideas flow easily from his/her mind. People who are cheating do not find proper words to use. Even when they find them they are uncoordinated.

4.2.6. Psychological Trauma

According to McCann and Pearlman (1990:10), an experience is traumatic if it is "(1) sudden, unexpected, or non-normative, (2) exceeds the individual's perceived ability to meet its demands, and (3) disrupts the individual's frame of reference and other central psychological needs and related schemas". To better understand the definition of psychological trauma and link it to the context of the post-genocide psychological trauma, it is necessary to complete the above definition and connect it to the trauma context that was analysed by Figley (1990: xviii). He said that the concept of trauma represents "*an emotional state of discomfort and stress resulting from memories of an extraordinary, catastrophic experience which shattered the survivor's sense of invulnerability to harm*".

With the above two definitions of psychological trauma, it is now easy to understand the psychological suffering that Mukagasana went through, after experiencing the 1994 genocide against Tutsi.

The following example illustrates how she was traumatised:

La plus belle journée de ma seconde vie, ma vie, vient de commencer Je suis vide de tout sentiment, c'est-à-dire heureuse. Je pars vers l'hôpital de Kimironko, lequel ressemble à une école remplie de lits pour ces enfants que sont les blessés de guerre et de génocide. Je ne sais plus où je vis. Je ne sais plus le chemin qui me mène à l'hôpital. J'ai l'impression d'être un automate. Mes jambes me guident sans que mon cerveau intervienne (Mukagasana, 1999:150-151).

The most beautiful day of my second life, my life, has just started... I am emotionless, that means happy. I go to the Kimironko hospital, which resembles a school full of beds for those children who are casualties of war and genocide. I don't know where I live. I can't remember the way that leads me to the hospital. I have the impression that I am a robot. My legs without any intervention of my brain led me.

The situation that Yolande was living in was a clear description of a traumatised person. She did not know what was happening in her life. The abrupt, unpredicted and non-normative genocide that she experienced and its consequences caused her to lose her normal consciousness. She was guided by her spinal cord and not her intelligence. Only our intelligence helps us control ourselves. Once we lose it, we tend to behave like animals that do not have logic.

In the above quotation, Yolande said that she was happy because she was emotionless. These two contradicting words are a good indicator of a traumatised person. What Yolande is explaining may look impossible. Being unemotional automatically eliminates true happiness. From a psychological viewpoint, happiness is referred to as a positive effect, a mood or emotional state which is brought about by generally positive thoughts and feelings. We must be able to quantify this state of mind in order to understand it. However, for a traumatized person, who lives in an abnormal world, it is understandable. To get over her despairing situation of the aftermath of genocide, Yolande had to find justifications for questions that were beyond her control.

Another example that justifies how Yolande was psychologically traumatised is her disgust for the future. She really had no hope in the future. This is evident

when she pointed out that she had hated life and that she wanted to die: “*Je n’ai pas peur. Je veux mourir. Je voudrais mourir (Peur 156).* /I am not afraid. I want to die. I wish to die. As earlier at the beginning of this chapter, when I was discussing the theme of revolt against life and nature in Yolande’s first testimony, *La mort ne veut pas de moi*, after genocide, Yolande was a traumatised person. Psychosocially, she had died. Under normal circumstances, Yolande who was 40 when the 1994 genocide occurred had no justification to hate her life to the extent of wishing to put an end to it. However, as someone who was under shock after almost losing everything most importantly her dearest ones, her traumatic behaviour is reasonable.

Illustrations that prove how Yolande was traumatised are many. Another interesting one is the following:

Toute une partie de la nuit, je fais des mathématiques. Christian plus Sandrine plus Benjamin plus Thierry plus Agnès, moins Christian moins Sandrine, cela fait donc, ben trois. J’ai trois enfants! Thierry! Mais non, il ne s’appelle pas Thierry! Il s’appelle Vincent. ... Qui m’en voudra d’avoir oublié le prénom de mes enfants quand je leur donne un surnom si charmant? J’ai donc trois enfants. Je trouve le soleil (Mukagasana, 1999:158).

Almost the whole night, I am doing mathematics. Christian plus Sandrine plus Benjamin plus Thierry plus Agnès, minus Christian minus Sandrine, this makes then three. I have three children! Thierry! But no, he is not called Thierry! His name is Vincent. ... Who will blame me for having forgotten the first name of my children when I am giving them a lovely nickname? Thus, I have three children. I am now able to sleep.

Normally, additions and subtractions respect and explore the applications of formal logic to mathematics. The mathematics of Yolande did not follow that principle. Her fresh extreme psychological suffering prevented her from being logical. Not only did it not allow her to remember first names of her three children, but also it allowed her to take the five first names including only two of her children and subtract to the two names of her children to reach a conclusion that she had three children. As it is known, her three children were

killed in the genocide against Tutsi. Nevertheless, because of Yolande's psychological trauma, she wanted to inform her mind they were still alive. She did so to find a solution to her frequent sleepless nights that followed her genocide experience.

Her false mathematical formula gave some good results. She was able to sleep. However, this sleep was not normal. It helped her to have a certain peace of mind, for a short time.

Further, the evidence of her shortened peace of mind is found in the following quotation:

Mais que se passe-t-il donc en moi? Le corps humain est un tombeau vivant. Dis-moi, corps, serais-tu un sanctuaire d'espoir? Penses-tu être digne de tout ce que je te donne? M'as-tu jamais dit merci? Je te lave tous les jours, je te masse, je te parfume et te protège. Je te nourris, te désaltère, te soigne quand tu es malade. Mai toi, corps, que m'as-tu donnée en échange? Quelque chose s'est cassé entre moi et mon corps. Une espèce de divorce (Mukagasana, 1999:164-165).

But what is really happening in me? The human body is a mobile corpse. My body, tell me, are you a sanctuary of hope? Do you think that you deserve of everything that I give? Have you ever thanked me? I always wash you, I massage you, I put some perfume on you and protect you. I feed you, quench your thirst, and treat you when you are sick. But you, my body, what have you given me in return? Something has broken between my body and myself. A kind of divorce.

The above quotation shows how the trauma that Yolande was going through had caused her to even hate her body. Accusing her body of not recognising what she had done to protect and make it look smart is at the same time condemning herself. The divorce between Yolande's body and her mind is a pure indicator of people who are living under trauma. These people do not understand what is happening in them. There is no connection between their minds and bodies. The disconnection between Yolande's mind and her body does not allow her to have justification for her fresh survivorship as hereby illustrated: *"Deux semaines passent ainsi. Je soigne, je ne sais plus ce qui se*

passe en moi, sinon que j'ai honte. Je ne sais toujours pas de quoi" (Mukagasana, 1999:165). Two weeks happened that way. I look after patients, but I really don't know what is happening in me, I only feel ashamed. I still don't understand why.

Another symbol of psychological trauma is self-blame. In trauma related to genocide, survivors tend to feel guilty that they did not do enough to protect their relatives who were victims. They tend to forget that they were not able to protect them. This is what happened to Yolande when she hopelessly asked herself the following: "*Pourquoi ne suis-je pas morte à la place de mes enfants? Pourquoi ne suis-je pas morte à la place de ceux qui sont morts en protégeant les Tutsi? Pourquoi ne suis-je pas morte à la place de tous ceux qui sont morts pour ce qu'ils étaient?*" (Mukagasana, 1999:173). /Why didn't I die in the place of my children? Why didn't I die in place of those who died protecting Tutsi? Why didn't die I in place of all those who were killed because of who they were?

Yolande's reaction, in this quotation, confirms how some genocide survivors condemn themselves as if they were responsible for not having been able to protect their relatives. This prevents them from recovering quickly from the genocide consequences and restart a new life. Furthermore, as Harvey and Pauwels (2000:114) say, "*self-blame is linked with distress, anxiety, depression, harsh self-criticism, low self-worth and poorer recovery from trauma.*"

Self-blame hunts always the lives of survivors who are still under trauma of their unbelievable genocide experiences. For Yolande she requested forgiveness from her children who had been killed as if she were responsible for their death: "*Mes enfants, mes pauvres enfants pardonnez-moi d'avoir échappé aux massacres*" (Mukagasana, 1999:158)/My children, my poor children, forgive me for having survived the genocide.

In addition to the trauma that was caused by the death of her three children, husband and other relatives, Yolande's trauma was worsened by the extermination of her neighbour: "*Et comment puis-je vivre encore sans vos*

visages et vos sourires? Où trouverai-je la force de continuer mon chemin?” (Mukagasana, 1999:200)/And how will I be able to live again without you and your smiles? Where will I get the energy to continue on my life? Mukagasana was wondering this after noticing that all her neighbours, especially the innocent beautiful young ladies of Cyivugiza where she was living were killed. Her post genocide life was full of indicators of trauma.

La vie est devenue plus difficile pour moi. J'ai des moments d'égarments, des bouffées de colère, des envies brusques de tout casser. Des sensations d'étouffer aussi. De haletter. Impression que je ne peux plus vivre, qu'il faut quelque chose d'inhabituel et de formidable de passer pour que je puisse continuer..... A l'hôpital, je suis devenue plus froide avec les médecins, moins communicative. Je fais mon boulot, sans plus....A la maison, cela ne va pas guère mieux (Mukagasana, 1999:225).

For me, life has become harder. I am experiencing many distractions, outbursts, and a sudden desire to break everything. I also feel that I am suffocating. I am gasping for breath. I have the impression that I can't live anymore, only something unusual has to happen to enable me to continue [with my life]... At the hospital, the relationship with my medical colleagues was very limited. I do not talk much. I only do my job... At home, it is the same. It is even worse.

The distractions, outbursts, sudden desire to break all, experiencing suffocation and becoming speechless are altogether characteristics of traumatized people. Yolande of the post-genocide was quite different from the one of before the genocide who was a happy and rich wife with her own health centre, a lovely husband and beautiful children. The one of post 1994 was a Yolande with a bleeding heart.

The last example that describes Yolande as a traumatized woman is her discussions with immigration staff when she was heading to Bujumbura without any paper. She was going to Bujumbura in search of internal peace. In Rwanda because of genocide consequences that were still fresh in her mind, she could no more find peace and sleep. In her own words, she could not sleep in Rwanda, because *“Même Imana ne vient plus y dormir”* (Mukagasana,

1999:232)/Even God could not sleep there. In the past, Rwandans used to say that God spends the day elsewhere, but He should come back and spend His night in Rwanda. This was because Rwanda was considered as a peaceful country. In the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, this was no longer the case.

Coming back to the discussions that Yolande held with the immigration staff, it has to be mentioned that the event took place at Akanyaru border, a border between Rwanda and Burundi (it is in the Huye District, Southern Province). This is how the discussion went: *“Et si on vous arrête à Bujumbura sans papiers, vous risquez d’avoir de sérieux problèmes! Non. Les gens qui ont des problèmes, ce sont des gens qui vivent encore. Moi, je ne vis plus. Les problèmes ne peuvent plus m’atteindre”* (Mukagasana, 1999:233)/And what if they arrest you in Bujumbura without papers? You may have serious problems! No. People, who have problems, are those who are still living. For me, I am no longer in life. Problems cannot affect me.

Yolande herself recognizes that she was a traumatised person. Generally, it is not usual to have traumatized people who accept that they are experiencing trauma. Even foolish people tend to consider themselves as normal and see normal people as abnormal! One may say that Yolande’s traumatic status had not gone beyond serious stages. This means that later on, Yolande could again have hope in the future. This actually happened. The following section will give more details.

4.2.7. Hope in the future

After surviving genocide, it is not easy for any survivor to have hope in the future. This is because genocide takes away any reason to believe in a better future. What makes many survivors lose hope in the future is the fact that many of them are still troubled by questions about what had happened to them during the genocide against Tutsi. However, little by little, survivors must accept what had happened to them and embrace a new life. In any case, life continues. To cope with the new life, they have to go beyond their inner

suffering and find reasons to believe in life. Failing to look at life in a positive way is to make room for their killers to kill them twice. Killers who have made them suffer physically, have no right to kill their psychological life.

If survivors start to see life in a positive way, they become able to undertake new projects and start to enjoy life. Yolande is among survivors who decided to accept what happened to her during the 1994 genocide and restart a new positive life. In *N'aie pas peur de savoir*, she gives some examples: "*Ce matin, je me sens des vellétés guerrières. J'ai l'impression que la justice est à portée de main. Que, ce soir, je ne serai plus veuve de génocide, que ceux qui ont tué mes enfants seront punis. Que tout va rentrer brusquement dans l'ordre*" (Mukagasana, 1999:217)/This morning, I feel warlike ambitions. I feel the justice nearby. I think that tonight, I won't be more a widow of genocide. Those who have killed my children will be punished. Everything will be shortly back to order.

This quotation shows a new Yolande who thinks that after the genocide, it is yet possible to live. She was happy that the RPF- led government was about to establish justice. At the time she wrote her testimony, countrywide, more than 100,000 people who were suspected to have played a role in genocide against Tutsi were detained in various prisons. Later on, due to their large number, it was realised that modern justice could not try all genocide cases and finish them before at least 100 years. Rwanda decided then to use Gacaca Courts. Yolande gives her satisfaction of how Gacaca Courts were very useful in her new book, *L'Onu et chagrin d'une négresse: Rwanda/RD-Congo, 20 après* that she published in 2014.

The hope in future is also seen in the description of the first night that Yolande had in Bujumbura: "*Je m'endors finalement. Un sommeil de normal, de huit à neuf heures, mais qui me semble avoir duré une semaine. Un sommeil sans machettes, sans Interahamwe, sans cadavres d'enfants, sans questions et sans rêves*" (Mukagasana, 1999:235). /I finally fall asleep. A normal, eight to nine

hours' sleep, but which seems to me like a sleep of one week. A sleep without machetes, without *Interahamwe*, without corpses of children, without questions and without [bad] dreams. This shows that Yolande is in peace with herself. She was then a normal person. She could then think of how to be useful to her society.

The following justifies how she was ready to help her country: "*Je vais témoigner du génocide des Tutsi. Je suis torturée, vous comprenez? J'ai besoin d'écrire. Sinon, je deviendrai folle....Je dois témoigner. Je le sens*". (Mukagasana, 1999:242)/I am going to testify about the genocide against Tutsi. I am being tortured, do you understand? I need to write. Otherwise, I will go crazy... I have to testify. I can feel it. Yolande's thinking and way of seeing life and what would be her role to improve it is a justification that she believes in a better future.

When she arrived in Europe, the idea of testifying how the genocide against Tutsi was planned and executed continued to haunt her mind. Her peace would only come from her testimony. This is how she says it: "*La vie renait en moi, le goût de vivre me revient sans que je le veuille. Je ne veux pas mourir. Je veux témoigner. Je veux me recueillir sur la sépulture de mes enfants et puis témoigner à la face du monde*" (Mukagasana, 1999: 252)/I feel as if I am given a new life, without my control, a taste for life comes back to me. I don't want to die. I want to testify. I want to visit the grave of my children and then testify worldwide. Yolande is now normal. She is a determined woman. She is taking endurance from her past experience in genocide. She now understands that she survived to live her life and the one of her killed children, husband, relatives and friends.

A survivor who has reached the stage of testifying on behalf of his/her exterminated beloved ones as Yolande Mukagasana did is the one who is on the true road to recovery from the harmful consequences of genocide. This person can claim to be in control of his or her emotions and ready to start a new life.

This is what happened to Yolande: *“Je veux vivre, être une femme à part entière. Et j’y arriverai. C’est maladif, en moi. Je veux pouvoir caresser des visages d’enfants. Mon corps meurtri, comme un champ au soir de la bataille, porte un avenir qui me dépasse (Mukagasana, 1999:260)/I want to live, be a woman in all senses. And I will make it. I am dying to achieve it. I want to cherish children. My defeated body that looks like an evening field that has experienced fight, has hope in future that goes beyond my control. This proves how our mind is the control tower of our life. She was determined and committed to enjoying the new life in spite of psychological problems that she was living with. Her behaviour proves that she had a strong self-control that was a backup for her to deal with the life in its new negative forms. This can only happen to those who have hope in a better future.*

The hope of Yolande Mukagasana for a future that was looking brilliant is also seen in her reaction when she learnt that Jeannette, mother of Gisele, Jeanne Paola and Arlette had finally survived the genocide. It made her love life and she was dying to receiving them in Belgium so that they may live together:

Vous, trois, mes nouveaux enfants, je vous attends avec impatience. Soyez optimistes. Vous me faites redevenir mère. Je vous aime. Vous trouverez en moi toute l’affection à vivre. Venez vite. L’amour que j’ai pour vous se confond avec celui que j’ai pour mon peuple (Mukagasana, 1999:283).

You, three, my new children, I couldn’t wait to see you again. Be optimistic. You make me become again a mother. I love you. You will find in me all the care to live with. Come quickly. My love to you is like the one I have for my people.

The above three survivors contributed a lot to the happiness of Yolande. She lost her three children. She had now other three children. There is a reason to celebrate. Yolande who thought that she could not be considered as a mother is now a happy woman. She even says that she loves her country that she had hated and fled because it was not offering her peace of mind.

Other people, who helped Yolande to see life in a positive way, are old people whom she was taking care of when she found a job in an old people's home in Belgium. Yolande says: "*Ces personnes âgées font ma joie. Elles me réapprennent à aimer, elles font remonter ce qu'il y a d'humain en moi et que le génocide avait enfoui... Je suis heureuse. Je retrouve le contact avec des êtres de chair*" (Mukagasana, 1999:284-285)/These old people are my happiness. They teach me to love again, and they return my human characteristics that the genocide had taken away.... I am happy. I am now in contact with human beings.

In addition to this sincere love, when survivors meet other people who are suffering, it also makes them change their negative attitude vis-à-vis the after genocide life. This is what happened to Yolande when she saw how the old women that she was looking after were suffering as if they never had families. Their sufferings and the love that they showed her empowered her fragile psychological life and made her a new person who could also inspire others to live a better life after whatever shock.

A concluding example that shows how Yolande was able to enjoy a better life after genocide, is when the three children that I earlier talked about were able to join her in Belgium:

Ce matin, pour la première fois peut-être depuis le 6 avril 1994, je me sens un peu reposée. Mes trois nouveaux enfants me donnent le courage de continuer la lutte. Le jus d'orange de mon petit déjeuner a une saveur nouvelle, celle de l'espoir. Et le café me procure une ardeur guerrière (Mukagasana, 1999:295).

For the first time perhaps since 6 April 1994, this morning, I feel a bit relaxed. My three new kids give me the courage to continue my struggle. My breakfast orange juice has a new taste, that of hope. And my coffee gives me a warlike zeal.

The three kids completely changed the life of Yolande. With them, she considered herself as a second mother. To her everything was new! Even her orange juice and coffee had a new taste!

4.2.8. Extremism

Yolande in her second testimony, *N'aie pas peur de savoir* did not forget to deal with the theme of extremism. Extremism is one of the main causes of any genocide. To help the reader understand how this theme is at work, it is necessary to, first of all, define extremism. Mustafayev (2005:65) points out, that it is “*a tendency towards extreme and views in politics and an attempt to solve problems with radical methods, including by means of violence and terror*”.

In the Rwanda of the after political violence of 1959 to the Habyarimana regime that prepared the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, leaders used extremism against Tutsi for their own interests. The following is a good example:

Les Tutsi sont haïssables. Ce sont les Juifs du Rwanda. Retenez bien cela, monsieur le professeur. Les Tutsi nous ont volé notre pays. Ce sont des étrangers. Ils viennent d’Ethiopie. Il faut les chasser. Qu’ils y retournent, dans l’Ethiopie..... “Méfie-toi de la femme Tutsi”, avertit mon frère Joseph. Lui, il vient d’épouser une femme, une vraie selon lui, une Hutu (Mukagasana, 1999:168).

Tutsi are hateful. They are Jews of Rwanda. Be well aware of that, Professor. Tutsi have taken our country by force. They are foreigners. They come from Ethiopia. We must throw them out. They have to return to Ethiopia... “Be careful of Tutsi woman”, warns my brother Joseph. He had just married a woman, a true one, according to him, a Hutu.

The above description shows how Tutsi, with no reason, except the forged ones by Hutu extremists, were considered as bad people to avoid. To convince other Hutu to be on their side, they used a myth tracing origins of Rwandans that justified that Tutsi were not Rwandans. The myth that was largely accepted by many Rwandans stated that Tutsi were Ethiopians who came to invade the country. Hutu extremists went further and prevented all Hutu to marry Tutsi ladies. As revealed in chapter one, they even introduced Hutu Ten Commandments with the aim of fuelling hatred against Tutsi.

Yolande experienced hatred and discrimination since her childhood. What happened to her in 1994 was a culmination of various bad past experiences. The following example gives more details:

Un soir, quatre hommes ramènent le cadavre de papa. “Il est mort tout d’un coup”. Ils se retirent, ils ont l’air de rigoler. Maman gémit: “ils l’ont assassiné. Ils l’ont empoisonné”. “Papa a été assassiné mais on n’a pas le droit de le dire. Mais moi, je suis fière de mon père, j’aurais aimé être comme lui (Mukagasana, 1999:169).

One evening, four men brought home the corpse of my father. “He immediately died”. They went back, they looked happy. My mother groaned. “They have killed him. They have poisoned him”. “My father was murdered, but we had no right to say it. But as far as I am concerned, I am proud of my father; I wish I could be like him.

What is being described in the above quotation shows clearly how Tutsi had accepted to be treated as foreigners in their own country. Faced with a government that was led by Hutu extremists, with all security organs in their hands, Tutsi had nobody, no institutions that could protect them. Even the international community failed to plead for their cause.

To ensure that Tutsi were not Rwandans, they were given some descriptions that differentiated them from other “true Rwandans”, who were Hutu in the past. It was erroneously explained to Rwandans that Tutsi tended to be tall, and thin. In addition, they had long noses, high pitch voices, and relatively clear skin. As for Hutu, they were said to be short, strong and had relatively broader features. They had also big noses and low pitch voices. (www.quora.com/How-can-one-tell-whether-someone-is-Hutu-or-Tutsi/). These false theories were taught in schools, at all levels. To make them more official, Rwandans’ identity cards had in them Hutu, Tutsi and Twa mentions. In genocide, these indications were used to identify Tutsi who were to be killed.

In *N’aie pas peur de savoir*, génocidaires used the above explained extremist theories to identify Tutsi and then kill them: “*Si, si, cet homme doit être un Tutsi, qu’ils disent, regardez son nez, ses petits yeux malins*” (Mukagasana,

1999:190)/No doubt, it's true, that man must be a Tutsi, as they say, look at his small crafty eyes. These words that Interahamwe militia told Kalisa who was hospitalized at Kabgayi hospital when they suspected him of being Tutsi, are a good example of the extremist gospel that Hutu extremists had taught to all Rwandans.

Mukagasana also describes how during the 1994 genocide, Tutsi were subjected to physical threats that in many cases resulted in death, with a few exceptions of Tutsi who inexplicably survived. Spérancie is one of the examples that Yolande used to explain how Hutu extremists abused Tutsi: *“Alors, calmement, l'un d'eux m'a donnée une gifle, puis m'a commandé: “Ouvre la bouche!” J'ai ouvert la bouche. “Plus grand”. J'ai fait un effort. “Plus grand!” Et tout à coup, il a dégrafé de son ceinturon une grenade et me l'a enfoncée dans la bouche”* (Mukagasana, 1999: 248)/Then, calmly, one of them slapped me, and then ordered me: “Open your mouth!” I opened my mouth. “Wider”. I tried my best. And suddenly, he unfastened his belt, took a grenade that was attached to it and pushed it into my mouth.

A normal person cannot do what this Interahamwe militia did to Spérancie. One who does it is no more a human being. His/her behaviour is like the one of dangerous wild animals. Indeed, one of the consequences of extremism is to change positive values into negative ones. This is due to the intoxicated ideas that they have blindly internalised, extremists tend to think that they are justified. They pretend to be victims whereas they are victimisers.

The hatred that Hutu stated against Tutsi had no borders. It was not limited to Rwandans. It was also exported to non-Rwandans. In *N'aie pas peur de savoir* Yolande mentions this internalisation of extremism when she explains how Hutu extremists, those who did not want her to publish her testimony on genocide as they were sure that she would expose their responsibility, tried to convince her editor, Patrick May, never to accept to work with her because she was Tutsi:

De son côté, mon écrivain reçoit des conseils d'amis. «Méfie-toi de la femme Tutsi. N'oublie pas que les Tutsi sont les Juifs d'Afrique. Ces gens, on ne peut rien faire avec eux. Tu leur donne la main, ils te mangent le bras». Moi, ces conseils, cela me fait penser aux dix commandements des Hutu (Mukagasana, 1999:272-273).

On his side, my editor receives advice from friends. "Be careful of Tutsi women. Don't forget that Tutsi are the Jews of Africa. It is not good to have business with these people. You give them your hand, they eat your arm". To me, such advice makes me think of the ten commandments of Hutu.

The ten commandments of Hutu that Yolande is referring to are extremist orders that Hutu initiated to help them to consolidate and maintain their segregationist power:

...They specified that any Hutu who married or consorted with Tutsi women were traitors, as were any who engaged in business with Tutsi. It demanded that all strategic posts in politics or administration be reserved for Hutu and that the armed forces be exclusively Hutu (Des Forges, 1999: 67).

A final illustration that supports the existence of the theme of extremism in Yolande's *N'aie pas peur de savoir* are words that were uttered by the late Laurent Désiré Kabila. The latter was the President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo from 17 May 1997 to 16 January 2001 when he was assassinated by one of his bodyguards. After eight days, his son, Joseph Kabila, replaced him. Laurent Désiré Kabila's extremist words were used in 1988 when he decided to turn a blind eye to Rwanda that had helped him to overthrow Mobutu Sese Seko (alongside Uganda) and sensitised all Congolese to hate Rwandans.

Yolande condemns Laurent Désiré Kabila's hate language as follows: "*Et toi aussi, Laurent Désiré Kabila, qui parles des Tutsi comme de microbes à éradiquer, ce qui ne t'empêches pas d'être reçu par le Pape, le roi des Belges et le président Chirac*" (Mukagasana, 1999:272)/And you, Laurent Désiré Kabila, you also consider Tutsi as microbes that have to be eradicated, and this does not prevent you from being received by the Pope, the King of the Belgians, and

president Chirac. When Laurent Désiré Kabila compared Tutsi to microbes, he was dehumanising them as planners of genocide dehumanise people whom they have to exterminate. It is the same language that Rwandan Hutu extremists used when they were comparing Tutsi to cockroaches or snakes. When Laurent Désiré Kabila used those inflammatory words, many Congolese obeyed him and started to hunt Rwandans as animals. Some of them were killed but the superiority of the Rwandan army to the Congolese one helped them to safely return to Rwanda.

4.3. Conclusion

This section aims to analyse themes that are at work in Mukagasana's *N'aie pas peur de savoir*. The main themes in this testimony are betrayal, betray by France, betrayal by the international community in general, betrayal by the faith-based organisations and betrayal between friends, psychological trauma, hope in the future and extremism. As part one of *N'aie pas peur de savoir* is a repetition of Yolande's *La mort ne veut pas de moi*, themes that were analysed in this novel were not repeated. The following section deals with the themes in Yolande Mukagasana's book, *Les blessures du silence* (2001).

CHAPTER FIVE: THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF *LES BLESSURES DU SILENCE* (2001)

5.1. Background to *Les blessures du silence*

Les blessures du silence/The Wounds of Silence, is a third genocide testimony of Yolande Mukagasana. She published it in 2001. She wrote it in collaboration with the Greek-Belgian photographer, Alain Kazinierakis. The project of writing this testimony started in 1999. To be able to carry out research activities that led to its publication, the authors benefited financial support from *Médecins sans Frontières*/Doctors without Borders. This is an international humanitarian-aid non-governmental organization that was founded in France.

The title of the testimony, *Les blessures du silence /The Wounds of Silence* concerns both Rwandans and the international community. For the international community, their silence started with their decision to remain silent in genocide with the fear of being accused of not having intervened to stop genocide and their attitude of keeping quiet even after genocide. As human beings, this silence was also a cause of their inner wounds though they could not reveal it.

Mukagasana summarises how both Rwandans and members of the international community were all wounded by their silence: “*La communauté internationale garde le silence sur le génocide de 1994 au Rwanda. Les Rwandais aussi. Pourtant, derrière les visages se cachent de très profondes blessures.*”(Mukagasana, 2001:10)/The international community is silent about the 1994 genocide in Rwanda. So are Rwandans. However, behind their minds they are very deep wounds.

Les blessures du silence offers a unique style that is not found in many genocide testimonies. Firstly, all its eighty photographs go with a specific picture. Each picture goes with a selection of key message that will be elaborated in the following chapter. The picture on the cover page captures the

content of the book. It is a picture of Eugénie, a widowed genocide survivor whose husband and four children perished in genocide and who survived with a scar of a machete on her forehead. The look of Eugénie and her mind that appears to be far away from this world because of despair is a representation of the other 79 pictures that are in the book. The aesthetics of these photographs and their disposition add significant additional meaning to the reader prior to reading each testimony. The photographs alone talk. For people who are good at interpreting pictures, they help them to easily predict what would be the content of each testimony.

To show the special value that authors attached to pictures, it has to be pointed out that they dedicated a long chapter on them and called it “Pictures.” This chapter covers 64 pages, from page 14 to page 78. The same pictures, but in small sizes, are also reproduced in the main part of the book that deals with testimonies in details (from page 85 to the page 159, the last page of the book). These pictures help the reader to be much closer to the testimony. Indeed, as Alex Parisel says, “*C’est dans les visages captés par le photographe Alain Kazinierakis que l’on aborde l’indicible*” (Mukagasana, 2001:7). /It is through pictures that were taken by the photographer Alain Kazinierakis that we can deal with the unspeakable. This style is rare in the different testimonies on the genocide against Tutsi.

Secondly, the authors of *Les blessures du silence* give enough space to both survivors of genocide and génocidaires. Whereas survivors were found in different parts of the country, génocidaires were in various prisons countrywide. To have a full understanding of what really happened in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, the authors also interviewed some Hutu who did not participate in genocide. People who were interviewed were from different walks of life. Among survivors who participated in the research, some were very young (from the age of five); others were adults including widows and widowers. The génocidaires included among others two journalists of the Radio Television Station (RTL) that spread hate messages, a priest, soldiers of the defeated

former Rwandan forces, politicians, women, young including teenagers, and adult people.

With this technique of interviewing both survivors and génocidaires, the authors came up with good results: testifying helps both survivors of genocide and their killers. Whereas survivors use testimonies to describe their extreme physical and social suffering, génocidaires use it to plead guilty, repent and ask for forgiveness to their victims. However, some génocidaires plead guilty superficially. Instead of acknowledging their responsibility, they prefer to accuse other people such as their superiors whom they use as scapegoats! There are others who simply say that they have never committed any crime, whereas they are guilty.

In summary, *Les blessures du silence* as Alex Parisel says, helps people speak of their genocide experience:

Ce livre fait parler des hommes et des femmes qui ont vécu dans leur chair le génocide rwandais [génocide contre les Tutsi]. Certains sont des survivants, d'autres sont des bourreaux. Ils se côtoient dans ce livre comme ils se côtoyaient avant le génocide et comme ils se côtoient encore aujourd'hui au pays des mille collines. A travers eux, ce livre nous parle de nous, de ce que nous autres, hommes et femmes, sommes amenés à vivre ou capables de commettre (Mukagasana, 2001:7).

This book helps men and women who have directly experienced the Rwandan genocide [genocide against Tutsi] to be able to testify. Some are survivors, and others are génocidaires. In this book they are brought together as they coexisted even before genocide, and as they are still coexisting today in Rwanda, the land of a thousand hills. Through people who testify, this book is ours. It shows us what we, men and women, are able to live with or to commit.

5.2. Main themes in *Les blessures du silence*

5.2.1. Interaction with the past

Interaction with the past is one of the themes discussed in *Les blessures du silence*. All the eighty testimonies in the book help people who testify to revisit their past. There are many reasons why people must re-examine their past. In the context of *Les blessures du silence*, the main aim was a healing one. Elringham and Maclean (2014:5) say: “*survivors must remember in order to heal themselves and deter future crimes*”. Corianne (2010:186) completes them: in saying that “*although the truth in itself is not always cathartic and healing, it is nevertheless an important part of the healing process*”. When a survivor of genocide and even génocidaires take the courage and accept to testify, a hard task for many, it creates a therapeutic relationship between themselves and their past that they wish they could not remember and re-experience.

Normally, for survivors of genocide, life in the aftermath event is not easy. Life is full of despair and disappointments of many kinds. It is mainly through honouring their killed relatives that they are able to cope with this new life. Yolande describes this phenomenon as follows: “*Par respect pour vous les survivants, par amour pour vous mes enfants, je dois surmonter cette peur. Je suis la seule à pouvoir vous donner un nom, une identité*” (Mukagasana, 2001:81)/For respect of you, survivors, by my love for you my children, I have to overcome that fear. I am the only one who can remember you and talk about you. This intimate relationship between Yolande and her children, but also the one she has for all survivors of genocide who are in the same situation like her, is a source of force to the long journey that life offers after genocide.

Mukagasana gives another example that justifies the importance of interacting with the past:

Nyamirambo, c'est là où j'habitais, où j'ai tout reçu et où j'ai tout perdu. Là se trouve une fosse commune dans laquelle mes enfants ont été jetés après avoir été massacrés. Je m'y rends chaque fois que je peux pour leur parler, leur demander conseil et les supplier de m'accorder leur pardon pour avoir vécu après leur mort, et leur dire

que je vis aussi pour leur cause. Trouver sur cette fosse la force de vivre et d'aimer. Pouvoir reconstruire l'amour sur la haine et la vie sur la mort (Mukagasana, 2001:81-82).

Nyamirambo, it is where I lived, where I got and lost everything. There is a common grave in which my children were thrown after being slaughtered. Whenever I can, I go there to talk to them, ask them advice and ask them forgiveness for having lived after their death, and tell them that I also live on their behalf to defend why they were killed. Find on that grave the strength to live and love. Being able to rebuild love over hatred and life over death.

In accepting to dig deep in her genocide experience, Yolande became nostalgic about her place of residence in which she had had good life before the genocide. She was married there, gave birth there, and had her own lucrative private health centre there. However, she finally lost all this in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. Surprisingly, it is the grave of her children that is found in the same place that helps her to endure the traumatic life of the post-genocide. To some people, this may sound strange. However, for survivors, going back to their history that they can't change anywhere, it is a good healer of genocide traumatic disorders that prevent them from standing strong.

For survivors, remembering their exterminated relatives and friends is a must. Despite their sufferings, they have to always remember them and ensure that they are given justice. One of the ways to achieve this important mission is to testify. This is how Augustin who survived the 1994 genocide against Tutsi in Bisesero, in today's Karongi District of the Western Province says it: *"Notre douleur n'empêche pas le monde de dormir. Mais il ne nous reste plus rien que la parole. Nous avons tout perdu, sauf notre langue. Alors, que pouvons-nous d'autre que de témoigner?"* (Mukagasana, 2001:137)/Our pain does not disturb anybody. We lost everything, except our language. So, apart from testifying, what else can we do? This means that testifying is the main mission of all survivors. To achieve it, they have to be strong enough and face the challenges of genocide with courage, dedication, commitment, and vision for their better future.

When survivors remember their killed relatives, they gain a sense of being useful to them. Dancilla, a Hutu widow from Ntarama, Bugesera District in Eastern Province explains this when she says: “*Je sers encore à mon mari, par la mémoire que j’entretiens de lui*” (Mukagasana, 2001:158). I am still useful to my husband, by keeping his memory. Dancilla’s husband was a Tutsi. He was killed in Ntarama Catholic Church, where Dancilla later got a job of looking after it (after it has become a genocide memorial). For survivors of genocide, their lost relatives and friends are always alive in their hearts. They are part of them.

Genocide is a crime against humanity. Therefore, remembering its victims is not an affair of survivors only. For this reason, the whole humanity must remember victims of genocide and ensure that what happened must never happen again. Alex Parisel of *Médecins sans Frontière/Doctors without Borders* gives more explanations on why all people must remember genocide: “*Car un génocide n’est pas une affaire de monstres, il est affaire de voisins, de petites gens et d’intellectuels, de politiques et d’artistes, de psychopathes et de personnes raisonnables, d’hommes ordinaires. Il est affaire de tous*”... (Mukagasana, 2001:7)/Because genocide is not an affair of monsters, it is a business of neighbours, small people, and educated ones, politicians and artists, psychopaths and reasonable people, and ordinary men. It is everyone’s business...

In conclusion, even though survivors must do their best in remembering the past genocide experiences, it must be repeated that it is not an easy task. However, they have to do it, whatever the cost, in order to build a good relationship with their relatives and friends and even with their environment.

5.2.2. Unspeakability of genocide

A close analysis of *Les blessures du silence* shows how testifying is not an easy task. Be it for survivors or for génocidaires. A good example is Daphrose who does not understand how she can be able to testify after surviving the genocide

against Tutsi: *“Mais par moments, je me sens tellement mal que je ne veux plus parler à personne. Je ne veux que le silence”* (Mukagasana, 2001: 45)/But as of now, I feel so bad to the extent that I don’t want to talk to anyone. I only want to be silent.

Mukagasana explains why survivors struggle a lot when testifying their genocide Calvary. The abrupt death of their beloved ones make them undergo psychological trauma that prevents them from being logical. To have peace of mind, some even try to forget what happened to them though it is not possible. Yolande is a good example. She tried it and failed: *“J’ai essayé d’oublier le génocide, j’ai tout fait pour l’effacer, mais c’était plus fort que moi”* (Mukagasana, 2001:7)/I tried to forget the genocide [against Tutsi], I did everything to forget it but I could not. It was stronger than me.

Finding words to talk about the genocide horror is quasi impossible. As earlier explained, it is because what people experience in genocide is beyond what they were familiar within their lives. The genocide experience disconnects survivors from the usual life. It makes them live in another world. Because of feeling deceived by their fellow humans, some prefer to remain silent. They cannot find words to describe what they have endured. The fact that they do not trust anybody worsens the unspeakability characteristics of telling one’s testimony. The testimony of Eugénie N. who survived genocide at the age of 25 years old is a good one. After the death of her husband and her four children (in the 1994 genocide) she found it quite impossible to testify: *“Je ne raconte mon histoire à personne parce que je suis dégoûtée de la nature humaine. L’homme a détruit tout en moi. Je n’ai accepté de témoigner que parce que toi aussi tu es une veuve qui a perdu ses enfants”* (Mukagasana, 2001:85)/I never tell my testimony to anyone because I detest the human nature. The human being has destroyed everything in me. I have only accepted to testify because you are also a widow who has lost her children.

In general, for survivors of genocide, the post-genocide life is not an easy one. Some even refuse to testify what they have experienced. When survivors accept to testify, sometimes in the middle, they break and cannot continue. In fact, testifying makes them remember each detail of their genocide experience. They indeed come closer to their beloved ones. They see again their killers as if they were seeing them in the time of genocide. As a result, their emotions become fresh and prevent them from cutting down their testimonies. In *Les blessures du silence*, there are many examples of this kind. One of them is Beata M. who is called Spérancie in *La mort ne veut pas de moi*:

Tante, je ne veux plus continuer. Le reste, on en parlera plus tard. Tu sais, le matin même, on m'avait mis une grenade dans la bouche pour me forcer à dire où tu étais cachée. Depuis cette grenade, je suis un peu folle. Je crois parfois encore qu'elle va exploser. Il m'arrive de regretter qu'elle n'ait jamais explosé. (Mukagasana, 2001:118).

Aunt, I do not want to continue. We will talk later of what remains. You know, the same morning, they had put a grenade in my mouth to force me to say where you were hidden. Since that grenade experience, I am a little foolish. I think sometimes that it would explode. I occasionally regret that it never exploded.

Beata M. who was willingly revealing to Yolande what had happened to her during the 1994 genocide, arrived at a point where she could not continue. Her heart was again bleeding as it was in genocide. She is not the only one to experience these ups and downs. It also happened to Vestine, another survivor in *Les blessures du silence*: “*Parler du génocide? Je ne sais pas si j'en suis capable. D'abord c'est très long et puis cela me ferait trop de peine. J'ai vu tous les massacres de mon pays depuis 1959*” (Mukagasana, 2001:129)/Talk about genocide? I don't know if I can. Firstly, it is very long, and then it would cause me too much trouble. I have experienced all exterminations that Rwanda went through since 1959. For Vestine, testifying was an opportunity to use a quick flashback to suddenly and unexpectedly revisit what she went through since the killings of 1959. This made impossible her wish to testify.

Another example is from Antoine S. who survived the 1994 genocide against Tutsi at the age of 17. He believes that he cannot describe what happened to him: “*Moi, je ne parviendrais jamais à tout expliquer.*” (Mukagasana, 2001:139)/For me, I will never be able to explain everything. He will not be able

to explain what happened to him, not because he does not want it or because he has forgotten it. He wants to say that his main challenge is the unspeakability characteristics of genocide testimony.

This unspeakability characteristics of testifying genocide experience, sometimes makes survivors forget some important details. Mukagasana also experienced this challenge:

Je ne sais plus combien de temps nous sommes traqués. Trois jours? Quatre? Cinq? Je ne sais que ceci: que nous avons trouvé à nous cacher dans la brousse, non loin d'une bananeraie, que nous sommes morts de faim, que mes enfants ont pris une silhouette émaciée, que dix casques bleus belges ont été assassinés et que l'ONU a décidé de nous abandonner à notre sort en retirant ses soldats (Mukagasana, 2001:133).

I don't really remember how many times we were tracked down. Three days? Four? Five? I only know this: we had to hide ourselves in the bush, not far from a banana plantation, that we died of hunger, that my children had become too slim, that the ten Belgian peacekeepers were murdered, and that the United Nations has decided to withdraw its soldiers and thus abandoned us to fate.

Survivors of genocide are not the only ones to experience the unspeakability characteristics of testifying the genocide experience. It also happens to génocidaires who accept to testify. In *Les blessures du silence* Gaspard B., a génocidaire who was in prison but who accepted to talk to Yolande is a good example: "*Devant chez toi, il y avait une barrière. Dis-moi qui sont les gens assassinés à cette barrière?*" "*Rwagwa... je ne sais plus...un commerçant, Kalima, je crois... je ne sais plus les noms*" (Mukagasana, 2001:134)/Near your house, there was a roadblock. Tell me, who are the people who were murdered at it?" "*Rwagwa... I do not remember... a businessman, Kalima, I think... I really do not remember their names*".

Gaspard B. is having problems in listing the names of his victims. Different pauses in his answer are an indicator that he was internally suffering. This was a serious handicap to his testimony. This confirms what Yolande found

out in 1999 when she was collecting testimonies that later were published in *Les blessures du silence*: “*Ce que j’ai compris en ce mois de février 1999, c’est que parmi les bourreaux, il y en a un certain nombre qui sont victimes d’être bourreaux*” (Mukagasana, 2001:84)/What I have realized in this month of February 1999, it is that among génocidaires, there are a number of them who are victims of being génocidaires. This happened when Yolande was interviewing Gaspard. She realized that génocidaires are human beings like other people. If they are given a chance to think of their responsibility, especially when they are in prison or brought to book in front of those who survived their savagery killings, they realize that they are guilty of their stupidity. This shame makes them unable to freely testify.

5.2.3. Looting

During the 1994 genocide against Tutsi as Bornkamm points it out (2012:85), “*all over Rwanda the killings were accompanied by looting. It has, therefore, become an important factor in keeping the machinery of genocide running.*” Different scholars who studied the genocide against Tutsi, tried also to understand why many Rwandans, even non-Rwandans, who, in one way or another, participated in the genocide, were also involved in looting. Some of the non-perpetrators said that those who looted were poor peasants who wanted to acquire properties of their victims.

To those who pleaded guilty, Straus (2006:149) said the following:

They took food, titles, and other pieces of property or tried to take over a plot after a house or the land was empty. However, very few said that they killed or originally took part in the violence to get those materials. For most, the looting came later, after the killing was done.

Whatever justification is given, it will not prevent looting to be considered as one of the weapons of génocidaires. As explained in chapter one, in Gacaca

Jurisdictions, people who were found guilty of looting were put in the third category. Offenders of this category were highly encouraged to talk to their victims and agree on how to pay back what they had stolen or damaged instead of being prosecuted.

In *Les blessures du silence*, there are various examples that deal with the theme of looting. This is how Eugénie N. does it:

L'église était pleine et les environs aussi. Ils [les miliciens et les militaires] sont entrés. Ils ont d'abord jetés dans l'air du pili-pili (grenades lacrymogènes). Aussitôt, ils nous ont pillés. "Donnez de l'argent, donnez de l'argent", criaient-ils. Mais en même temps ils tuaient" (Mukagasana, 2001:85).

The Church and its surroundings were full [of people]. They [the militiamen and soldiers] entered. They first threw the pili-pili (tear gas grenades) in the air. Immediately, they looted our properties in shouting: "Give money, give money". At the same, time they were killing.

In some circumstances, génocidaires could not agree on how to equally share what they had looted. In some situations, those who were looting were quarrelling and even fighting over those misunderstandings. In so doing, they somehow lost focus of the Tutsi that they were about to kill. In few occasions, this could give a narrow escape to those who were about to be killed.

This is what happened to Odette P.:

Un de nos voisins fut assassiné en même temps. Les miliciens ont fouillé cet homme, ils ont trouvé de l'argent et se le sont disputé. Profitant de la querelle, un des assassins qui s'appelait Antoine, m'a fait disparaître et m'a conduite chez lui, nous a cachés, moi et mon bébé, sous son lit (Mukagasana, 2001:130-131).

At the same time, one of our neighbours was murdered. The militias searched him, found that he had money and started to fight over it. Taking advantage of that quarrel, one of those killers called

Antoine, helped me to escape and took me to his home, he hid me and my kid under his bed.

As earlier explained in the words of Scott Straus, some people who were involved in looting had no intention of killing. They only wanted to loot the properties of their victims. In *Les blessures du silence*, this is also pointed out. Alice M. who was disabled by genocide but was lucky to survive it, puts it this way: *“Le premier qui m’a vue avec mon enfant a eu pitié. Il s’est contenté de me voler mes vêtements et a dit: “Je ne suis pas capable de tuer cet enfant. Si ce n’est pas un enfant de Kagame, c’est un enfant du ciel. Donne-moi ton argent”* (Mukagasana, 2001:137)/The first one who saw me with my children felt pity for me. He only stole my clothes and said: “I am not able to kill that child. If he isn’t a child of Kagame, he is a child of the heaven. Give me your money.

Saying that this Alice’s child could either belong to Kagame or heaven had a special meaning to génocidaires. Kagame that Antoine was referring to is the current president of the Republic of Rwanda. During genocide, he was the commander –in- chief of the Rwandan Patriotic Army, a branch army of RPF that stopped the genocide. In that time, all Tutsi, were considered as allies of RPF. Thus, by saying that the child was Kagame’s was to say that he was also his supporter, though in fact it was not true, even his age could not allow him to be so. Associating the child to heaven could explain how Antoine was not a killer. He somehow believed in heaven and did not want to kill. However, the fact that he took by force the money of Alice challenges his faith.

Génocidaires looted everybody, including very old people whose Rwandan culture directs that they have to be protected. In some cases, looting went hand in hand with humiliation. In so doing, it confirms the assertion that during the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, Rwanda had become a jungle. A good illustration is what happened to Judith M., an old widow survivor who was 79 in 1999: *“Quand nous sommes arrivés à la frontière avec le Burundi, j’ai rencontré deux hommes. Ils ont pris tout ce que j’avais. Ils ont commencé à me déshabiller”* (Mukagasana, 2001:106). /When we arrived at the border with Burundi, I met

two persons. They took everything that I had. They started to undress me. The madness that characterized killers could not allow them to respect old people such as this one.

Looting was not only done by Rwandans. There are non-Rwandans like Hutu Burundian refugees who were in Rwanda and who actively participated in genocide and were also involved in looting. French soldiers who were serving under the Operation Turquoise were also involved in looting activities, though there are not many cases that were reported. Emmanuel M. who survived the genocide from Gikongoro explains how some French soldiers were involved in looting: *“Les Français ont même pillés les motos du projet d’agriculture pour les donner aux génocidaires afin de leur permettre de fuir au Zaïre”* (Mukagasana, 2001:131)/French have even looted motorcycles that belonged to agriculture project and handed them to génocidaires so that they could use them to flee to Zaire (The current Democratic Republic of Congo).

People who looted and did not plead guilty or those who always deny the genocide and go further in saying that looting did not happen are contracted by people who looted and pleaded guilty. In *Les blessures du silence* there are many examples of people who accept that they have taken properties of their victims. As all of them cannot be given space in this paper, I will only select five examples that seem to be too convincing.

The first one is that of Jean Damascene M., a child who participated in genocide at the age of 13 and who in 1999 was in a re-education centre, after pleading guilty. He said: *“Les Interahamwe et les populations tuaient et pillaient”* (Mukagasana, 2001: 120)/Interahamwe and civilian people killed and looted.

The second example is that of Aphrosis N. who was also in the centre of reintegration in 1999. He confirms that: *“Les assassins pillaient, assassinaient les vaches et me donnaient de la viande”* (Blessures 122) /Génocidaires looted, killed cows and gave me their meat.

The third example comes from Séraphine M., an inmate who was answering the question of her role in the death of a woman: she was found with the cloth of the dead woman: *“Moi, ce que j’ai fait à ce moment-là, et qui a fait que j’ai plaidé coupable, c’est que sur le chemin par où ils l’ont passé, j’ai ramassé son pagne et que je ne le lui ai pas rendu”* (Mukagasana, 2001:123) /What I did at that time, and it is what I have pleaded guilty for, is that on the way where they have passed, I picked up her kitenge (African garment often worn by women and wrapped around the chest or waist, over the head as a headscarf, or as a baby sling) and that I did not give it back to her.

The fourth illustration is through the revelations of Emmanuel N., a former sergeant in the Rwandan Defence Forces that were defeated by RPF. Emmanuel N. who was in prison because of his role in genocide said the following: *“Dès le 7 avril au matin, j’ai volé des vaches aux Tutsi pour les manger. C’est de cela que je plaide coupable”* (Mukagasana, 2001:140)/Since the morning of 7 April [1994], I stole Tutsi’s cows with the aim of eating them. That is what I have pleaded guilty for.

The last example is the testimony of Alvera M., a survivor of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi: *“Après le génocide, je me suis mise à la recherche des biens de mes frères de Kigali, qui avaient été pillés. Je les ai retrouvés. Je les ai vendus. C’est ainsi que je résiste encore”* (Blessures 130)/After genocide, I went in search of goods of my brothers that were looted in Kigali. I found them and sold them. That is how I am still struggling.

In short, it is evident that looting was part of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. Politicians and Hutu extremists used looting as an enticement to encourage people to be very active in genocide. However, it has to be reminded that not all the people who looted did it with the intention of killing, some had a mission of taking other people’s properties only.

5.2.4. Organisation and Preparation of the 1994 genocide

For any genocide to happen, it has to be organized and prepared. As Gregory Stanton (Gasabo et al, 2014:38) points out:

Genocide is always organized, usually by the state, often using militias to provide deniability of state responsibility (the *Interahamwe*.) Sometimes organization is informal (local militias of *Interahamwe*) or decentralized (terrorist groups). Special army units or militias are often trained and armed. Plans are made for genocidal killings. To combat this stage, membership in these militias should be outlawed.

As for the preparation, Gregory Stanton says that

Plans are made by perpetrators for the “final solution”: genocide. Meetings are organized by leaders...The Akazu led by Théoneste Bagosora and President Habyarimana’s wife began meeting in 1992 to plan the genocide against Tutsi (Gasabo et al, 2014: 39).

For the case of the genocide against Tutsi, organizations and preparations are rooted in the barbaric actions that preceded and followed the bloody revolution of 1959 that overthrew the monarchism and installed the Republic rule, which was followed by the independence of Rwanda on 1 July 1962 (further details were given in chapter one).

Les blessures du silence through the testimony of Grégoire H., nicknamed Mandela because of the numerous times he was imprisoned and the duration of time he spent in jail being imprisoned many times and for many years simply because he was a Tutsi, explains the 1994 genocide against Tutsi as a culmination of plans that started in the late 1950’s. Grégoire S. was born in 1945. When Hutu extremists killed Tutsi in 1959 and forced some of them into exile, he personally experienced those killings. On 22 October 1963, following an attack of *Inyenzi* (a group of Rwandans who were still loyal to the King who was overthrown and who were fighting to retake power) from Burundi that had attacked Rwanda on 20 October 1963, he was captured and jailed. As it was the case for other Tutsi who were inside Rwanda, he was considered as an ally of those *Inyenzi*.

Grégoire S. explains how the president of the First Republic, Grégoire Kayibanda and his supporters planned to exterminate all Tutsi. They deported them to Bugesera that was known to have many deadly tsetse flies and other wild animals. In chapter one, I quoted president Kayibanda warning those Tutsi to stop invading Rwanda and threatening that if they failed to do so, they would find all Tutsi inside Rwanda killed.

Deporting some Tutsi to Bugesera falls under the eighth stage of persecution. Gregory Stanton describes it very well when he says that victims “*are often segregated into ghettos, deported into concentration camps, or confined to a famine-struck region and starved*” (Gasabo et al, 2014: 40). In the forests of Bugesera, Tutsi were separated from other people. There was no food and no basic infrastructure. In short, there were no life! Only fatal Tsetse flies and other wild animals were there. Fortunately, Tutsi who were deported there struggled successfully to make Bugesera a livable place.

The testimony of Grégoire S. is supported by that of the late Catholic Brother, Jean Damascène Ndayambaje, who survived the 1994 genocide and experienced all the ethnic killings that targeted Tutsi since 1959 (Mukagasana, 2001:88-95). In 1967 he was imprisoned for one week because some Tutsi had attacked Rwanda from Burundi. In 1973 he miraculously escaped from the killings of Tutsi but he was wounded seriously. In 1990 when RPF attacked Rwanda he was jailed in Ruhengeri prison until he was released by the RPA on 21 January 1991 when it attacked and freed all the prisons. He was again rearrested by the then Rwandan leadership and jailed in what was called the Kigali Central Prison, also commonly known as 1930. In all these arrests he was innocent. The pretext of his arrestation was that he was born as a Tutsi, something for which he was not responsible for.

Coming back to how the 1994 genocide was planned since late 1950's, Brother Jean Damascène Ndayambaje, describes how it that all started in 1957. It kicked off with the publication of the ten Hutu commandments (further details

were given in chapter one) that were drafted with the strong support of three influential white catholic priests:

Le Manifeste des Bahutu de 1957 à été fait sous l'instigation de trois prêtres très influents: Père Massion, le fondateur de la Revue Dialogue, le Recteur du Collège du Christ- Roi à Nyanza et le Père Naveau. Ce dernier était le créateur de SEKA, ce mouvement de jeunes qui diffusait une idéologie incendiaire. Tout est parti de l'Eglise, en tout cas (Mukagasana, 2001:89).

The 1957 Hutu Manifesto was written under the inspection of three very influential priests: Father Massion, the founder of the Dialogue Magazine, the Headmaster of *Christ the King* College in Nyanza, and Farther Naveau. The latter was the founder of SEKA, a youth movement that was tasked to disseminate the inflammatory genocide ideology. In any case, everything started from the [Catholic] Church.

In addition, Brother Jean Damascène Ndayambaje shows that in the killings of Tutsi that took place in February 1973, the leaders of the First Republic under the late President Kayibanda Grégoire were also highly involved:

Les étudiants de l'Université Nationale de Butare encadraient les jeunes Hutu du secondaire pour faire la chasse aux Tutsi dans les écoles. Mais ils étaient chapeautés par un Député du Parmehutu, Max Niyonzima, et le Commandant de la place de Gitarama, Barahira (Mukagasana, 2001:89).

The students of the National University of Butare trained young Hutu who were studying in secondary school on how to hunt their Tutsi classmates. But they were supervised by Max Niyonzima, a Member of Parliament representing [MDR] Parmehutu, and Barahira, the [army] Commander of Gitarama.

What survivors of genocide described about how the 1994 genocide was a culmination of what was planned and tested over a long period, is not different from what is said by people who were leaders in the First and Second Republics. Patrice N. who was the Burgomaster (equivalent to today's mayor of a district) of Kanzenze said:

On a divisé le secteur en quartiers, selon les origines: Tutsi de Rulindo, de Ruhengeri, de Gikongoro. N'oublie pas qu'il avait été décidé de forcer les Tutsi à habiter dans le Bugesera..... Tu sais bien que ce que nous avons appris à l'école. On nous a appris que la reine du Rwanda qui était Tutsi déposait une lance sur le ventre d'un bébé Hutu, et qu'elle se levait en s'appuyant sur sa lance, laquelle traversait le corps de l'enfant. Comme les Tutsi sont des étrangers qui sont venus d'Abyssinie, actuelle Ethiopie. Que c'étaient des Nilotiques venus avec leurs vaches, les Hutu étant arrivés avant, qu'ils étaient propriétaires des terres....On nous appris que le Tutsi est très mauvais et que c'était un étranger et notre ennemi (Mukagasana, 2001:100).

They divided the sector into areas, according to place of origins: Tutsi from Rulindo, Ruhengeri, and Gikongoro. Don't forget that Tutsi were forced to live in Bugesera... You know quite well that what we were taught in schools. They taught us that for her to stand up, the Tutsi Queen of Rwanda had to put a spear on the belly of a Hutu baby. They also taught us that Tutsi were foreigners who came from Abyssinia, the current Ethiopia. That they were Nilotic who came with their cows and found Hutu who had already arrived before them and they are the owners of the land... We learnt that a Tutsi was a dangerous person, a foreigner, and our enemy.

The above quotation exemplifies how the genocide ideology was taught to all Rwandans in an academic way. Teaching ethnic divisions in all levels of education, especially to young people who did not know that they were being deceived, was an effective strategy to prepare all Hutu to be ready to exterminate Tutsi once the opportunity would come.

Honest people who were educated in Rwanda between 1960's to April 1994 cannot deny that the 1994 genocide was long planned. Eduard Sebushumba, who was the former burgomaster of Giti Commune during the 1994 genocide (Giti is the today's Gicumbi District, in the Northern Province), provided clear evidence of the planning that went into the genocide. It has to be pointed out that because of the wise leadership of Eduard Sebushumba, Giti is the only Rwandan Commune that did not experience genocide. As an educated Hutu, and one of the senior members of the then government, he confirms that genocide was planned for a long time:

Le génocide était une affaire longuement préparé. L'avion est tombé le 6 [Avril 1994] et dès le lendemain, dans les communes voisines, les maisons brûlaient déjà. Les gens fuyaient, certains tuaient... La grande responsabilité revient aux intellectuels au pouvoir, parce que ce sont eux qui ont préparé et planifié le génocide. Les intellectuels qui n'étaient pas au pouvoir se sont tus (Mukagasana, 2001:88).

Genocide was well-prepared for a long time. The airplane was shot down on 6 [April 1994] and the following day, in neighbouring communes/districts, houses were already being burnt down. People were fleeing, some were killing ... The major responsibility is within intellectuals who were on power, they are the ones who prepared and planned the genocide. Intellectuals who were not on power kept silent.

Eduard Sebushumba was different from many Hutu leaders of his time. His bravery helped him to disobey orders that his colleagues received from his superiors of using guns to kill Tutsi but instead used those guns to protect Tutsi until the RPA arrived in the second week of April 1994 and freed the area: *“Les autorités de Byumba nous ont donné des armes à distribuer à la population. Je les ai prises mais je les ai distribuées aux conseillers communaux avec mission de les utiliser pour protéger la population”* (Mukagasana, 2001:88)/Leaders of Byumba Province gave us weapons that had to be distributed to the population. I took them but handed them to the communal/district councillors with the mission of using them to protect the population.

Sylvestre G. is among the intellectuals that Eduard Sebushumba said preferred to remain silent instead of denouncing the genocide organization and preparation. He was a well-known poet in the country. Sylvestre G pleaded guilty for his role in genocide and was jailed. He said that genocide was planned using different ways:

Cela a été fait de plusieurs façons. Il y a des planificateurs comme tout le monde le sait, il y a des gens qui s'y sont prêtés et que j'appellerais les opportunistes et qui étaient habitués à le faire depuis 1959, en 1973 et alors de tous les évènements similaires. Et puis, il y a nous, qui l'avons fait en 1994 pour la première fois... (Mukagasana, 2001:125).

That was done in several ways. As everyone knows, there are planners, there are people who actively participated, these were opportunists who were used to kill [Tutsi] since 1959, in 1973 and then in all similar events. And finally, there are we, who participated in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi for the first time...

In addition to these intellectuals and senior politicians in central government offices, there are other categories of Rwandans who testified that they are witnesses of the preparation of genocide. Among them, there are some local leaders such as Israël D. who was the Cell leader during the 1994 genocide: *“Combien d’autorités rwandaises ont refusé de génocide à ton avis?” “S’il y en a, ce serait un hasard, comme le Tutsi qui a échappé au génocide”* (Mukagasana, 2001:155)/In your opinion, how many Rwandan leaders were not involved in genocide? If there are any, it would be a chance, like there are some Tutsi who survived the genocide”. Marc N. who was a member of the Rwandan defeated army forces (FAR) completes Israël in saying that all soldiers were aware of the genocide preparation: *“Aucun officier des FAR ne peut dire qu’il ne connaissait pas la planification du génocide”* (Mukagasana, 2001:102)/No single FAR officer can say that he/she did not know the genocide preparation.

Valérie Bemeriki who was among the journalists of RTLM, a radio that was used by Hutu extremists to fuel the genocide ideology and sensitize Hutu who had started to kill Tutsi to do it with immediate effect, admits that genocide was planned without any doubt. She revealed this when Yolande asked her whether the 1994 genocide was planned. Immediately she responded: *“Oui je l’admets”* (Mukagasana, 2001:95) /Yes I confirm.

In all cases, senior leaders were the ones to encourage local leaders and citizens, to kill Tutsi. A good example is the testimony of Jean N. who was in prison because of his role in the genocide and who had pleaded guilty. He confirms that during genocide, he attended a meeting that was chaired by Alphonse Nteziryayo. The latter was the Governor of the former Butare Prefecture. He had replaced Habyarimana Jean Baptiste who was killed

because he did not support the génocidaire plan of killing Tutsi. This is how Jean says it:

Il nous a dit que les soldats du FPR avaient dépassé le Bugesera, qu'ils étaient à Mayaga, tout près. "Voilà aussi, a-t-il ajouté, vous devez vous mobiliser coûte que coûte pour tuer les Tutsi". Il nous a même donné un dicton: "Tu refuses de verser ton sang pour ton pays, et les chiens le boivent gratuitement. Partout où il y a un serpent vous devez le tuer" (Mukagasana, 2001:132).

He told us that RPF soldiers had crossed Bugesera, and that they were in Mayaga, near us. "To kill the Tutsi, you must mobilize yourselves at any cost", he added. He even used a very known Kinyarwanda saying: "If you refuse to give your blood to your country (to sacrifice for one's country), the dogs will drink it for free". Where there is a snake (meaning a Tutsi), you have to kill it".

The testimony of Jean N. is not different from the one of Pierre K. who was also in prison because of his role in genocide: "Maintenant, si tu sortirais de prison, que ferais-tu?" *"Je témoignerais contre le génocide, Et contre l'autorité qui nous l'a fait faire"* (Mukagasana, 2001:135)/"If you now get out of prison, what would you do?" "I would testify against genocide and against leaders who forced us to carry it out". Jean N. is expressing his remorse for his role but most importantly he is accusing the then leadership of Rwanda for having planned the genocide and for having compelled them to get involved in it.

The above example is a good illustration of how the then senior leadership of Rwanda who planned the 1994 genocide was also highly involved in its execution.

A last example, in the same context, is the testimony of Jean de Dieu, who was in prison and had pleaded guilty:

La voiture du bourgmestre Hategeka faisait des tournées en disant: "Travaillez très vite. Chassez l'ennemi". Pour nous c'était un devoir civique....Quand tu venais de tuer, les autorités te louaient et te considéraient comme un homme courageux. Même après avoir tué un homme, je n'ai senti aucun remord (Mukagasana, 2001:149).

Mayor Hategeka, in his car, was on a tour to encourage killings saying: “Kill very fast. Hunt the enemy [Tutsi]”. For us, it was a civic duty... After killing, leaders would laud you and consider you as a brave man. Even after I had killed a person, I did not feel any remorse.

There is much evidence that genocide was prepared since the late 1950’s. For those who may still have doubts, testimonies that were given in this section should provide convincing evidence for the truth of this statement.

5.2.5. Betrayal

Without the betrayal and complicity of the international community, including some countries, some international and national organisations, and some individuals, the 1994 genocide could not have happened. Some testimonies in *Les blessures du silence* highlight this theme of betrayal and I give some illustrative examples. Eduard Sebushumba, former Mayor of Giti has this to say:

La communauté internationale est coupable. Parce qu’on voit qu’elle n’a pas fait d’effort pour sauver la population. Je ne sais pas quel était son objectif. La France par exemple s’est investie dans la guerre au Rwanda avant le génocide: Ce sont les militaires français qui vérifiaient les cartes d’identité aux barrières et ils étaient sur le champ de bataille (Mukagasana, 2001:88).

The international community is guilty. Indeed, it did not make any effort to save the population. I don’t understand what its goal was. France, for example, was involved in the Rwandan war before the genocide: On roadblocks, French soldiers were checking identity cards, and they were also found on the frontlines.

Brother Jean Damascene Ndayambaje, a survivor of genocide who was teaching at the then National University of Rwanda, Ruhengeri campus and imprisoned for a long time in Ruhengeri prison testified about the role of France. He explains that in January 1991 when RPF attacked Ruhengeri and freed prisoners who were in Ruhengeri prison, almost all the released people had to leave Ruhengeri. The National University of Rwanda was forced to close its

doors as well. It was then fully occupied by French soldiers who previously were living in some of its houses: *“Des militaires français logeaient à l’université. Ils étaient là pour appuyer les FAR dans les combats contre le FPR. Leurs armes puissantes leur permettaient de tirer très loin, de sorte que les FAR pouvaient avancer* (Mukagasana, 2001:92)/French soldiers were staying at the University. They were there to support the FAR in the fighting against RPF. Their powerful weapons helped them to shell far away so that FAR could advance.

Génocidaires who pleaded guilty also accuse the international community, in particular the involvement of France. One of them is Valerie B., a renowned RTLM journalist who was the mouthpiece of the génocidaire government. She unveils the following:

La communauté internationale n’a rien fait, alors qu’elle en avait les moyens. Pourquoi est-ce qu’ils ont permis que tant de monde soit tué bêtement? Il y avait de bonnes relations entre la France et le Rwanda. Pas seulement privées, mais aussi politiques et diplomatiques. La France offrait une coopération, y compris dans le domaine militaire. La France était l’amie du Rwanda. (Mukagasana, 2001:96).

While it had means, the international community did nothing. Why did it allow so many people to be killed stupidly? There were good relations between France and Rwanda. Not only private relations, but also political and diplomatic ones. France also supported Rwanda in different domains including militarily. France was a close friend of Rwanda.

In the middle of genocide, after the UN had decided to continue its betrayal of Rwanda by withdrawing its peacekeepers, France went ahead and requested the UN Security Council to approve the deployment of “Operation Turquoise”, which was accepted. Troops started to arrive in Rwanda on 22 June 1994. Officially, the mission was a humanitarian intervention. However,

...given its field operations and the close relations that France had maintained with the regime, now with its genocidal forces in disarray, the intervention raised many suspicions. Creating a safe

humanitarian zone was considered by some as a way to provide those disorganized, re-treating forces a territory which could serve as a base to regain power (Habumuremyi, 2013:95-96).

The above quotation is complemented by what Alison Des Forges (1999:24) has written in her book, *Leave None to tell the Story*. She points out that France “undertook Operation Turquoise purportedly to save lives but also to preserve territory and legitimacy for the interim government”.

A Rwandan who met French soldiers during the 1994 genocide emphasizes what the two authors have discussed. One of them is Augustin N. who survived the 1994 genocide in Bisesero (Karongi District, Western Province). When asked how he judged the French deployment in his area, he easily responded: “*Les soldats français? Ils sont venus prêter main-forte aux génocidaires! C’est tout*” (Mukagasana, 2001:131)/French soldiers? They came to support génocidaires. That’s all.

Augustin N. agrees with Fabien H., who also survived genocide in Bisesero. He was then 11. The following explains how the French soldiers betrayed them:

Les Français sont arrivés, nous sommes tous sortis des cachettes. Au lieu de nous sauver ils nous ont dit de continuer à nous cacher comme nous le faisons et qu’ils reviendraient le jeudi suivant, alors qu’on était lundi. Là, les Interahamwe nous ont réellement tués durant ces trois jours (Mukagasana, 2001:110).

The French arrived, we all got out from our hiding places. Instead of saving us, they told us to continue to hide ourselves as we were doing and that they would come back the following Thursday, on that day it was Monday. During those three days, Interahamwe actually killed us.

In addition to the international betrayal, *Les blessures du silence* also stresses the betrayal between Rwandans. Friends betrayed their friends, religious people who were seen as people of God with all qualities of Christians, did the same. Brother Jean Damascène Ndayambaje who was seriously wounded in the ethnic killings of 1972 and was receiving secret medical treatment in Sovu nunnery where his sister was living as a candidate to become a nun (he fled

clandestinely the university hospital where he could be killed because he was Tutsi) was betrayed by Hutu nuns who were living with his sister:

En cette période, on marquait l'ethnie sur les fiches des malades. J'étais bandé de partout, j'entendais mais je ne pouvais pas parler. Comme ma sœur était candidate chez les sœurs de Sovu, par solidarité, les sœurs sont venues la nuit me prendre à l'hôpital. C'est ainsi que j'ai échappé à la mort sur ce lit d'hôpital. Le médecin belge venait me soigner chez les sœurs. Mais j'ai été dénoncé par les sœurs Hutu. On n'a dû me transporter de nuit de Butare à Kigali, puis vers Gisenyi pour rejoindre Goma.... Imagine que j'ai été transporté de Gisenyi à Goma dans une brouette, pour faire croire que je n'étais que la marchandise (Mukagasana, 2001:89).

In that period, ethnic identities were marked on patients' forms. I was bandaged almost everywhere. I could hear but I could not speak. As my sister was a candidate at Sovu Sisters, in solidarity, those Sisters came during the night to take me from the hospital. That is how I escaped death in that hospital. A Belgian doctor used to come and treat me at that nunnery. However, Hutu nuns betrayed me. They had to move me, during the night, from Butare to Kigali, then to Gisenyi to reach Goma... Imagine that from Gisenyi to Goma I was transported in a wheelbarrow, to make people believe that there were only goods.

Failing to protect any person in danger in all international laws is punishable. When Christians or those from other faiths fail to protect a person in danger, it becomes even worse. With the Catholic Church, it was unbelievable. Even Bishops, who were supposed to be role models for other Christians, gave a bad example. Brother Jean Damascène Ndayambaje experienced this betrayal when he was innocently jailed in Ruhengeri prison and visited by a group of ambassadors accredited to Rwanda including Bishop Morandini, the Apostolic Nuncio. This is how Brother Jean Damascène Ndayambaje describes the bishop who was his superior betrayed him:

Nous avons eu la visite des ambassadeurs, dont le Nonce Apostolique, Mgr Morandini, un homme très méchant. Quelqu'un qui avait été torturé et dont les blessures étaient très infectées lui a demandé secours. Pour toute réponse, il lui a dit: "Moi aussi, j'ai été opéré, et je mangeais tout. Il faut manger ce que l'on vous donne". L'évêque s'est alors retourné vers moi et m'a dit: "Monsieur le

professeur, que faites-vous ici”? J’ai répondu: “Excellence, voici mes nouveaux élèves”. Il est devenu tout rouge. Il a regardé un prêtre handicapé et dont on avait confisqué la béquille et l’appareil qui lui soutenait la jambe et lui a dit: “Et toi, le boiteux, qu’est que tu fais ici?” (Mukagasana, 2001:90).

We had a visit of ambassadors, including Bishop Morandini, the Apostolic Nuncio, a very dangerous man, visited us. Someone who had been tortured and whose injuries were very infected requested his assistance. In response, he told him: “Even myself I had a surgical operation, and I was eating everything. You must eat what you are given”. The Bishop then turned to me and told me: “Professor, what are you doing here”? I answered: "Excellence, these are my new students". He was confused. He then looked at a disabled priest whose crutch and device that was supporting his leg were confiscated and asked him: “And you, the lame person, what are you doing here?”

The above nasty remarks from Apostolic Nuncio, Bishop Morandini, to suffering people including a Priest and a Brother of his church, are a good illustration of his betrayal to his people and even his God! The use of irony when he was addressing both Brother Jean Damascene and the priest gives more explanations to his betrayal. Calling the disabled priest a lame person in cruel language is another indicator that the Bishop considered the priest a bad person who deserved only to be betrayed and not assisted.

The RPF soldiers released Brother Jean Damascène Ruhengeri Prison, and he went to a refugee camp. He met there some Hutu religious people whom he knew and were his friends. He again experienced the same betrayal as the one of Apostolic Nuncio, Bishop Morandini in Ruhengeri Prison that I have earlier explained: *“On m’a laissé sur le chemin à un camp de réfugiés. J’y ai trouvé presque tous les religieux que je connaissais. Mais tout le monde m’a fui comme un lépreux, parce que j’avais fait la prison (Mukagasana, 2001: 90) /They left me on the way to a refugee camp. I found there almost all religious people whom I knew. But everyone ran away from me as if I was a leprous, simply because I had been in prison.*

Later, when Brother Jean Damascène was in that refugee camp, he was asked by a staff of the International Red Cross to prepare a list of the needs of refugees. While doing it, he was again betrayed by one of his “friend”:

Un officier, Charles Uwihoreye, m’a craché au visage, alors que c’était un ami et que nous avions l’habitude de nous inviter à manger. Il a désigné un cachot pour moi, où nous étions dix, ou plutôt six, car quatre prisonniers étaient déjà mort (Mukagasana, 2001:91).

Charles Uwihoreye, an army officer and a friend, we used to invite each other to share meals, opened his mouth and spit on my face. He showed me the way to a dungeon in which we were ten, or rather six, as four prisoners had already died there.

Brother Jean Damascène was betrayed by many people and in many ways. When he was about to survive the genocide, together with some Tutsi who were hiding in Hotel des Mille Collines, they were betrayed by members of the UN Peacekeepers from Congo Brazzaville:

Un autre coup de chance que j’ai eu: lorsque les casques bleus du Congo-Brazzaville ont dressé une liste des réfugiés des Mille-Collines qui voulaient gagner la zone du FPR, je ne me suis pas fait inscrire. Or, cette liste, les casques bleus l’ont remise aux FAR qui sont immédiatement venus exécuter tous les inscrits, soit une dizaine de personnes (Mukagasana, 2001:94).

I had another chance: when members of the UN Peacekeepers from Congo-Brazzaville prepared a list of refugees who wanted to join the RPF side from Hotel des Mille Collines, I did not register my name. Those members of the UN Peacekeepers handed that list to FAR that immediately came to kill those who were on it, they were about 10 people.

More explanations are needed about the transfer of Tutsi refugees who were in Hotel des Mille Collines to the RPF side. In late May, the RPF took both the Airport and the major military camp at Kanombe in Kigali. This was a big blow to the then genocidal government. When RPF captured these two strategic places, it also captured about eight hundred soldiers of the former regime and some members of their families. It treated them as prisoners of war. They were gathered at Amahoro Stadium. The former Rwandan government then sought

their release through the assistance of General Roméo Dallaire, the commander of the UN Peace Mission in Rwanda. RPF agreed with the principle but on one condition: they had to be exchanged with refugees who were in Milles Collines. Faced with this situation, the then Government of Rwanda accepted as it did not want to lose its loyal people. That is why lists from Milles Collines Hotel were prepared. However, some were not able to reach the RPF side as génocidaires and their supporters like the above Congolese peacekeepers planned to exterminate some of the refugees.

Congolese were not the only international peacekeepers to betray Rwanda. Even Belgian peacekeepers did the same but in a different way. This is how Laetitia T. who survived the genocide in Kicukiro says it:

Le 9 avril 1994, nous avons cherché refuge à l'Ecole Technique Officielle. Elle était pleine, des casques bleus la protégeaient. Mais au bout de quatre jours, le général Rusatira est venu discuter avec eux et il plie bagage en nous abandonnant. Juste après leur départ, des grenades sont tombées dans la foule... (Mukagasana, 2001:151).

On 9 April 1994, we sought refuge in the Official Technical School [Kicukiro]. It was full, peacekeepers were protecting it. But after four days, General Rusatira came to discuss with them, they withdrew and abandoned us. Just after their departure, grenades were thrown into the crowd...

Betraying other people during the 1994 genocide was commonplace. Agnes M. who survived the genocide after being raped several times, was betrayed by a wife of a couple that she had decided to follow and pretended to be their daughter: *“Aux barrières, je prétextais être l'enfant de l'homme, bien que sa femme voulait me livrer. Tout à coup, ils ont été surpris par des soldats du FPR. Moi j'étais sauvée”* (Mukagasana, 2001:101)/On roadblocks, I pretended to be the child of that man, even though his wife wanted to betray me. Suddenly, they were surprised by soldiers of the RPF. For me, I was saved.

Julie, a survivor of genocide who was a teacher, was betrayed by her former pupils: *“Les enfants à qui j'ai enseigné qui étaient à l'université, ce sont eux qui*

ont tué mes enfants. Ils ont été les premiers à les pourchasser” (Mukagasana, 2001:144)/The children whom I taught and who were pursuing their university studies, are the ones who killed my children. They were the first to hunt them down.

There are many examples of betrayal in *Les blessures du silence*. They cannot all be discussed in this paper. The illustrations that were mentioned are enough to justify the presence of betrayal in the testimonies that were analysed.

5.2.6. Resistance

Resistance is another theme that is at work in *Les blessures du silence*. It describes how Tutsi who were targeted by génocidaires tried to resist. Faced with the then government, which was determined to exterminate them all and had all the necessary means to do so, Tutsi could not resist for long. A combination of their moral force and traditional weapons and stones could not stop thousands of mad, well-trained génocidaires who were often equipped with modern arms. It has also to be mentioned that all security organs were working hand in hand with Interahamwe militias that had a mission of exterminating Tutsi and few Hutu who did not support the genocidal plan.

There are different reports that mention how Tutsi, before being exterminated, organized heroic resistances countrywide. However, as Scherrer (2002:114) points out, and as many Rwandans know, some places became most remarkable.

The most remarkable case was the heroic resistance of the Bisesero Tutsi in Kibuye [Western Province]. It was known that in 1959 and 1973 the cattle herders of Bisesero had resisted genocidal attacks by armed Hutu gangs. The case of Bisesero is unique-with the local community having resisted earlier massacres-but nevertheless exemplifies how the killing was organized. Among the organizers were officials and businessmen...As the Bisesero Tutsi went on resisting, the key organisers Kayishema [former Prefet/Governor of Kibuye, Ruzindana [local renowned businessman] and the heads of

Interahamwe called for reinforcements, among them truckloads of Burundi refugees from southern Rwanda who had a solid reputation as experienced mass killers.

Most testimonies in *Les blessures du silence* deal with the resistance of Tutsi who were in Bisesero. The next lines will give some examples that explain how those Tutsi tried to defend themselves. The first testimony comes from Fabien H. who survived the genocide in Bisesero at the age of 11. He was born in a family of five children but he is the only survivor:

Nous étions cinq enfants, j'étais le plus jeune et je suis le seul survivant... Je faisais partie des enfants qui ramassaient les cailloux pour les adultes... Je suis allé vers le sommet de Karongi, là où il y a l'antenne de la radio, nous avons encore essayé de résister, mais ils tuaient énormément (Mukagasana, 2001:110).

We were five children in my family... I was part of children who were picking up stones for adults... I went to the top of Karongi Mountain, where there is the radio antenna, we tried to resist, but they [génocidaires] were killing a lot of people...

Jean Yves B. who also survived the genocide in Bisesero gives more details of how their resistance was:

Nous nous battions avec les assassins qui nous attaquaient tous les jours. Au début ils n'étaient pas nombreux et certains d'entre eux n'avaient que des armes traditionnelles. ... Nous avons continué la résistance. Je ne me suis jamais caché pendant tout ce temps de combats... (Mukagasana, 2001:110).

We were fighting with génocidaires who were attacking us every day. At first, they were not many and some of them had only traditional weapons. ... We continued our resistance. I never hid myself during all that time of fighting.

Jean Yves B. continues his testimony as follows:

Deux jours plus tard, ils se sont attaqués à nous, le combat a duré cinq heures. Nous voilà avec deux blessés et toutes les difficultés de la résistance. Nous ne pouvions chercher à manger qu'à partir de dix heures, après la lutte de toute une journée, la peur, la fatigue, la faim, les morts, les séparations (Mukagasana, 2001:111).

Two days later, they attacked us, the fight lasted for five hours. We recorded two people who were wounded and met all challenges of the resistance. We could only look for something to eat after 10. 00 PM, after an entire day of fight, with fear, exhaustion, hunger, deaths and separations.

The testimony of Jean Yves B. and the previous one of Fabien H. need special consideration. The two were too young, respectively 14 and 11 at the time of the genocide. Normally at their age, they were not supposed to play an active role in fighting with génocidaires. However, given the situation that Rwanda was going through, they had to help their fathers and other elder people who had decided to face the génocidaires instead of being killed as animals that are sent to slaughters. Various reports indicate that even women, who in ancient Rwandan culture, were not supposed to be at frontlines, were also involved in different heroic activities that aimed to protect Tutsi from being killed. In the same vein, even Hutu children and women from génocidaires' families, played a key role in the execution of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi.

The role of children and women is supported by the testimony of Augustin G., a genocide survivor from Bisesero. He was 40 years old when the genocide started. He was among the Bisesero men who strongly resisted the génocidaires deadly attacks. He describes how in their resistance they were assisted by children and women:

Les femmes et les enfants ramassaient les cailloux et les hommes se battaient avec les assassins. Nous avons essayé d'aller sur les collines dominantes. Il y avait des camions et des bus pleins de miliciens et des gens d'un peu partout qui s'étaient joints à eux. Bisesero est devenu un champ de bataille (Mukagasana, 2001:136).

Women and children picked up stones and men fought with the génocidaires. We tried to go on the top of dominant mountains. There were trucks and buses full of militiamen and other killers from everywhere who had come to join them [Interahamwe of the place]. Bisesero really had become a battle field.

As earlier mentioned in the introduction of this section, in *Les blessures du silence*, there are other places that organised resistance against génocidaires.

One of them is Ntarama in Busesera District. Seven year-old Francine M. who survived at Ntarama, explains how their resistance was: “*Les adultes nous disaient de ramassaient les cailloux pour nous défendre. Nous leur en apportions. Les hommes qui étaient encore capables de se battre lançaient les cailloux sur les assassins*” (Mukagasana, 2001:134)/Adults were telling us to look for stones to defend ourselves. We were bringing them to them. The men who were still able to fight threw stones at the génocidaires.

The resistance that took place at the top of Kubutera Hill and its surroundings (in Ntarama), as was the case for all Tutsi resistances in the country, did not last. Interahamwe who were supported by security organs and Interahamwe militias from different places such as Kigali City defeated and killed almost all of them. Few who survived were saved by RPF Inkotanyi when the area was liberated.

Another place where Tutsi tried to resist, is Nyamata, also in Bugesera District. The Testimony of Grégoire reveals a bit how they resisted and how they were defeated: “*Nous avons résisté jusqu’à ce qu’on envoie trois bus pleins de militaires bien armés*” (Mukagasana, 2001:86) /We resisted until three buses full of well-armed soldiers were sent to kill us. If the Interahamwe of Nyamata had not received the reinforcement of the then Rwandan army forces, the Tutsi of Nyamata could, perhaps, have stayed stronger until the arrival of RPF soldiers.

The last place (in *Les blessures du silence*) that shows an organized resistance of the targeted victims of genocide, is Gikongoro, in the southern Province of Rwanda. Emmanuel M., a survivor from that area and an eyewitness of that resistance describes it as follows: “*Nous nous défendions comme nous pouvions, avec des pierres contre des armes à feu*” (Mukagasana, 2001:131)/Using stones against guns, we were defending ourselves as best as we could.

I would like to conclude this section with the description of a special resistance to genocide: moral force. This is how Brother Jean Damascène describes it: “*Je*

banalise l'homme, car il est tout petit et passager. Il faut lutter contre le mal, mais pas avec un fusil. Avec une force morale" (Blessures 94)/I underestimate [any] person, because he/she is very small and non-permanent. The evil must be fought against, but not with a gun. With a moral force. How Brother Jean Damascène thinks of the use of non-violence meets what the famous Mahatma Gandhi, the preeminent leader of the Indian independence movement in British-ruled India, preached when he said that "*Nonviolence is a weapon of the strong*".

5.2.7. Rape

Rape, a type of sexual attack generally consisting of sexual intercourse or other forms of sexual penetration perpetrated against a person without her/his consent, was a weapon of génocidaires who executed the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. Most cases of people who were raped during the genocide were women. However, there are rare cases where women génocidaires raped Tutsi men. The Human Rights Watch Report (1996:39) gives a good description of how during the 1994 genocide women were raped:

During the 1994 genocide, Rwandan women were subjected to brutal forms of sexual violence. Rape was widespread. Women were individually raped, gang-raped, raped with objects such as sharpened sticks or gun barrels, held in sexual slavery (collectively or individually) or sexually mutilated.

In *Les blessures du silence*, there are many examples of rape. Firstly, there are women who were raped and have accepted to testify against it, secondly there are people who raped and have pleaded guilty and lastly, there are eyewitnesses or those who were informed, in one way or another, of the perpetration of rape during the 1994 genocide.

Let us begin with women who acknowledge that they were raped. Agnès M. is one of them. This is how she describes how she was raped:

Le lendemain, le même milicien est revenu et m'a violée. Puis, il m'a reconduite chez la vieille. Et le lendemain, c'est un autre milicien, un

borgne, qui est venu. J'ai été à nouveau conduite dans une maison déserte, j'ai été violée et frappée une nuit durant. Et le jour d'après, c'est un militaire qui est venu. Il m'a emmenée dans une autre maison, pleine de rats et de puces... (Mukagasana, 2001:101).

The following day, the same militiaman came and raped me. Then, he took me to the old woman. And the next day, another blind militiaman came. I was again taken to an empty house. During the whole night, I was raped and beaten. And the day after, a soldier came. He took me to another house, full of mice and fleas...

What happened to Agnès M. confirms what was pointed out in the 1996 report of Human Rights Watch that was mentioned at the beginning of this section. Agnès was firstly individually raped, then raped by many people, at different times and places. Her rape went with humiliation. Indeed, rape in itself is humiliation. However, for the case of Agnès it was even worse. She was raped by a blind man who in normal circumstances could not rape her. The blind man succeeded in raping her because she was defenceless, and the blind man was supported by other génocidaires. Another reason that justifies how Agnès was nastily raped, is to be beaten and raped at the same time and for the entire night. Needless to say, even being raped in a house full of mice and fleas was also another indicator of how génocidaires had already dehumanised her. She was assimilated with animals.

Clémence K. is another survivor who was raped. Her case is different from stories of rape that are recorded in *Les blessures du silence*. In addition to being atrociously raped, as it was the case for other women who were raped, she was made pregnant out of that rape.

This is how she describes it:

Finally, l'un d'eux m'a emmenée et enfermée, toujours nue, dans une pièce sombre. Le jour, il allait travailler, c'est-à-dire tuer, piller, violer humilier.... Le soir il me battait et me violait... Lorsque je me suis retrouvée enceinte j'ai d'abord eu honte (Mukagasana, 2001:103).

Finally, one of them took me and locked me up in a dark room, still naked. During the day, he was going to kill, (what was called to

work), loot, rape, humiliate... Throughout the night, he was beating and raping me... When I realized that I was pregnant, I first felt ashamed.

After being in the above humiliating conditions that are similar to the ones of Agnès M. that were earlier explained, Clémence got an unwanted pregnancy. After surviving the genocide, she finally gave birth to a daughter that she at first did not want because of the conditions in which she was made pregnant. She was terribly traumatized. With time, she came to love her innocent daughter and named her Umumarungu. In Kinyarwanda this name has a special meaning. It means somebody who helps to get out of loneliness.

Another example of rape is illustrated in the testimony of Vestina M., a survivor of genocide. She explains how she was raped by a young brother of a militia who protected her as well as her children. She accepted to be a slave of rape instead of losing her life and that of her children *“C’est le petit frère d’un milicien, un milicien pourtant aussi, qui m’a sauvé la vie. Il m’a prise en otage pendant toute ma cavale. Il me violait régulièrement. Je le laissais user de mon corps, pourvu qu’il n’assassine pas mes enfants”* (Mukagasana, 2001:128)/I was saved by a young brother of a militiaman, he was also a militiaman. He took me hostage during the time of genocide. He was regularly raping me. I did not resist. I allowed him to abuse my body, provided that he did not slaughter my children.

Psychologically, Vestina M. was terribly suffering. There is nothing worse than being raped in the presence of your children. Interahamwe militias were not behaving like human beings. Indeed, their misbehaviour was inferior to that of animals. In history, there are no records whereby animals of the same pieces kill each other as Rwandans did in genocide. When animals fight, it is for the control of other animals. Those which are defeated, immediately accept the new leadership.

Victoire M., is another genocide survivor who gave a testimony of an unspeakable experience of being raped. Her testimony is a bit special. She

explains how the burgomaster/mayor of her district was the one who sensitised Interahamwe militias to rape Tutsi women:

Le bourgmestre Akayezu disait aux Interahamwe: “Vous devez sentir vous-mêmes le plaisir que l’on éprouve à violer une femme Tutsi”. Et les Interahamwe commençaient alors le viol. Les filles hurlaient de douleur... Aucune fille avec laquelle j’ai été violée n’est plus en vie. C’étaient des filles de quatorze à seize ans. Les violeurs venaient à plusieurs, ils nous prenaient par équipes de quinze ou vingt. Ils nous déshabillaient, la partie inférieure seulement. Le premier jour, j’ai été violée par quatre personnes, je me suis évanouie, j’étais comme morte, j’ai passé trois jours avec de la fièvre... Ce troisième jour, j’ai été violée par plus de six personnes. Ils étaient sur une file, ils me violaient à tour de rôle. Moi, j’étais comme un cadavre, je n’avais même plus mal... Il s’agissait seulement pour les assassins d’humilier la femme Tutsi. Et ils le faisaient souvent devant leurs épouses qui étaient complices de notre humiliation... parmi tous ces gens, je n’en ai vu qu’un seul qui ait mis un préservatif, c’était plus tard dans la forêt de Murambi. Il avait une épée qu’il a déposée à côté de lui, il a enfilé sa capote, il m’a couchée sur mon enfant et il m’a violée. “Quoi? Pendant tous ces viols, tu avais ton enfant sur le dos?” “Bien sûr” (Mukagasana, 2001:147).

Burgomaster Akayezu was giving orders to Interahamwe: “You have to feel yourselves the pleasure of raping a Tutsi woman”. And immediately the Interahamwe started to rape. Girls were screaming because of the pain... None of the girls who were raped with me is still alive. They were girls of between 14 and 16 years old. Rapists came in big numbers, they took us in teams of fifteen or twenty. They undressed us, the lower part only. On the first day, I was raped by four people, and I collapsed, I looked dead. I spent three days with a fever. On that third day, I was raped by more than six people. They were on a queue, and they raped me in turn. I was like a living corpse, and I was even feeling nothing... For rapists, they only wanted to humiliate Tutsi women. And often they raped us in front of their wives who were accomplices of our humiliation... Among all those people, I saw only one person who used a condom, it was later in the forest of Murambi. He had a sword that he put down next to him, he put on his condom, laid me on my child and raped me. “What?” During all these rapes, you had your baby on your back?” “Of course”.

The above example explains how rape was organized during the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. It was a tool that was used to encourage génocidaires to kill Tutsi. If this was not the case, all the girls who were raped with Victoire M. could not have all been killed. Victoire M. further describes well how Tutsi women and ladies were humiliated when she points out how they were raped in front of the Hutu wives of rapists.

The humiliation of Victoire M was double. She was even raped in front of her child. Her child who was on her back during all the series of rapes experienced and witnessed what happened to her mother. This was too demeaning, degrading and assaulting. No words can justify this humiliation.

In addition to the sadistic behaviour of Interahamwe rapists, there may be another reason why génocidaires raped many Tutsi women and ladies. Before genocide, many men, especially rich ones were saying that Tutsi women were more beautiful in comparison to other Hutu women. It was because of this that some rich and powerful Hutu were in close friendship with Tutsi girls. To stop this, Hutu extremists came up with ten Hutu commandments that I have earlier explained. The first commandment as Thomson (2007:280) says, “*warns Hutu men of the dangers of Tutsi women and deems a traitor any Hutu man who marries a Tutsi woman, keeps a Tutsi mistress or makes a Tutsi woman his secretary or protégée*”.

In some cases, rape of Tutsi women/ladies was motivated by revenge. This is what happened to Petronilla N., a widow survivor of genocide with a Hutu mother:

Ils étaient très nombreux et l'un d'eux a dit: “Depuis tout le temps que tu n'as pas voulu coucher avec les Hutu, nous allons voir aujourd'hui. Va devant et marche”... Ils m'ont conduite dans une plantation de caféier. Ils m'ont couchée et ont planté des épées tout autour de moi. Ils m'ont violée à tour de rôle. J'ai commencé à saigner, mais ils n'ont pas arrêté” (Mukagasana, 2001:145).

They were so many and one of them told me: “Since all the time you have refused to sleep with Hutu, we will see today. Go ahead and walk. They took me to a coffee plantation. They lied me down and surrounded me with swords. They raped me in turn. I started to bleed, but they did not stop.

The Hutu extremists who raped Petronilla N. were doing it to punish her because she was married to a Tutsi husband, who was also a victim of genocide. Those Hutu were blaming her because she had refused to be married to a Hutu. One may say that these Hutu extremists were mad enough to even forget that Petronilla had their blood as her mother was a Hutu like them. However, as earlier explained, the madness of génocidaires could not allow them to be guided by normal human logic.

The last example of rape from among those who accepted to testify how they were raped is Cécile M. Her testimony is exceptional. Among all the women who were raped in *Les blessures du silence*, she was the only one who was raped before having her first period:

Je n'avais pas encore eu mes premières règles. Sous prétexte de me protéger, un homme du nom d'Antoine, m'a emmené dans un endroit isolé, m'a déshabillée et m'a violée. J'ai crié, j'ai pleuré, je saignais. Mais rien n'y fit. Antoine m'a ensuite conduite chez un de ses amis, Emmanuel, et tous deux se sont mis à me violer à tour de rôle (Mukagasana, 2001:148).

I had not yet had my first period. Under the pretext of protecting me, a man called Antoine, took me to an isolated place, undressed me and raped me. I screamed, I cried, I was bleeding. But it was not helpful. Antoine then led me to one of his friends, Emmanuel, and both started to rape me in turn.

What happened to Cécile M. explains how some Tutsi women were held in sexual slavery. She was betrayed by Antoine who promised her protection whereas he had a plan of raping her. The fact that after Antoine had raped Cécile M. several times and he called Emmanuel to rape her is another indicator of nastiness of génocidaires. They could not even have mercy on

Cécile M. who was so young and defenceless. She was 15 years old when she was raped.

The second category of rape in *Les blessures du silence*, as earlier mentioned, is composed of people who have pleaded guilty that they have raped. Jean Léonard B. is one of them. At the time of the interview in 1999, he was in prison and he had pleaded guilty. This is how he said it: *“Moi, je suis rentré dans la maison pour demander du feu pour fumer. J’ai vu une fille qui se cachait là, et j’ai fait sortir les enfants pour la violer. Elle avait plus ou moins dix-sept...”* (Mukagasana, 2001:150)/I went to a house to ask fire for smoking. I saw a girl who was hiding there, and I asked children to go out and I raped her. She was more or less seventeen...

Jean Léonard’s justification that before raping the 17 year-old girl he had to take out all the children needs further explanations. It is as if he had pity for children. But this is not valid. Even his victim was still under age and she was supposed to be protected. His statement was, therefore, a contradiction. What is clear, is that he knew that the girl was there. He only came with the intention of raping her. What he was trying to say is to hide his responsibility. He wants to prove that he did not rape her whereas in fact, he did it.

The last category of rape is composed of eyewitnesses of rape or those who were informed of how it was practiced. A good example is the testimony of Jean N. This is how he said it: *“Et où sont les violeurs?” “Sur la colline. J’en connais un: mon petit frère. Mais il paraît que la femme était d’accord. Il est en prison, mais je ne sais pas s’il est coupable”* (Mukagasana, 2001: 132) /“And where are rapists?” “In villages. I know one: my young brother. But it seems that the woman had agreed. He is in prison, but I don’t know whether he is guilty.

Jean N. is somehow trying to cover up the crime committed by his young brother. He wants to mislead people that the lady had agreed to willingly have sex with his brother whereas in fact it was not the case.

Another example is given through the testimony of Aphrodis N. who was in a centre of re-education at the time of the interview because of his role in genocide. Aphrodis N. who was 14 during the genocide against Tutsi gives an example of a person because who was considered famous for raping many Tutsi women: *“Le frère du bourgmestre travaillait au ministère. Pendant le génocide, il était appelé Ruteruzi (celui qui soulève les femmes en public pour les violer)”* (Mukagasana, 2001:122)/The burgomaster’s brother was employed in the ministry. During the genocide, he was nicknamed Ruteruzi (the one who lifts women in public in order to rape them).

Another example is the testimony of Véronique U., a survivor of genocide. She narrates how a person who saved her after taking her as a house girl was frequently raping a young girl of 13 years old who was named Madeleine. This is how she describes it: *“Mais un homme est venu, qui m’a demandée comme servante. Arrivée chez lui, j’ai découvert qu’il s’appelait Ntahemuka et qu’il séquestrait une autre fille, une fille de treize ans qui s’appelait Madeleine, qu’il violait régulièrement”* (Mukagasana, 2001:142)/But a man came, he took me as a servant. When I arrived at his residence, I learnt that he was called Ntahemuka and that he was holding illegally another girl of thirteen named Madeleine. He was raping her regularly.

The last example is the testimony of Francine M., a survivor of genocide who was married to a Hutu husband. She narrates how different women were raped:

Je suis parvenue à acheter une femme qui était en travail pour trois mille francs. Elle était en train de coucher dans la fosse. J’ai promis aux Interahamwe qu’après l’accouchement, je prendrais la fille pour qu’ils la tuent. Je l’ai cachée chez un voisin pour qu’on ne vienne pas la chercher chez moi. Quand je suis retournée la voir, elle avait été emmenée dans la bananeraie pour être violée, le jour même de son accouchement. ...La femme de Ntereye a été violée alors qu’elle était enceinte à terme, elle a directement accouché d’un mort-né... J’ai assisté au viol de Nishimwe. Je connais tous ceux qui les ont violées,

tous ceux que j'ai pu voir je les ai dénoncés, mais le bourgmestre Akayezu était à la base de tout (Mukagasana, 2001:148).

I managed to save the life of a woman who was in labour by paying three thousand francs. She was delivering in a pit. I promised the Interahamwe that after childbirth, I would take the girl so that they could kill her. I hid her in my neighbour's house so that they could not come back to look for her at my residence. When I went to see her, she was taken to the banana plantation to be raped, the same day of giving birth. ... The wife of Ntereye was raped when she was about to give birth. She immediately gave birth to a stillborn baby. I know all people who raped, all the rapists whom I saw, I denounced them, but the burgomaster Akayezu was responsible for the rapes.

It has to be stressed that Hutu were not happy when after the 1994 genocide against Tutsi Francine M. started to denounce rapists. They were very angry at her. Even her Hutu husband, with whom she had seven children, was among them. To show how he disapproved of her bravery in telling the truth, he decided to leave her. Francine M. ended up alone with her children together with five other orphans of her sisters who were killed in the genocide, struggling terribly to look after them.

In short, there is evidence in *Les blessures du silence* proving beyond a reasonable doubt the presence of rape. These proofs were given by people who were raped and had the courage to give testimony, people who raped and pleaded guilty, and people who witnessed rape or were informed of it.

5.2.8. Justice and reconciliation

Some of the testimonies in *Les blessures du silence* deal with the theme of justice and reconciliation. They explain how, for a better future in post-genocide Rwanda, it was a must to rebuild the national unity through justice. Indeed, only justice and reconciliation could help to achieve a non-confrontational social cohabitation between survivors of genocide, génocidaires, and members of their families.

For reconciliation to be possible, the only condition that the book sets, generally through survivors, and Yolande in particular, is justice. Yolande

summarises this condition as follows: *“La justice est le seul moyen de redonner vie à la société rwandaise et sans elle rien d’autre ne sera plus possible. Elle est nécessaire par devoir de mémoire”* (Mukagasana, 2001:10)/Justice is the only condition to help Rwandans have a new life; and without it nothing else will be possible. Justice is necessary to achieve memory duty.

In their introductory remarks (*in Les blessures du silence*), Yolande and Alain Kazinierakis clearly point out that justice leads to true reconciliation through forgiveness: *“Il n’y aura pas d’humanité sans pardon, il n’y aura pas de pardon sans justice, mais il n’y aura pas de justice sans humanité”* (Mukagasana, 2001:9)/There will be no humanity without forgiveness, there will be no forgiveness without justice, but there is no justice without humanity. Yolande adds:

La justice rendue est la condition nécessaire pour que puisse tracer un nouveau chemin dans la vie des survivants... Il n’y aura pas de réconciliation sans justice, certes, mais il n’y aura pas non plus si les bourreaux sont diabolisés en bloc (Mukagasana, 2001:82).

Giving justice is a necessary condition to help survivors to start a new life. There will be no reconciliation without justice; reconciliation can’t also happen if people who were found guilty of their role in genocide are all demonized without any distinction.

Talking about justice, Yolande understands well how it was a complex issue. This complexity is caused by the nature of the genocide against Tutsi. This genocide was planned by Rwandans and executed by Rwandans. Almost all the victims of genocide were killed by their neighbours. There are some reported cases where Hutu men killed their Tutsi wives and some of their children who looked like their mothers. However, as earlier explained, it has to be reminded that Rwandan génocidaires were supported by some international organisations and countries. This is how Yolande defines the complexity of the genocide against Tutsi: *“Parmi les Rwandais, il y a des criminels qui ont pensé, planifié et exécuté le génocide. Il faut les juger. Il y a des victimes, et d’autres qui ne sont ni victimes ni bourreaux”* (Mukagasana, 2001:10)/Among Rwandans,

there are criminals who thought, planned and executed the genocide. They must be judged. There are victims, and others who are neither victims nor executioners.

In her deep analysis, Yolande realised that all three types of Rwandans need justice. She provides explanations:

Les survivants du génocide ont besoin de justice, pour que leur soit rendue leur dignité d'être humain. Les bourreaux aussi ont besoin de justice, d'abord pour se construire eux-mêmes, puis pour participer à la reconstruction de la société rwandaise. Quant aux innocents, ils ont besoin d'écartier les soupçons qui pèsent sur eux. La justice est le seul moyen de redonner vie à la société rwandaise et sans elle rien d'autre ne sera plus possible. Elle est nécessaire par devoir de mémoire (Mukagasana, 2001:10).

To bring back their dignity as human beings, survivors of genocide need justice. The génocidaires also need justice, firstly to reconcile with themselves, and secondly to be able to participate in the reconstruction of the Rwandan society. As for innocent people, they need to move away from suspicions hanging over them. Justice is the only way to revive new life to the Rwandan society, and without it, nothing else will be possible. It is also necessary for memory.

It is out of the above conviction of Yolande Mukagasana that in collecting testimonies that were used in writing *Les blessures du silence*, she came up with the idea of having both survivors and génocidaires speak equally. This was meant to show that after genocide, it was still possible to reconcile Rwandans and help them live together again. In addition, as Yolande says, listening to génocidaires' testimonies would help to know all details of how the genocide against Tutsi was planned and executed. This is because what survivors know is too limited. They do not know fully, how the genocide was planned as they did not participate in meetings that organised it. Equally important, they do not have a complete understanding of how the genocide was planned as they were hiding and not allowed to move freely. This is how Yolande explains the importance of talking to génocidaires: *“Mais la vérité que nous connaissons n'est qu'une partie de la vérité. Les bourreaux savent toute la vérité. Il faut*

qu'elle sorte" (Mukagasana, 2001:10)/But the truth that we know is only part of the truth. Génocidaires know the whole truth. They must reveal it.

Yolande Mukagasana further explains why both Hutu and Tutsi have to equally testify about the 1994 genocide against Tutsi:

Les Hutu et les Tutsi ont toujours cohabité, cohabitent encore après le génocide et cohabiteront toujours dans mon pays car nous sommes tous les enfants de Gihanga, notre ancêtre à tous. Nous n'avons jamais été des ethnies mais nous avons été transformés en ethnies (Mukagasana, 2001:80).

Hutu and Tutsi have always lived together, after the genocide, they again live together and they will always live in my country. This is because we are all children of Gihanga, our common ancestor. We never had ethnic groups. We were rather transformed into ethnic groups.

What Yolande Mukagasana is saying is right. Rwanda does not have an island of Hutu and another of Tutsi. We are all Rwandans. We have to live together as one people. In addition, Rwandans are not qualified to have ethnic groups. We have the same language and culture. Divisions between Rwandans, as it was explained in chapter one, were brought in by Belgians who colonized Rwanda with the intention of dividing Rwandans in order to control them.

It is unfortunate that these ethnic divisions built on false theories were highly welcomed by both leaders of the First and Second Republics. I will not elaborate on this as in chapter one I provided many details. Yolande refers to these divisions as follows: *"De toute façon, nous ne pouvons reconstruire que sur la vérité et la justice. Depuis 1959, nous avons toujours vécu les massacres des Tutsi, or je n'ai jamais entendu qu'une personne ait été punie pour avoir tué un Tutsi"* (Mukagasana, 2001:80)/In any case, we can only rebuild [our country] on truth and justice. Since 1959, we have always experienced massacres of Tutsi, but I have never heard of any person who was punished for having killed a Tutsi. As earlier explained in chapter one, Hutu who were found responsible for killing Tutsi were promoted to higher ranks.

Let us now have other examples of how people who gave their testimonies talk about justice and reconciliation. Grégoire. H. who says that Rwanda has known impunity for a long time, advises on what may be done in the aftermath of genocide: *“Qu’on puisse séparer les hommes justes et les bourreaux. Que le coupable soit séparé de l’innocent. On a assez vécu l’impunité. Je le dis avec colère”* (Mukagasana, 2001:86)/We have to be able to separate innocent people from génocidaires. We have experienced impunity for long. I say this with anger. What Grégoire. H. is saying is not different from the statements of Eduard Sebushumba, the former burgomaster of Giti Commune and Brother Jean Damascène Ndayambaje. Whereas Eduard Sebushumba says that *“La première réconciliation c’est la justice”* (Mukagasana, 2001:88)/The first reconciliation is justice. Brother Jean Damascène Ndayambaje complements him in pointing out that *“Pas de réconciliation sans justice. Ceux qui pensent le contraire veulent mettre les gens dos à dos”* (Blessures 95) /No reconciliation without justice. Those who think the contrary want to put blame on both sides. In other words, both Eduard Sebushumba and Jean Damascène Ndayambaje want to stress that without justice, reconciliation is impossible.

Emmanuel M. a genocide survivor from Gikongoro, who was frustrated because of what he experienced in genocide, also thinks that justice is an important key to reconciliation: *“Je me révolte, mais je me sens totalement impuissant. Je ne crois pas à la réconciliation sans justice”* (Mukagasana, 2001:131)/I am in revolt, but I totally feel helpless. I do not believe in reconciliation without justice. This means that only true justice can help him accept to willingly reconcile with himself first, then with people who were responsible for genocide that took almost his entire family, damaged his belongings and broke his heart.

Reconciliation is a long process. It does not come overnight. Indeed, it is not an easy task to develop new trust between people whose relationships were seriously damaged. For an effective reconciliation, culprits must first of all sincerely apologise. Victims must also willingly forgive them. To arrive at this level, both concerned parties must first understand the need of going beyond

their dark past and understand the importance of re-establishing their unity and reconciliation.

Yolande Mukagasana is in agreement with the above explanations on how reconciliation is a long process. She reveals it in her comments on Emmanuel's ideas:

Je partage les sentiments d'Emmanuel. Il ne peut y avoir d'humanité sans pardon, il ne peut y avoir de pardon sans justice. Le génocide a été une planification longue et minutieuse, la réconciliation ne s'obtiendra pas d'un claquement de doigts. La réconciliation est elle aussi une procédure longue et minutieuse (Mukagasana, 2001:131).

I share the same views with Emmanuel. There can be no humanity without forgiveness, there can be no forgiveness without justice. The genocide was a long and careful plan, reconciliation will not be achieved in one day. Reconciliation is also a long and thorough process.

In conclusion, after the aftermath of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, reconciliation was a must. To achieve it, justice was and is still an absolute precondition. Though reconciliation is necessary, it is a long journey that requires both the survivors of genocide and the génocidaires to think big and realize that they have no other choice but to accept to go through this long, hard, and sophisticated journey of reconciliation. In so doing, they will be guaranteeing a better future for Rwandan generations.

5.2.9. Guilt, Remorse, and Repentance

A close reading of *Les blessures du silence* shows that the book deals with guilt, remorse and repentance. The latter are mostly illustrated in testimonies of génocidaires whom Yolande found in different prisons. Indeed, prisons are good places that help people to have enough time to think on what they have done, regret it, and feel remorse. A good example is the testimony of Valerie B., a former infamous journalist of RTLM who was in prison because of her role in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. She acknowledged her role in genocide and expressed regrets and asked to be forgiven:

Je suis journaliste. Je travaillais à la RTLM. ... Je plaide coupable pour les péchés [crimes] que j'ai commis, pas pour ceux que je n'ai pas commis....On dit que nous avons incité les gens à tuer. C'est surtout cela. Les gens ont été tués. Nous avons travaillé en collaboration étroite avec des militaires. En fait, la RTLM est devenue une radio militaire le 7 avril, entre onze heures et midi. Par nos communiqués, nous guidions les gens vers les ennemis [les Tutsi]... Après la diffusion de nos communiqués, les tueries commençaient. Pourtant dans mon cœur, je regrette beaucoup que les gens aient été tués. Mais la réparation est possible. Chacun doit reconnaître sa part de responsabilité dans le génocide. Il faut que chacun reconnaisse sa faute, reconnaisse son péché, qu'il essaie de se repentir et demander pardon (Mukagasana, 2001:95).

I am a journalist. I was working at the RTLM. ... I plead guilty for the crimes that I have committed, not for those that I have not committed... They say that we have sensitized people to kill. That is all. People were exterminated. We have worked closely with the military. In fact, RTLM became a military radio on 7 April, between 11.00 AM and 12. 00 o'clock. By our announcements, we were giving names of those [Tutsi] to be killed to génocidaires... After broadcasting our announcements, killings had to immediately start. In my heart, however, I immensely regret that people were killed. But reparation is possible. Everyone must recognize his/her portion of responsibility in the genocide. It is necessary that each acknowledges his/her responsibility, recognizes his/her crime, and then tries to repent and ask forgiveness.

The above quotation shows how Valerie B. who is pleading guilty because of her role in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi is expressing her remorse. However, it has to be said that her remorse is half expressed. Indeed, she does not immediately accept it.

In addition, a close look at her picture that accompanies her testimony, also proves that what she said was not corresponding to what was behind her mind. Indeed, the picture reveals that she was on defence. She was fighting to prove that some of the accusations against her were not fair. This is illustrated by her revelations that she only would plead guilty for the crimes that she had committed and not for those for which she believed she was not responsible.

In any case, what matters most, is the fact that she was regretting her responsibility and giving advice to other people on how to better repent. According to her, and she is right, culprits must, first of all, have the courage to accept their responsibilities and then seek forgiveness from their victims.

Another example is the testimony of Evariste N. who, in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, killed Tutsi at the age of 10 and was later jailed because of that crime. According to his testimony, Rwandan génocidaires and Burundian refugees who were in Rwanda and who participated in the genocide are the ones who trained him to kill Tutsi. While in a re-education centre, he took time to think about his responsibilities. He could not understand why he killed Tutsi. He was regretful for his lost childhood: *“Je ne pleure plus, car je ne suis plus un enfant. Je suis un assassin. Mon enfance est finie”* (Mukagasana, 2001: 97)/I do not cry anymore, because I am no longer a child. I am a murderer. My childhood is over. To hear words like these from a child who was 10 in 1994, is also painful for any normal person. Among almost all culprits who accept to repent, cases like this are many. However, if it happens that those who are guilty are willing to repent and do it from the bottom of their hearts, they become relieved. They start first to have internal peace with themselves, and finally with their victims.

The remorse and shame that Evariste N. experienced, is similar to the one that Patricie N. underwent. Patricie N. is a Hutu who was in prison because of her role in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. She pleaded guilty that she killed Tutsi though she added that she was forced to do so by six policemen who found her at her residence. She finally reveals that she cannot, at any cost, accept to be involved in another genocide. She knew how bad it was and its consequences were very dangerous:

Alors, le vieux, m'a dit l'un deux, ou tu tues ces gens, ou nous t'abattons. Alors j'ai commencé à frapper les prisonniers....Ils avaient tous les mains attachées derrière le dos....S'il y avait un nouveau

génocide, madame, je creuserais un trou pour me cacher et éviter d'être contraint de tuer (Mukagasana, 2001:110-111).

So, the old man, one of them ordered me, either you kill these people, or we kill you. I then started to hit prisoners... they all had hands tied behind their backs... Madam, if there was a new genocide, I would dig a hole, hide in it, and avoid to be forced to kill.

Patricie N. is now acting like a human being. She is different from Patricie N. who, during the 1994 genocide, was treating Tutsi as animals to be killed. Her decision to acknowledge her responsibility and say with determination and in the strongest terms possible that she would not accept to participate in any other genocide, is a good indicator of her remorse and commitment to no longer repeat it.

Another good example of guilt, remorse, and repentance in *Les blessures du silence*, is the testimony of Innocent N. His testimony is special. Contrary to other génocidaires who were mainly Hutu extremists, Innocent N. belongs to the minority Twa. It is rare to come across testimonies of the Twa who played a key role in the genocide. He is among the few examples. While in prison, he expressed his regrets and importance of repentance:

Oui. J'ai tué trois Tutsi. Un certain Karasira, d'un coup de gourdin. Un certain Vianney, qui était mon ami, d'un coup de lance. Et un enfant de douze ans, de plusieurs coups de couteau....Quand on m'a arrêté, je me suis senti soulagé et j'ai directement avoué. C'était si bon de redevenir un être humain (Mukagasana, 2001:112).

Yes. I killed three Tutsi. One is called Karasira. I killed him with a club. Another is Vianney who was my friend. I killed him with a spear. And the last one was a child of twelve. I knifed him several times... When I was arrested, I felt relieved and I directly pleaded guilty. It was so good to become a human being again.

Innocent N. testifies that repenting helps to come back to normal life. He is talking about the peace of mind that was earlier discussed. He wants to inform all génocidaires who have not yet accepted their role in genocide to repent, that failing to do so is dangerous for their lives. It causes them to be dead living

beings like Ancilla M. who could not sleep: “*Si l’on me condamnait à mort, ce serait pour moi un repos. J’ai tant de regrets que je ne parviens plus à dormir*” (Mukagasana, 2001:109)/If they sentenced me to a death penalty, it would be a rest for me. I have so many regrets that I cannot sleep.

She has no peace because of having killed innocent Tutsi and mainly because she was not able to repent and ask for forgiveness. To her, the best answer was to die as her inhuman actions were no longer granting her a place that human beings deserve.

Innocent shares the same remorse with Pierre who was in jail because of his role in the genocide. His remorse is described in his answer when he was asked why he killed an innocent person. This is what he responded: “*Pourquoi penses-tu que tu as tué cet homme?*” “*Justement, rien. C’est pour cela que j’ai vraiment beaucoup de remords. Mon cœur n’est pas tranquille*” (Mukagasana, 2001:136)/“Why did you kill that man?” “Indeed, there is no reason. This is why I really have a lot of remorse. My heart is not at ease”.

Pierre was not in good terms with himself and with his victims because he had refused to sincerely repent. Mathieu N., a former nurse who killed Tutsi in genocide and was jailed because of that but took the courage to ask forgiveness from his inner heart has a free heart:

Je voudrais vous dire, madame, que j’ai trahi ma profession et ma conscience.... J’ai tué là où j’avais pour mission de sauver la vie...J’ai essayé de rencontrer les gens à qui j’avais fait du mal... Mes regrets sont d’autant plus forts que j’ai été accueilli, après le génocide, par les familles de ceux que j’avais assassinés... Je remercie Dieu d’être encore en vie pour pouvoir demander pardon...Mais je suis comme un homme mort (Mukagasana, 2001:115).

Madam, I would like to tell you that I betrayed my profession and my conscience... I killed whereas my mission was to save lives... I tried to meet people whom I victimized... My regrets were stronger to the extent that after the genocide, I was received by families of

those whom I executed... I thank God to be alive to be able to ask for forgiveness... But I am like a dead man.

The above quotation shows the importance of repentance. Mathieu N. who was psychologically traumatised by his inhuman actions in genocide managed to be in peace with himself because he was able to meet his victims and apologised to them. After he was forgiven, his life became more normal. He was a bit a free man. He could sleep.

The decision of Mathieu is different from the one of Innocent N., in the previous quote. Innocent was not able to repent. As a result, he was living a life with no sense. For him, death was the only solution. However, it has to be said that even if somebody is forgiven, it does not make him/her innocent. Inside him, he is still culpable. This is what Mathieu revealed when he said that though he had repented and was forgiven he was still living as a dead man.

The internal peace that follows a true repentance is also described by the testimony of Pierre K.:

Mais quand tu plaides coupable sincèrement, tu as une paix intérieure....Maintenant que j'ai plaidé coupable, j'ai une paix intérieure et je n'ai plus peur de rien. Si je connaissais toutes les langues du monde, j'irais à travers le monde pour parler du génocide (Mukagasana, 2001:135).

But when you sincerely plead guilty, you feel an inner peace... Now that I have pleaded guilty, I have a feeling of inner peace and I am not afraid of anything. If I knew all the languages of the world, I would go around the world to talk about genocide.

Pleading guilty has to be a personal commitment and not a collective one. If somebody pleads guilty and adds that he/she was pushed by other people to have such misbehaviour, it shows that his/her repentance is superficial. This is what the following testimony of Jean Damascène M. reveals:

Prends cette femme, va la tuer et jette-la dans une fosse qui est sur sa parcelle et que son mari a creusée pour les toilettes. Le serviteur Hutu l'a jetée vivante dans cette fosse. La femme a passé des journées et des nuits à appeler l'ami Hutu de son mari, lui

demandant de venir la sauver. ... Pour la faire taire, l'ami Hutu a convoqué son personnel et d'autres gens, dont moi, pour que nous l'enterrions cette femme vivante. Et j'y suis allé. Lorsque j'ai été arrêté, je n'ai pas nié... Nous avons fait du mal et nous devons avouer, pas pour les autres, mais pour nous (Mukagasana, 2001:120).

Take this woman, go and kill her, throw her in a pit which is in her plot that her husband had dug for toilets. The Hutu servant threw her alive in that pit. The woman spent days and nights calling for help from a Hutu who was a friend to her husband... To silence her, that Hutu asked his staff and other people, including me, to bury that woman alive. And I went there. When I was arrested, I did not deny... We committed crimes and we must confess, not for others, but for ourselves.

The above statement of Jean Damascène describes well how he was deeply convinced of the importance of repenting. His testimony is different from that of Faustin N. and Sylvestre G. Both Faustin and Sylvestre apologised in a superficial way. Indeed, instead of acknowledging their responsibility in genocide, they apologised in blaming other people. In other words, they use other people as scapegoats. Faustin says: *“J'ai tué deux hommes et un enfant. Ma première victime, cela s'est passé ainsi. J'étais avec les responsables, c'est eux qui m'ordonnaient de tuer”* (Mukagasana, 2001:121)/I killed two men and a child. My first victim, it has happened this way. I was with officials, who were ordering me to kill. This gives the impression that even if he killed, it was not his intention. He wants to excuse himself. This does not make his apology genuine.

Sylvestre G., who was a renowned poet in the country and who was in prison because of his atrocity in killing Tutsi, attempted to dodge his responsibility in the following way:

On ne m'a pas dit que tu l'avais tué, on m'a dit que tu lui avais coupé le sexe. “Oh! Mon Dieu! Pour ce qui concerne cette affaire, j'ai été embauché par un militaire, un sergent. Je venais de tuer ces gens, c'était à la Pentecôte”. “Quelles personnes?” “Les trois pour lesquelles je plaide coupable” (Mukagasana, 2001:126).

I was not told that you killed him, I was informed that you cut off his sex. “Oh my god! As far as that case is concerned, I was hired by a soldier, a soldier was a sergeant. I had finished to kill those people, it was on Pentecost”. “Who are those people?” “The three for whom I have pleaded guilty”.

The questions that Yolande asked Sylvestre were good ones. It shows that she had gathered the necessary information before meeting him. When she asked him serious questions whose answers would show his role, Sylvestre did not want to give correct answers. He instead wanted to escape his responsibility by accusing a sergeant whom could not even give his name and indicate his whereabouts.

People like Faustin and Sylvestre are many. Actually many testimonies of génocidaires who have accepted to plead guilty end up by not fully owning their responsibilities. They tend to accuse other people, especially those who were leaders during the genocide but had died or fled the country. In addition to earlier given examples, Aphrodis N. is another good one: *“Quand nous sommes allés à Hanika, nous sommes passés près d’une maison détruite, mais la cuisine ne l’était pas encore. Nous l’avons ouverte, il y avait deux enfants qui étaient cachés. J’ai accepté d’en tuer deux”* (Mukagasana, 2001:122)/When we went to Hanika, we passed near a destroyed house, but the kitchen was not yet destroyed. We opened it and found there two children who were hidden in it. I accepted to kill them.

The last sentence of Aphrodis needs some clarifications. By saying that he accepted to kill the two children, he wants to justify that he had no intention of killing them. He wants to make people believe that he killed them in order to obey the orders of other people whom he did not even mention. Simply this indicates how he was not ready to acknowledge his responsibility.

Another example of a génocidaire who pretends to have repented but did not do it in a proper way is Espérance N. From her prison where she was detained because of her role in the genocide, she said the following. *“Après, j’ai eu des*

remords, je me suis présentée à la justice mais j'avais l'intention d'indemniser le seul enfant survivant de la famille et j'ai été mise en prison (Mukagasana, 2001:123)/After [killing], I felt remorse, I decided to surrender to justice but inside me I had an intention of compensating the only child survivor of the family that I had exterminated but I was jailed.

One may say that Espérance was not right. Saying that she was about to repent but she was not able to do it because she was jailed is a pretext. If she was really willing, she should have done it before. She should have started by feeling remorse about her misbehaviour, then she should have repented and finally sought forgiveness. She should indeed have followed the examples of Jean Léonard B. and Adiel K., both génocidaires who were in prison. Whereas Léonard B. said: *“Moi et les autres qui plaidons coupables de participation au génocide, nous regrettons et nous nous condamnons”* (Mukagasana, 2001: 150). I and others who are pleading guilty of our participation in the genocide, we are regretting and condemning ourselves; Adiel K. added: *“Je suis un imbécile, un imbécile, tout simplement... je n'ai vraiment rien de bon, je suis très triste. Je suis désespéré d'avoir tué”* (Mukagasana, 2001:158)/Simply, I am stupid, a stupid... I am a bad person, I am very sad. I am desperate because I have killed.

In conclusion, the examples that were described in this section proved that the theme of guilt, remorse, and repentance were repeatedly discussed in the testimonies of génocidaires who pleaded guilty (in *Les blessures du silence*). It was also made clear that there are culprits who sincerely repent and those who do it as a formality. To those who do it with all their conscience, they still have nightmares or regret or feel bad though it does not make them innocent from their genocide crimes. Genuine repenting also brings internal peace to genocide survivors. For people who are not able to properly repent, they are condemned to stay psychologically traumatized.

5.2.10. Denial

In *Les blessures du silence*, different testimonies of génocidaires and victims of genocide reveal the presence of the theme of denial. Génocidaires use it to try to deny their role in the genocide and actually deny the genocide, though their testimonies are describing the opposite. Survivors refer to it to show how the génocidaires and their supporters are attempting to deny the existence of the genocide.

One of the best examples of denial in *Les blessures du silence* is what happened to Enos N. He was in prison because of his role in the genocide. Before being jailed, he was traumatized because of the remorse of innocent Tutsi whom he had killed. His trauma had gone beyond his control as he was always moving with the skull of one of his victims.

The denial in question took place when he arrived in prison with that skull and met other génocidaires:

Du reste, les génocidaires qui partageaient ma cellule en prison l'on cassé. Ils ne voulaient pas que je me promène avec ce crâne, car ils disaient que c'est un aveu et que je ne devrais jamais avouer. Ils disaient que je leur faisais honte (Mukagasana, 2001:117).

Besides, génocidaires whom we were sharing the same cell in prison broke it. They did not want me to walk with that skull, because they said that it was a confession of my guilt that I should never admit. They said I was making them ashamed.

The intention of these génocidaires was to ensure that genocide is denied. They wrongly thought that if they deny that they did not kill Tutsi, it would make them innocent and uninformed people would agree with their assertion. For the victims, this behaviour can have the effect of doubling their sufferings.

Les blessures du silence presents different examples of denial. One of them is Jean N., a génocidaire who was in prison. This is how he did it: “*Je plaide*

coupable, mais dans le fond, je suis innocent. Vous savez madame, avouer, c'est un don du ciel. C'est vrai que j'étais dans une équipe de tueurs. Mais l'enfant que j'ai tué, n'a pas voulu mourir. Je ne l'ai donc pas tué" (Mukagasana, 2001:132) /I am pleading guilty, but in reality, I am innocent. You know Madam, pleading guilty is a gift from heaven. It is true that I was part of the team of killers. However, the child that I killed refused to die. I did not then kill him.

Jean N. thinks that he is innocent because his victims miraculously survived his killing. This does not make him innocent. His intention and his adhesion to a group of génocidaires who killed innocent people are enough to make him a génocidaire. His contradiction when he said that he is innocent though he had pleaded guilty (because the child survived as explained above) is another indicator of denying genocide.

Jean N. shares the same views with Noël H., a journalist at RTLM who died in prison because of disease when serving his sentence as a génocidaire. In his testimony, he was saying that he did not participate in genocide. His argument was that from 7 April to 17 April 1994 he was at RTLM and did not have time to physically participate in genocide. *"J'accepte que j'ai fait mon travail pendant le génocide. Mais je n'ai pas plaidé coupable. A propos du génocide, je suis à cent pour cent innocent. Du 7 au 17 avril, j'étais à RTLM, jusqu'au jour où l'on a bombardé la radio"* (Mukagasana, 2001:133) /I accept that during genocide I performed my duty. But I did not plead guilty. As for genocide, I am one hundred percent innocent. From 7 to 17 April, I was at RTLM, until the radio was bombarded.

Noël seems to forget his role and the one of RTLM in general in sensitizing Rwandans to exterminate Tutsi, as well as some Hutu who did not approve of the execution of the genocide against Tutsi. In addition, he pretends to ignore that being a génocidaire does not mean only to kill physically. One may also kill by his/her genocide plans. As for Noël, he killed by his was actively

involved in encouraging the génocidaires to kill as many Tutsi as they could. He actually killed many people. As his colleague Valerie says when describing the role of RTLM in genocide (this was earlier explained), they closely collaborated with soldiers of the then government that implemented and supervised the execution of the genocide against Tutsi:

RTLM became a military radio on 7 April, between 11.00 AM and 12. 00 o'clock. By our announcements, we were giving names of those to be killed to génocidaires... After broadcasting our announcements, killings had to immediately start (Mukagasana, 2001:133).

All the people who were killed after RTLM announcements, as he was an active journalist at RTLM, were on his head (together with other journalists of RTLM). He shares the same responsibility with those who killed them. Saying that he did not participate in genocide per se as he was at RTLM and was not able to go out, is a way of denying the genocide against Tutsi.

Emmanuel N., a sergeant in the former Rwandan government that prepared and executed the genocide is another example of a person who denies the genocide in a strange way. When asked what he could tell God if he meets Him, he responded smiling: *“Je lui dirais que j’ai fait tuer... (Silence.) Je lui dirai que je ne ferai jamais de mal. Je n’ai jamais fait le génocide”* (Mukagasana, 2001:140)/I would tell Him that I urged people to kill... (Silence.) I would tell him that I would never do wrong things. I never participated in genocide.

Emmanuel’s contradictions, especially the silence that punctuated his responses, and his last sentence where he says that he never participated in genocide, are nothing else but a way of denying the occurrence of genocide.

Deniers of genocide do not want people to talk about it. Indeed, talking about genocide disturbs them. It makes them remember their role and this makes them lose peace. In addition, when people talk about genocide, it is a good way of condemning all the people who were responsible for that genocide including those who may be on the run. What is being described here happened to Marie-

José N., a Hutu who was married to a Tutsi who was killed in genocide. The incident took place when she met Hutu friends. It was after the genocide. At that time, she was working at Ntarama Genocide Memorial:

Je suis affectée à un mémorial du génocide...Au début, les Hutu me disaient: "Tu es notre sœur, cesse de t'occuper de ces ossements, ils vont te porter malheur. Tu n'as donc pas honte de t'occuper encore des Tutsi?" Mais depuis que j'ai épousé le frère de mon mari, c'est eux qui éprouvent la honte. Ils n'osent plus m'apostropher sur ce sujet (Mukagasana, 2001:159).

I work at a genocide memorial... Initially, Hutu were telling me: "You are our sister, please stop to take care of those bones [remains of Tutsi]. They will bring you bad luck. Aren't you not ashamed to continue to cherish Tutsi?" But since I remarried my husband's brother, it's them who are experiencing shame. They no longer dare to engage discussions with me on that topic.

The above quotation shows that those Hutu extremists would prefer to see genocide forgotten. This is the preaching of genocide deniers. In addition to denying genocide in words, génocidaires or their supporters use also the destruction of proofs of their role in genocide to ensure that people do not use them to bring them to justice. In *Les blessures du silence*, this technique was also used. It is brought to our attention by the testimony of Emmanuel M., who survived the genocide in Gikongoro, Southern Province of Rwanda. Emmanuel M. describes how even French soldiers were involved in destroying proofs justifying the existence of the genocide against Tutsi:

Et avant de repartir, ils [les soldats Français] ont enseveli les morts [Tutsi] avec les derniers Interahamwe et ils ont planté du gazon et aplani les fosses pour qu'on ne se doute pas qu'il y avait des cadavres enterrés. Quand on a vu l'herbe pousser, cela rassemblait à un terrain de football (Mukagasana, 2001:131).

And before leaving, they [the French soldiers] in collaboration with *Interahamwe* who were still around buried killed people [Tutsi]; and they planted grass and levelled pits so that it might not be noticed that people were buried there. When we saw the grass growing, it looked like a football playground.

The above paragraph is a good justification of the role of French soldiers in the genocide against Tutsi.

5.2.11. Despair

Despair is defined as a state of depressed mood and hopelessness. In general, it characterises almost all testimonies of survivors of the genocide. This is the case in *Les blessures du silence*. Some of the testimonies of survivors deal with the theme of despair. They indicate how, after escaping the genocide, some survivors were not able to regain hope. They had lost confidence in life. To them, life had no meaning. They could not understand how their future would again be bright. To come back to normal life, they had to undertake some healing and reconciliation sessions. This had to go hand in hand with other activities that facilitate quick rehabilitation like justice to victims and support to vulnerable survivors so that they could have a decent social-economic life. There are numerous examples of despair in *Les blessures du silence*. As they cannot all be given here, I will only select a few of them.

The first example is found in the testimony of Grégoire H. nicknamed Mandela. This is how his testimony describes despair that he experienced since his childhood because of the poor leadership of Rwanda under the First and Second Republics: *“Je n’ai jamais eu de vie. Ma vie est actuellement aléatoire. Vous voyez mon âge. Et les souffrances que j’ai endurées toute la vie”* (Mukagasana, 2001:87)/I have never had a life. Currently, my life has no sense. You see my age. And the suffering that I endured in my lifetime.

Grégoire H. was an old man who was born in 1945. He was imprisoned many times, with no reason, under the regime of late President Kayibanda Grégoire and later on under the regime of Habyarimana Juvénal. His unjustified imprisonments and other injustices that he faced simply because he was born Tutsi, pushed people to nickname him Mandela. He was so nicknamed because he had had a life that was similar to the one of late Nelson Mandela, the South

African anti-apartheid revolutionary and politician, who served 27 years in prison because of the injustice of the apartheid regime in South Africa.

The second example is the testimony of Judith N. who was 79 in 1999 when Yolande interviewed her. After surviving the genocide she testified that she was having a desperate life:

Depuis, je vis dans une peur sans fin. Je ne supporte plus ni le bruit ni la foule. Et je revois la machette tout le temps. Chaque fois que je vois des enfants, je pense aux miens, alors que je sais qu'ils sont morts....Il n'y a plus de Rwandais qui aime, il n'y a plus d'amour au Rwanda, et tout rescapé est un mort ambulante. (Mukagasana, 2001:106).

Since then, I live in endless fear. I do not tolerate any noise nor a crowd of people. And I always see the machete. Whenever I see children, I think of mine, whereas I know that they were killed... There is no more Rwandan who loves, there is no more love in Rwanda, and each genocide survivor is a dead living person.

Judith had no hope. To her, it is as if Rwanda was no longer existing. Having been heavily betrayed by her former Hutu neighbours who exterminated almost her entire family made her believe that Rwandans were no more human beings. To her, they were like wild animals. This explains why she said that there was no more Rwandan who loves, and no more love in Rwanda, before concluding that survivors were like dead living people. She had pity for their lives (survivors).

The third example is the testimony of Fabien. His testimony is a carbon copy of the one of Judith that I have just explained. Fabien, a child who survived the genocide in Bisesero, Karongi District, when asked how he was considering the life of survivors in the post-genocide era in Rwanda, desperately responded: "*Personne ne nous aime. Nous sommes devenus un problème de la société rwandaise*" (Mukagasana, 2001:110) /Nobody likes us. We have become a problem in the Rwandan society.

The fourth example of existence of the theme of despair is noticeable through the testimony of Jean Yves B. Asked why he had a strange behaviour in class, shortly after genocide, he gave an answer that describes well how he was living in despair: *“Malheureusement pour moi, je n’ai jamais pu pleurer, je ne pleure jamais. Par contre, il m’arrive de me sentir absent, en classe. J’essaie de pleurer, cela ne vient pas, alors je demande à sortir de la classe”* (Mukagasana, 2001:111-112)/Unfortunately for me, I never cried [for killed members of my family], I never cry. On the other hand, it happens to me to feel absent in class. I try to cry but in vain, I then ask permission to go out of class.

Jean Yves B. is traumatised because of what he went through in genocide. He tries to cry but he cannot. To be unable to cry when one is experiencing the utmost suffering is normal. As an example, women in labour suffer a lot but they cannot cry. Their suffering is beyond understanding. Likewise, what survivors of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi witnessed was beyond imagination. It made some of them like Jean Yves become expressionless.

The last example is the testimony of Anselme B., also a survivor of genocide. When Yolande asked him why he was deeply and always looking sad, he responded in a manner that revealed why he was very desperate. This is how he said it:

Je pense que cela dépend de l’évolution du traumatisme en moi. J’ai souffert et je souffre encore. J’essaie de tout surmonter, mais je n’y arrive pas.... Je sens tellement seul que je ne vois pas la raison d’étudier...Mais moi, il y a autre chose que je voudrais faire. Le labo, ou la pharmacie. Pour ne pas être en contact direct avec les humains. Je voudrais aider les êtres humains sans être en contact avec eux (Mukagasana, 2001:115).

I think it depends on the evolution of my trauma. I have suffered and still suffer. I am trying to overcome everything, but I can’t... I feel so alone to the extent that I don’t see the reason to study... But there is another thing I would like to do. The Laboratory or Pharmacy courses. The two courses will help me not to be in direct contact with people. I would like to help people without being in contact with them.

The above quotation proves how Anselme had tremendously lost trust in human beings. He was betrayed by the behaviour of génocidaires. This inhuman behaviour made him become a person who was completely different from Anselme of before genocide. However, Anselme was still demonstrating that though he was deceived, he was not planning to avenge himself. On the contrary, he was planning to help other people in giving them medical services that do not necessitate to be in direct contact with them (because he did not want to be disappointed again).

5.2.12. Trauma

Trauma is the last theme from *Les blessures du silence* that is going to be discussed in this paper. It is illustrated through testimonies of both survivors and génocidaires. Yolande, a survivor of genocide and co-author of *Les blessures du silence*, gives a good picture of how survivors of genocide were traumatized. This is how she says it: “*Il y a eu des victimes mortes durant le génocide, mais il y en a d'autres qui sont des morts ambulants: les survivants du génocide. Nous sommes des malades qui s'ignorent*” (Mukagasana, 2001:80)/During the genocide, there were victims who were killed, but there are others who are living dead: survivors of genocide. We are patients who are not aware of it.

To consider the genocide survivors as living dead people who do not know that they are living with serious post-genocide consequences is proof that survivors were traumatized. Indeed, one of the characteristics of traumatized people is to consider themselves as normal people and refuse to acknowledge their psychological problems.

Another example is the testimony of Daphrose M., also a survivor of genocide. To cope with the post-genocide life, she decided to pretend that she had forgotten all the traumatic experiences that were not allowing her to live in peace but this is not sustainable.

This is what she responded when she was asked whether it happens to her to recall genocide experience:

T'arrive-t-il de penser au génocide? Oui, bien sûr. Mais j'essaie d'éviter d'y penser, parce que sinon je perdrais la tête. En classe, il y a des enfants qui font des crises liées à leur traumatisme. Et tu lis sur le visage d'autres qu'ils sont contents. Alors j'évite de penser au génocide pour ne pas faire de telles crises. Mais par moments, je me sens tellement mal que je ne veux plus parler à personne. Je ne veux que le silence (Mukagasana, 2001:120).

Does it ever happen to you to think about genocide? Yes of course. But I try to avoid it because otherwise, I would lose my control. In class, there are children who experience crises that are caused by trauma. And you can easily notice on faces of others that they are happy because of the suffering of their classmates. So, I avoid thinking about genocide in order to avoid such crises. But sometimes, I feel so bad to the extent that I don't want to talk to any person. I only want to be in silence.

Daphrose M. describes how some of her classmates are traumatised and how their classmates who were not survivors of genocide were not sympathising with them. Probably one may guess that these pupils were from families of génocidaires. Daphrose who was psychologically suffering decided to hide her suffering so that she may not be frustrated by those unsympathetic pupils. Her strategy cannot help her to heal her trauma. It can only help her to forget her suffering for sometimes but not for a long time.

Vestina M., a survivor of genocide, was undergoing the same traumatic experience like the one of Daphrose M.:

J'ai perdu mon mari, mon fils aîné est traumatisé...Aujourd'hui, je me sens très seule, désespérée et sans force... Nous n'avons vraiment plus d'espoir. Nous, les survivants de ce génocide, on dirait que nous avons péché contre le monde entier... Je passe des journées à pleurer et les gens se moquent de moi et disent que je ne pourrai pas pleurer toute ma vie (Mukagasana, 2001:129).

I lost my husband, my oldest son is traumatized... Today, I feel very lonely, desperate and helpless... We really have no hope. We, survivors of genocide, it seems that we have sinned against the

world... I spend the day crying and people make fun of me and say that I can't cry all my entire life.

To feel lonely, desperate, helpless and crying almost every day, are indicators of Vestina's trauma. Indeed, one experiences trauma when he/she begins to think that nobody else cares about him/her. To the understanding of the traumatised person, only his/her exterminated family members could understand him/her.

Trauma comes in different forms. For Martin N., who survived the genocide at 12, it makes him lose control of his actions:

Je viens de doubler la deuxième. Je suis devant le professeur, je ne sais pas où va mon esprit, je ne suis pas présent, à la fin du cours, je me rends compte que je n'ai rien entendu. Ce que j'entends, c'est la sonnette pour sortir, mais je ne sais pas ce que l'on vient d'apprendre. (Mukagasana, 2001:138).

I have just repeated my second year. When I am in front of my teacher, I don't know where my mind goes, it is as if I am absent, at the end of the course, I realize that I have not heard anything. What I hear, it is the bell ring to get out, but I don't know what was taught.

The above quotation shows how Martin N. was psychologically dead. Indeed, any traumatized person is psychologically a dead living person. Trauma kills one's mind. However, this situation can be controlled with the assistance of counsellors or other people who are trusted by those experiencing trauma. However, there are some victims who need special counsellors as their level of trauma is so deep. A good example is Julie, a survivor, and a teacher: *"Il n'y a qu'une chose que j'entends, c'est la mort, car elle seule pourra me guérir de mon chagrin et m'apporter le repos"* (Mukagasana, 2001:144) /There is one thing I am still waiting for: death, only death can cure me my pain and bring me rest.

Another strange description of trauma is found in the testimony of Laetitia T. who survived genocide in Nyanza of Kicukiro after being betrayed by UN Peace Forces (I have earlier elaborated on this betrayal): *"Mais après le génocide, j'ai eu des envies bizarres. J'aimais manger la terre. J'en mangeais beaucoup et il*

n'y a pas longtemps que j'ai arrêté. J'aimais le goût de la poussière aussi" (Mukagasana, 2001:151)/But after genocide, I had a bizarre behaviour. I loved eating the dust. I ate a lot of it. I recently stopped it. I loved its taste.

Under normal circumstances, it is not possible to understand how a person can enjoy eating dust. Only some pregnant women have strange behaviour like this. However, with enough knowledge of trauma, it becomes possible to understand this phenomenon.

Trauma also happens in the category of people who were born from mixed parents. In chapter one, I have explained that the genocide mainly targeted Tutsi, Hutu who did not support the genocide plan, and all the people who looked like Tutsi. Many of these people were those who were born from Hutu who were married to Tutsi or from Tutsi who were married to Hutu. This is what happened to a child of Marie-José N. The latter was a Hutu widow who was married to a Tutsi engineer who was killed in genocide after trusting in the protection of the international community. This is what Marie-José says:

Mon enfant a eu le cou à moitié coupé au point qu'il est devenu hémiplégique. Et aujourd'hui, il a de surcroît des troubles liés à un traumatisme psychologique. Il lui arrive de se retourner la nuit dans son lit et de hurler: "On vient de me tuer, on vient de me tuer!" (Mukagasana, 2001:159).

The neck of my child was half cut to the point that it became hemiplegic. And as of now, he is experiencing psychological trauma related to that. During the night, while in his bed, it happens to him to turn over in bed screaming: "They have killed me, they have killed me!"

As introduced in this section, trauma is not reserved to survivors only. There are also some génocidaires who live with it. Enos who was in prison because of his role in genocide is one of them. This is how he was traumatized:

Je me promène toute la journée avec les restes du crâne de l'homme que j'ai tué parce que, longtemps après le génocide, alors que je passais devant la maison de ma victime, ce crâne m'a parlé et m'a demandé de le prendre avec moi. Je veux garder ce crâne jusqu' à ce

que tout soit clair en moi. Je dois expier. Hélas, le crâne ne me parle plus (Mukagasana, 2001:117).

I walk around all day with the rest of the skull of the man whom I killed because, long after the genocide, while I was passing near the house of my victim, this skull talked to me and asked me to take it with me. I want to keep this skull until everything becomes clear with me. I must be accountable. Unfortunately, the skull no longer talks to me.

The trauma of Enos shows that any human being can experience trauma. This does not happen when a human being refuses to listen to his/her consciousness that is hurting him to accept his responsibility in causing chaos to innocent people.

5.3. Conclusion

This chapter deeply analysed the main themes in *Les blessures du silence*, with supporting examples from different testimonies from the book and a thorough analysis that accompanied those selected examples. The chapter pointed out fifteen main themes. These are interactions with the past, unspeakability of genocide, looting, organisation and preparation of the 1994 genocide, betrayal, resistance, rape, justice and reconciliation, guilt, remorse repentance, denial, despair, and trauma.

CHAPTER SIX: THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF SHAKE HANDS WITH THE DEVIL: THE FAILURE OF HUMANITY IN RWANDA (2003)

6.1. Introduction

This chapter is a thematic analysis of Roméo Dallaire's book, *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*. Roméo Dallaire is a retired Lieutenant-General of the Canadian Forces. He is also a retired Canadian Senator. Between 1993 and 1994, he served as the Force Commander of the

United Nations Assistance Mission to Rwanda (UNAMIR). This force failed to stop the 1994 genocide against Tutsi.

In writing *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*, a book that was first published in 2003, Roméo Dallaire was helped by Major Brent Beardsley. The latter was his first executive assistant. As Dallaire (2003: xii) points it out, he is the one who pushed him to write this book:

Brent used every opportunity to press me to write the book. He finally persuaded me that if I did not put my story to paper, our children and our grandchildren would never really know about our role in and our passage through the Rwanda catastrophe [genocide against Tutsi]...Brent collaborated at every stage in the writing of this book. I thank him for his prompting and his support.

In his *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*, Roméo Dallaire, an eye witness of the genocide against Tutsi, gives a full detail of his fateful experience related to the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. He does it chronologically. He summarises his book as follows: “*The following is my story of what happened in Rwanda in 1994. It’s a story of betrayal, failure, naivety, indifference, hatred, inhumanity and evil*” (Dallaire, 2003: xvii).

Roméo Dallaire also explains why his book is entitled *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*. He revealed it when he was responding to the question of one of the Canadian Forces Padre who wanted to know whether he was still believing in God after what he had seen and experienced in the genocide against Tutsi: “*I answered that I know there is a God because in Rwanda I shook hands with the devil. I have seen him, I have smelled him and I have touched him. I know the devil exists, and therefore I know there is a God*” (Dallaire, 2003: xviii).

It has to be noted that after its publication, *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda* became an award-winning international sensation. Indeed, in 2003, it won the Shaughnessy Cohen Award for Political Writing; in 2004 it received the Governor General’s Award for nonfiction. The

book also inspired two award-winning documentary films: *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Journey of Roméo Dallaire* (2004) and *Shake Hands with the Devil*, a 2007 Canadian war drama film.

The testimony of Dallaire is different from testimonies that were previously analysed. Whereas the latter were mainly between testimonies of victims of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi and some of the perpetrators, the one of Dallaire is a testimony that belongs to the category of “bystanders”. It shows the role of the third party, the onlooker, the passenger.

Bystanders as Grünfeld and Huijboom (2007:3) say, are at “*three different levels of micro (individual), meso (society, groups in a state) and macro level (state and the international political system)*”. Victims and perpetrators form the “genocide-relationships-triangle. In April 1994, Lt. General Roméo Dallaire witnessed the genocide of more than one million Tutsi in one hundred days. This made him enter the “genocide-relationships-triangle”. In *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*, “*we experience genocide through the glasses of a “privileged”–“a privilege that quickly became a curse”* (Dallaire, 2003: xiii). Indeed, Dallaire experienced a bystander burdened with a sentiment of guilt, suffering from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder. The following sections will give full details of main themes that are at work in *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*.

6.2. Thematic analysis of *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*

6.2.1. Betrayal

The theme of betrayal is one of the main themes that are discussed in *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*. Roméo Dallaire refers to it at the very beginning of his testimony, in the preface:

In Rwanda today there are millions of people who still ask why the United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR), the

United Nations (UN) and the international community allowed this disaster to happen. I do not have all the answers or even most of them. What I do have to offer the survivors and Rwanda's future generations is my story as best as I can remember it (Dallaire, 2003: xviii).

This quotation shows that Dallaire is well aware of how Rwandans, especially survivors of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi were and are still questioning why the international community betrayed them. After reading his whole testimony, one finds out that in addition to trying to explain why the international community failed in Rwanda, Roméo Dallaire also wanted to use his testimony to justify why he failed as well.

Semujanga (2007:3) is one of the literary critics whose analysis helps to better understand the testimony of Roméo Dallaire. This is how he says it:

Son récit se présente en opposition au témoignage indicible et se caractérise par la primauté de la narration sur la vérité des événements: c'est un récit héroïque insistant sur la résistance du général abandonné par l'ONU et qui, avec une poignée de soldats africains, porte secours à quelques civils menacés de génocide.

His testimony is in opposition to the unspeakable testimony of survivors. Its main focus is on the superiority of narration over the veracity of events: it is a heroic testimony that insists on the resistance of a general who was abandoned by the United Nations and who, with a handful of African soldiers, was able to save some civilians who were targeted by genocide.

The account of his heroism starts in the first three chapters of his *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*. It continues in almost all chapters. In those first three chapters, Dallaire presents himself and his family and goes further to talk about his military career that he started in 1963. He points out that he was born into a military family (his father was a soldier), and says: "it's not surprising that soldiering became not only my profession but my passion" (Dallaire, 2003:8-9). A close analysis of these chapters shows that Romeo Dallaire is indirectly trying to convince his audience that he was a hero from his childhood. However, even if Roméo

Dallaire's testimony is considered as a heroic one, it does not prevent him from correctly describing how Rwanda he was not able to save the lives of Tutsi who were being killed in genocide. In his own words, he says that: "*Rwandan men, women and children were brutally murdered while the developed world, impassive and apparently unperturbed, sat back and watched the unfolding apocalypse or simply changed channels*" (Dallaire, 2003: xvii-xviii).

Contrary to Yolande, after a thorough analysis of Dallaire's testimony, one realises that in addition to narrating what he experienced and what Rwanda experienced during the 1994 genocide, he has another mission. He tries to distance himself from what happened. He explained how he wanted to stop the genocide and how his boss, UN, betrayed him. A good critic may conclude that Dallaire is using his account to let people understand the heroism of a general who was commanding a force that was not allowed to use force. There are some examples that justify his heroism.

A good one is when he explains what he did when he learnt that RPF's delegation, without informing him, attended the funeral of Félicien Gatabazi, a PSD president who was shot dead on 21 February 1994 by unknown Hutu extremists who were supporting MRND:

We couldn't afford to lose any more ground with the RPF, so together with my staff, I built an operation to rival Clean Corridor in order to move the delegation safely to and from the funeral. There was a risk that we would be ambushed, but I was determined that this time we would use overwhelming force to respond, and I lead the operation myself" (Dallaire, 2003:195).

When reading how Dallaire led the above operation, one is left with the impression that he was like a brave commander in an action movie. His heroism was beyond limit.

Another example of his heroism is when he described how he initiated the transfer of civilian refugees/transfers who were in the area under the control RPF *Inkotanyi*, who wanted to join the zone that was under the control of the genocide interim government and to those who were in Mille Collines, then under FAR control but who wanted to join the zone that was under RPF *Inkotanyi*'s control, and what he did to ensure that this transfer was done:

In order for UNAMIR to participate in the evacuation, that night I signed a new ROE that permitted my troops to disarm belligerents and to intervene with force after warning shots. The new rules also permitted local commanders to decide on the level of force they needed to use. The question remains as to whether I had the authority to change my own ROE for the duration of the evacuation mission. I was on the ground, I was in command, I had been given the mission and I took the decision (Dallaire, 2003:290).

Dallaire wants to prove that he was in control of what he was able to do. However, it has to be recalled that even if he is trying to defend himself and show his bravery, he did not want to hide where he failed and where his mission failed: *“My mission had failed. I, the stubborn lobbyist for and commander of UNAMIR, had failed. There was no chance of sleep”* (Dallaire, 2003:261). Dallaire did not also want to cover the failure of the international community that he has accused of having played a key role in allowing the genocide against Tutsi to happen while they were able to stop it.

It has to be stressed that Roméo Dallaire looks honest in his description of how Rwanda was betrayed. This is exemplified by his courage to even acknowledge his own failure. A good example is when he illustrates how he failed to save a child whom he had found on the road, very hungry and crying for help (during the 1994 genocide against Tutsi). He took that child in his hands. Suddenly and surprisingly, a soldier of the former Rwandan génocidaire government took

back the child by force and ran away in the bush. Dallaire who was with some of the UNAMIR soldiers decided to withdraw as he did not know the number of soldiers who were with that soldier who had captured the child. When this comes back to his mind, it hurts him: *“It’s a memory that never lets me forget how ineffective and irresponsible we were when we promised the Rwandans that we would establish an atmosphere of security that would allow them to achieve a lasting peace”* Dallaire, 2003: (4).

Another example of how Rwanda was betrayed is Dallaire’s account of how the UN refused to consider his request of changing its deployment in Rwanda from chapter six to chapter seven. According to the Dallaire, UNAMIR could use force to stop the genocide. Indeed, in spite of his convincing arguments that were supported by easily verifiable examples like this one:

By mid-January [1994], thanks to Jean-Pierre we had all the information we needed to confirm that there was a well-organised conspiracy inside the country dedicated to destroying the Arusha Peace Agreement by any means necessary (Dallaire, 2003:150-151).

Jean-Pierre’s real name was Abubakar Turatsinze. He was closely working with the génocidaire government and had willingly accepted to reveal to Dallaire the genocide plan, and the existence of four arms caches in Kigali. These arms were to be used in exterminating all Tutsi. Dallaire’s intelligence staff checked Jean Pierre’s information and found out that it was accurate. He then decided to act. However, he could not do that without the UN’s acceptance to change his mission to chapter seven as noted above.

Unfortunately, the UN declined Dallaire’s request. It did not give it the value and urgency that it deserved. As he says: *“No nation would be prepared to contribute to chapter seven, or peace-enforcement mission to a country where there were no strategic national or international interests and no major threat to international peace and security”* (Dallaire, 2003:71). The justification of this inhuman decision, as Roméo Dallaire points out, was that *“Rwanda was on nobody’s radar as a place of strategic interest. It had no natural resources and*

no geographical significance. It was already dependent on foreign aid just to sustain itself, and on international funding to avoid bankruptcy” (Dallaire, 2003:88).

Faced with the genocide that Rwanda was experiencing and bearing in mind that since 1948 the UN had defined genocide as a crime against humanity, hence calling for the UN intervention wherever genocide occurs, the UN decision of refusing to empower UNAMIR to prevent the genocide that later took place after three months, was not acceptable. It was too deceiving and frustrating. It indeed irritated Dallaire: *“The code cable from Kofi Annan, signed by Riza, came to me and the SRSG; its contents caught me completely off guard. It took me to task for even thinking about raiding the weapons caches and ordered me to suspend the operation immediately”* (Dallaire, 2003:146).

Rwanda was not only betrayed by the UN, but also by some Western countries that were informed of the genocide plan long before its execution. Some of them are Belgium, France and the United States of America. Dallaire discovered it when he went to see the Belgium and United States of America Ambassadors and the Chargé d’Affaires of France, all with residence in Rwanda. His intention was to share with them the information that he had got from Jean Pierre and then ask them to do the necessary lobbying so that the UN could endorse his proposal of changing UNAMIR mission to chapter seven. He was astonished by the fact that *“None of them appeared to be surprised, which led me to conclude that our informant was merely confirming what they already knew”* (Dallaire, 2003:148). They were all aware of what was happening in Rwanda but they were reluctant to do any intervention to stop the genocide plans that were in high gear.

Later on, Germany was also added to the above list of countries that did not act to stop the genocide against Tutsi whereas they had the capability to do so. Dallaire discloses this when he describes what happened to him when he was lobbying for the authorisation to be given advisers and coordinators who had to

help UNAMIR to give professional answers to growing queries from the populations, due to the different attempts of implementing the genocide plan:

I took it upon myself to lobby the French, German and Belgian ambassadors for riot gear for the Gendarmerie, but neither country would commit those resources. The unwillingness puzzled me, as these countries were the first to condemn civil violence and urge the Rwandan gendarmes not to overreact. But when they had the opportunity to actually commit some resources to match their words, they did nothing” (Dallaire, 2003:173-174).

Instead of helping Dallaire to get the support that he was requesting, some of the Western countries like France had another hidden agenda. Indeed, in the end March 1994, when General Roméo Dallaire was on holidays, he was informed while in New York, that:

France had written to the Canadian government to request my removal as force commander of UNAMIR. Apparently someone had been reading my reports and hadn't liked the pointed references I had made to the presence of French officers among the Presidential Guard, especially in light of the Guard's close links to the Interahamwe militias (Dallaire, 2003:209).

There are reasons that may explain why France was against Dallaire. It was not happy with his decision of revealing how France was actively involved in the preparation of genocide. Though Dallaire was aware that France was against him, he never stopped to condemn its continuous support to the Rwandan genocide government. One of the best examples is Dallaire's condemnation of the French Amaryllis operation. Officially, the French Amaryllis operation, a French military operation that was assisted by the Belgian army and UNAMIR, to evacuate about 1,400 international expatriates who were in Kigali when the genocide against Tutsi broke out. It started on 8 April 1994 and ended on 14 April 1994. The idea itself was not bad. What is worse is the French hidden agenda of supporting génocidaires. As Dallaire reveals:

My [Dallaire] conversation with Colonel Poncet was curt, and the French commander showed no interest in co-operating with us. This unhappy exchange was an indication of how the French

evacuation task force, Operation Amaryllis, would continue to behave with UNAMIR. Poncet said his mission was to evacuate the expatriate community within the next forty-eight to seventy-two hours. We had heard from the MILOBs at the airport that the French had already evacuated a number of Rwandans and that twelve members of the presidential family were part of this group, but Poncet insisted to me that he was only here to evacuate expatriates and “white people” (Dallaire, 2003:282).

Evacuating a good number of Rwandans who included twelve members of the presidential family is a good indicator of how the French Amaryllis Operation violated the agreed terms of its deployment. Covering their former Rwandan leaders was not part of their mission. However, as France was enjoying fruitful bilateral cooperation with the late president Habyarimana regime, France decided to support their former allies.

Melvorn (2000:29) summarises why France had to support the génocidaire government, at any cost:

Rwanda was part of a family, Francophonie, a group of states linked to maintain the promotion and protection of the French language. Closely related to this obsession with French language and culture was a fear in France of an Anglophone encroachment in Africa, nurtured by centuries of Anglo-French rivalry on the continent. Rwanda was important not because French was its language, but because Rwanda was located on a political fault-line between francophone and Anglophone East Africa.

The French support to Rwanda was translated into French extensive military and diplomatic support. The latter intensified when RPF Inkotanyi invaded Rwanda on 1 October 1990. Indeed, there are credible and variable proofs that testify how French soldiers trained the Rwandan army and later the Hutu militias, Interahamwe (youth of MRND) and Impuzamugambi (youth of CDR). When RPF Inkotanyi attacked Rwanda on 1 October 1990, some of the French soldiers who were deployed in Rwanda were engaged in some front lines to

assist the Rwandan army to defeat RPF. Dallaire confirms this direct involvement:

The French had a relationship with the Habyarimana regime that stretched back to the mid-seventies. Over the years, the French government had made a significant investment in the French-speaking Rwanda, supplying it with arms and military expertise, support that had escalated to outright intervention against RPF insurgent force in October 1990 and again in February 1993...France was the only member of the UN Security Council that had demonstrated a clear interest in Rwanda (Dallaire, 2003:62).

The above quotation shows how the international community was not interested in what was happening in Rwanda. It is this disinterest that led the UN to ignore the claim that it had received from Dallaire in the first week of the genocide against Tutsi. In his claim, Dallaire was requesting 4,000 troops to stop the genocide: *“That night [10 April 1994] an adviser to the Secretary-General called me to find out what was going on. I told him if I had four thousand effective troops I could stop the killing”* (Dallaire, 2003:289). Unfortunately, as Dallaire goes on, his repeated claim to the UN, to be empowered to stop the genocide execution that was worsening and spreading in many parts of Rwanda was neglected:

Despite our verbal and written reports of the worsening scenario, and episode such as this, reinforcement wasn't discussed in New York. Maurice had made it clear to me on several occasions that no one was interested in Rwanda, and now, because of the escalating risks, they were even less interested... There was a void of leadership in New York. We had sent a deluge of paper and received nothing in return; no supplies, no reinforcement, no decisions (Dallaire, 2003:290).

Instead of putting its effort together and intervening in Rwanda, the international community wrongly and rashly decided to evacuate foreign nationals who were in Rwanda. This evacuation took place between 8 and 14 April 1994. During this evacuation, some white people were even seen boarding the airplane with their dogs, leaving behind innocent Rwandans who were being slaughtered by génocidaires. UNAMIR was powerlessly watching, as it

was made unable to protect Rwandans. This scenario was a good indicator of how Western countries were simply putting the lives of white people above those of Rwandans and Africans in general.

During this evacuation of foreign nationals, there is a date that Dallaire will never forget: 12 April 1994. This date, according to him, was a date that marked how the whole world missed the opportunity of preventing the genocide against Tutsi. Rwanda was clearly betrayed.

Dallaire describes this situation as follows:

I mark April 12 [1994] as the day the world moved from disinterest in Rwanda to the abandonment of Rwanda to their fate. The swift evacuation of the foreign nationals was the signal for the génocidaires to move toward the apocalypse. That night I didn't sleep at all for guilt. Later that evening I received a telephone call from Europe, Mr. Gharekhan on the line, who was a special assistant to Boutros Boutros Ghali. He told me that the Belgian government had just decided to withdraw its troops from Rwanda. He asked me to consider future options and terminated the call (Dallaire, 2003:291-292).

Before the above-mentioned date that still hunts Dallaire's mind, on the evening of 9 April 1994, Dallaire called New York and described the situation that was happening in Rwanda:

They had my reports in hand: along with political assassinations and indiscriminate killings, we now had an example of systematic ethnic killing in the Polish Mission massacre and twenty thousand Rwandans under our supposed protection. But even though Kigali was crawling with elite foreign forces, no nation was interested in reinforcing us except the Belgians and a few non-aligned Third World states. By now there were five hundred French paracommandos working out of the airport, and a thousand Belgian paras staging in Nairobi. To that, I could add the 250 U.S Marines in Bujumbura. A force of that size, well-trained and well-equipped, could possibly bring an end to the killings. But such an option was not even being considered (Dallaire, 2003:283-284).

Instead of receiving a positive feedback that could help UNAMIR to stop the genocide that was at its topmost, the UN via Riza sent a response that did not help to stop the genocide. Indeed,

...the Code Cable 1173, signed by Riza for the triumvirate, arrived the night [April 18th, 1994] under the heading “Status of UNAMIR”. In essence, the message was simple: If the RPF and the RGF wouldn’t agree to a ceasefire by nine the next morning New York time, UNAMIR was to start its withdrawal. There was no discussion of any of the other options. The cable went on to ask for assessment of the consequences of the withdrawal on those who have “taken refuge” at our sites. I noted the use of the phrase “taken refuge” as opposed to “under protection” (Dallaire, 2003:312).

As if this was not enough, four days after this inhuman decision was taken, Riza called Dallaire and asked him news of the withdrawal of UNAMIR troops. What mattered for Riza, as the following quotation shows it, was not the death of many innocent Rwandans but the image of some members of UNAMIR who were happy to go back home and leave Rwandans at the mercy of the génocidaires. This annoyed Dallaire:

To my great displeasure, later that afternoon [April 22nd, 1994] I received a call from Riza asking me what was going on with the withdrawal. He said that the *Washington Post* had published on its front page a large picture of UNAMIR soldiers rushing an evacuation aircraft like a scared herd of cattle. Some, he said, were actually kissing the aircraft while others were dropping belongings on the tarmac as they raced to the plane. We were portrayed as scared rats abandoning a sinking ship (Dallaire, 2003:323-324).

Later, in Mid-May 1994, when UNAMIR left, Bernard Kouchner, a former French Minister of Health and founder of Médecins Sans Frontières and then the president of a humanitarian action group based in Paris, arrived in Rwanda. His official mission was to save a bunch of orphans in Interahamwe held territory and bring them back when things were calm). However, a close analysis of what he said shows that he also tried to protect the reputation of France that was involved in the genocide against Tutsi that was happening in Rwanda for: “*Though he was in Rwanda on his own hook, he told them that*

France and the world were beside themselves with disgust at what was happening here” (Dallaire, 2003:368).

France’s direct involvement in the Rwandan crisis did not stop at the above described direct involvements. It even continued with “Opération Turquoise”. This operation was a French-led military operation that was launched in Rwanda at the end of June 1994 when RPF was approaching a complete liberation of the whole country. It was under the mandate of the United Nations.

When France initiated the “Opération Turquoise”, it convinced the UN that its mission was to establish and maintain a safe zone in the southern and western part of Rwanda. On paper, this safe zone was meant to protect displaced persons, refugees, and civilians who were in danger in Rwanda. Whereas a few of them were fleeing génocidaires, many of them had left their places after the victory of RPF.

In reality, however, as was the case for the French Amaryllis operation, *Opération Turquoise* had also a hidden agenda. According to different resourceful and reliable people such as Roméo Dallaire, it is evident that it was not a purely humanitarian mission. It was a French invented way of protecting the former defeated Rwandan army and a means of trying to stop RPF from liberating the whole country. Dallaire describes this hidden agenda when he first met some of the members of *Opération Turquoise* and recognised them as former military advisers of the Rwandan génocidaire Government. He then questioned their neutrality:

I later realised that a number of officers who became part of Turquoise had been French military advisers to the RGF until the start of the war. How would their presence strike the RPF, who had to suspect that the French were not on a purely humanitarian mission? (Dallaire, 2003:427).

Dallaire goes further and reveals another important piece of information that proves, without any hesitation, how France had not good intentions in its

initiated *Opération Turquoise*. According to Dallaire, France deployed its troops in Goma, Eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo that shares borders with the western and eastern parts of Rwanda even before the Security Council had approved that mission: “On June 22, [1994], the French were already landing in Goma, which I found out through media reports on the morning of June 23 [1994]” (Dallaire, 2003:439).

It has to be recalled that the UNSC approved the deployment of *Opération Turquoise* on 22 June 1994, two days after it had received a draft resolution from France. Under normal circumstances, it was not possible to have the deployment-ready in Rwanda on the same day. This rapid deployment is, therefore, another proof of how Rwanda was betrayed by the international community, especially by France. It is indeed a betrayal because prior to the adoption of that resolution, Dallaire had asked the UN to give him more troops and change his mandate into chapter seven so that he could be able to stop the genocide, but his request was not approved. Even when it was considered later, no single country was immediately ready to offer troops and other needed logistics! But when it came to *Opération Turquoise*, because of the French conflict of interests as I have earlier explained, a heavily armed force was deployed in Rwanda in a matter of seconds!

France cannot have any justification to explain that its main intention in *Opération Turquoise* was not to prop up the former Rwandan genocidal regime. It was even an open secret to French members of the *Opération Turquoise* who were in Rwanda to support their former friends. Roméo Dallaire is an eyewitness of this French betrayal. He discovered it when he was discussing with Brigadier General Lafourcade, the French commander of the *Opération Turquoise*, about the French protected area in Rwanda:

Over lunch I found him to be much more genuine, his staff were rising points about the loyalty France owed to its old friend. (I had been told the Habyarimana family had close ties to President Mitterrand; one of his sons had serious business interests inside

Rwanda). They thought that UNAMIR should help prevent the RPF from defeating the RGF, which was not our job (Dallaire, 2003:450).

The above-mentioned quotation shows how French soldiers were excited to support the former Rwandan government. They were deceived saying that it was RPF that was committing crimes. However, soon after the deployment in Rwanda, some of them witnessed what was happening and realised that it was the Rwandan government with its trained extremist Hutu militias who were culprits. They then understood how their country was betraying Rwanda and started to share their findings with the media:

The French media very soon would start to report interviews with French soldiers who were shocked that it was their allies who were conducting the massacres and not the RPF, as they claimed to have been told by their supervisors.... At Bisesero, hundreds of Tutsi came out of hiding to be saved by a French patrol. The soldiers told them to wait while they went to find transport, and left them out in the open and on their own. When they got back with the trucks, they found the Tutsi had been massacred by Interahamwe (Dallaire, 2003:451).

Rwanda was not only betrayed by France, but also by other countries that I have so far mentioned. Another country that was not on the list is Bangladesh that had supplied troops to UNAMIR. In April 1994, shortly after the murder of the ten Belgian peacekeepers (7 April 1994) and the decision of Belgium to withdraw its soldiers from Rwanda, what was approved by the UN, Bangladesh troops decided to no longer be involved in activities that aimed at protecting some Rwandans who were being targeted by génocidaires. They did it in order to avoid the fate that had happened to the 10 Belgians who were killed by génocidaires on 7 April 1994 while protecting the former Rwandan Prime Minister, Mrs Agathe Uwilingiyimana. General Roméo Dallaire found it strange that Bangladesh troops had received that order from their home commander in Bangladesh. This decision frustrated Dallaire and pushed him to inform the Bangladesh commander in Rwanda, Henry, that he would be held responsible for betraying Rwandans who were then in urgent need of support and rescue. This is how Dallaire describes the Bangladesh betrayal:

I ordered Henry to inform the Bangladesh commander that he was contributing to the potential deaths of Rwandans and UNAMIR personnel and that he would be held accountable. The night I found out that he had received direct orders from his chief in Dhaka to stop taking risks, stay buttoned down, close the gates and stop carrying Rwandans in the APCs. He did exactly as he was ordered, ignoring the UNAMIR chain of command and the tragedies caused by his decisions (Dallaire, 2003:244).

Despite Dallaire's warning, Bangladesh troops did not change their minds. They continued to be a significant frustration to the mission.

Colonel Luc Marchal, the Commander of UNAMIR's Belgian, also pointed this out, as Dallaire says:

The situation with the Bangladesh battalion was worsening. Luc felt that this unit was almost useless. The Bangladeshis had either ignored his orders to conduct missions or told him they had complied when they hadn't. The commanding officer offered nothing but excuses, and most of the contingent had gone to ground inside their companions in a state of fear (Dallaire, 2003:272).

This situation of soldiers who were disobeying orders from their superiors was a characteristic of indiscipline. Normally, in any military service, hierarchy is strictly respected. Any indiscipline is seriously punished. But what was happening in Rwanda was beyond rules! This frustrated Dallaire greatly, as he was commanding the force with the goodwill of doing anything possible to stop what was happening. In addition to this disappointing Bangladesh behaviour, there are other scenarios that worsened the situation at the very beginning of the genocide against Tutsi (7 April 1994). Dallaire (2003:260) described eloquently terms this excruciating fate that Rwandans were facing:

It was past midnight in Kigali, and about 1600 at the UN. On line were Kofi Annan, Iqbal Riza and Hedi Annabi. I went through the failures of the day: the deaths of my soldiers and the moderate leaders, the systematic killings, the failed political meetings, Kagame's offers and threats, Bagosora's actions, the resumption of

hostilities-but they had no suggestions on how to put the evil genie that had been released back in the bottle.

On the one hand, the UN that has been formally informed (three months before) by Dallaire that genocide was to happen in Rwanda was still asking him details of what had happened instead of empowering UNAMIR. On the other hand, Dallaire was being overwhelmed by the rapid, organised and unhuman killings that were being perpetuated by the then génocidaire government of Rwanda and the RPF threats to intervene within one day, if the killings of innocent people were not stopped by 7 April 1994. The short but strong message that Dallaire received from Major General Paul Kagame, who was the Commander-in-Chief of Rwandan Patriotic Army, and today's Rwandan President, was delivered in six lines as Roméo Dallaire (2003:247) describes it:

- A. RPF is prepared to secure Kigali;
- B. Force Commander should not rely on his Belgian staff;
- C. UNAMIR should pull its forces out of the DMZ (Demilitarized Zone between forces of RPF and those of the former Rwandan government) to reinforce Kigali;
- D. RPF prepared to assist UNAMIR;
- E. If CND³ is attacked, RPF will move on Kigali; and
- F. If situation is not secured by last light 7 April, definite attack.

To summarise, the illustrations highlighted in this section suffice to demonstrate how the theme of betrayal is at work in Dallaire's *Shake Hands with the Devil*. For those who might need further examples, I would like to refer them to Dallaire's excellent summary of why Rwanda was betrayed by the international community and some specific countries.

This summary from an eyewitness of that genocide will clear all of their remaining doubts:

³ The National Council for Development, a Rwandan parliament building that was hosting the battalion of RPF that was in Kigali with a mission of protecting RPF leaders who had to represent RPF in the transitional government as stipulated in the Arusha Peace Agreement.

I truly believe the missing piece in the puzzle was the political will from France and the United States to make the Arusha accords work and ultimately move this imploding nation toward democracy and lasting peace. There is no doubt that those two countries possessed the solution to the Rwandan crises (Dallaire, 2003:514).

The whole world missed this political will and therefore failed to respect the principles that it had set to itself in 1948 after the Jewish genocide.

6.2.2. Failure

Failure is another theme that is discussed in Dallaire's *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*. Dallaire says: "The genocide in Rwanda was a failure of humanity that could easily happen again" (Dallaire, 2003: xviii). This idea of Dallaire is supported by Grünfeld and Huijboom (2007: xi) in their book, *The Failure to prevent Genocide in Rwanda: The Role of Bystanders*. This book is:

...about the international community failure to act in Rwanda, and the responsibility of a few within the United Nations' system to raise the danger flag. Their actions were more consonant with the petty interests of politics than the basic needs of humanity. As to the inaction of the Security Council, it is certainly beyond rational human explanation. No one can now doubt the extent of the tragedy in Rwanda and the fact that it could have been averted with a limited commitment, but the major capitals of the West were hardly interested in military protection for the civilian population of that country.

If the international community had not turned a blind eye to the early well documented warnings of plans to exterminate Tutsi, and had taken concrete actions on time, the genocide against Tutsi could have been prevented and thus the "never again", that the same international community took in 1948 after the World War II and the Holocaust, could have been a reality.

Another example of failure is when Roméo Dallaire saw a child who was still alive but terribly hungry and in need of assistance. He wanted to save him and

had in mind a dream of adopting him and making him his fourth child. His dream was abruptly destroyed when a young soldier, fast as wolf, yanked the child from arms and carried him directly into the bush. Not knowing how many members of his unit might already have their gun-sights on them, they reluctantly climbed back into the Land Cruiser

...By withdrawing, I had undoubtedly done the wise thing: I had avoided risking the lives of my two soldiers in what would have been a fruitless struggle over one small boy. But in that moment, it seemed to me that I had backed away from a fight for what was right, that this failure stood for all failures in Rwanda (Dallaire, 2003:4).

Roméo Dallaire was traumatised by his failure to protect this child who was still alive. When he remembered his inability to offer his assistance, he wanted to commit suicide:

I plunged into a disastrous mental health spiral that led me to suicide attempts, a medical release from the Armed Forces, the diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder, and dozens upon dozens of therapy sessions and extensive medication, which still have a place in my daily life (Dallaire, 2003:5).

Roméo Dallaire considers his failure as a collective failure of the whole forces that he was leading and the entire international community. He describes this when he explains how the UN Peaceful Force that had come to Rwanda to help Rwandans taste the fruits of peace had failed: *“Instead, we watched as the devil took control of paradise on earth and fed on the blood of the people we were supposed to protect”* (Dallaire, 2003:7).

The UNAMIR failed to accord timely attention to the revelations of Jean Pierre, a former trainer of Interahamwe who did not want to take part in the genocide plan and in the killings of 10 Belgians who were the best contingent of the UNAMIR and whom the then Habyarimana government and its extremist militias wanted to withdraw from the mission: Jean Pierre explained, with evidence, that Interahamwe were well trained to the extent of killing *“a thousand Tutsi in Kigali within twenty minutes of receiving orders”* (Dallaire,

2003:142). He added: *“the leadership was about to make a decision to distribute the arms caches to every Interahamwe cell in Kigali. If that happened, he said, there would be no way to stop the slaughter”* (Dallaire, 2003:144). As earlier mentioned, through Jean Pierre’s revelations, Interahamwe had received orders to make lists of Tutsi countywide so that they could use them to easily know Tutsi who had to be exterminated at the implementation stage of the genocide plan. This indeed happened.

Commenting on how the UN failed to adequately use the above intelligence information from Jean Pierre and prevent the genocide, Dallaire innocently blames also himself:

My failure to persuade New York to act on Jean Pierre’s information still hunts me. If only I had been able to get Maurice onside, to have him as my friend in court to persuade Annan and Riza that I wasn’t some gun-happy cowboy. I know now that the DPKO was still reeling in the wake of the American debacle in Somalia, in which eighteen American soldiers were killed while attempting to arrest a warlord in the streets of Mogadishu (Dallaire, 2003:147).

Dallaire is not the only one to point out the failure of the international community in preventing the genocide against Tutsi. The statement of the former USA President, Bill Clinton in his historic visit in Rwanda, on 25 March 1998, supports the Canadian General, when he says:

The international community, together with nations in Africa, must bear its share of responsibility for this tragedy, as well. We did not act quickly enough after the killing began. We should not have allowed the refugee camps to become safe haven for the killers. We did not immediately call these crimes by their rightful name: genocide. We cannot change the past. But we can and must do everything in our power to help you build a future without fear, and full of hope (www.cbsnews.com/news/text-of-clintons-rwanda-speech).

In March 2013 interview with CNBC, Bill Clinton clearly emphasised what he had said in 1998. He firmly admitted that if U.S.A. had intervened to stop the 1994 genocide against Tutsi sooner after it had started, they could have at

least saved 300,000 lives out of more than one million Tutsi who were killed. This is how he said it: “If we’d gone in sooner, I believe we could have saved at least a third of the lives that were lost...it had an enduring impact on me” (www.cnbc.com/id/100546207).

Clinton’s views are not different from the ones of Nicolas Sarkozy, the former French President, when he visited the Kigali Genocide Memorial on 25th February 2010. He confessed that “What happened here [Rwanda] is unacceptable and what happened here forces the international community, including France, to reflect on the mistakes that prevented it from anticipating and stopping this terrible crime” (www.theguardian.com/world/2010/feb/25/sarkozy-rwanda-genocide-kagame). However, some critics say that what Nicholas Sarkozy said was not complete. It was not a genuine apology that Rwandans were waiting for. Saying that France made “serious errors of judgment” is not an act of seeking an apology. France should openly accept its role in the genocide against Tutsi and refuse to offer safe refuge to some génocidaires who live in France, but instead, work with the Rwandan justice to try those people.

Sarkozy’s refusal to directly apologize is different from the one of Kofi Annan. The latter was the UN Under-Secretary-General for peacekeeping between March 1992 and December 1996 when the genocide took place in Rwanda. He was in a good position to know every single detail of how the genocide was being prepared and how it would have been prevented. Between 1996 and 2006 he was the UN Secretary-General. On 17 October 1999, Kofi Annan, officially acknowledged the failure of the international community in preventing the 1994 genocide against Tutsi:

In 1994, the whole international community-the United Nations and its Member States failed to honour that obligation. Approximately 800,000 lives [more than one million according to the census carried out by the Rwandan Government in 2002 with names of victims] Rwandans were slaughtered by their fellow countrymen and women, for no other reason than that they

belonged to a particular ethnic group. That is genocide in its purest and most evil form. All of us must bitterly regret that we did not do more to prevent it. There was a United Nations force in the country at the time, but it was neither mandated nor equipped for the kind of forceful action, which would have been needed to prevent or halt the genocide. On behalf of the United Nations, I acknowledge this failure and express my deep remorse (www.un.org/press/en/1999/19991216.sgsm7263.doc.html).

The humble and direct manner that Kofi Annan used in apologising and acknowledging the wrongdoings of the entire UN and international community, in general, is similar to the one that was used by the Belgian Prime Minister, Guy Verhofstadt on 7th April 2000 when he attended the commemoration of 1994 genocide against Tutsi in Rwanda. He used this opportunity to apologize for his country's failures during the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. He said:

In order for Rwanda to turn its eyes toward the future, toward reconciliation, we have first to assume our responsibilities and acknowledge our mistakes...In the name of my country, I pay tribute to the genocide victims, and in the name of my country, my people, I beg forgiveness. (www.articles.latimes.com/2000/apr/08/news/mn-17377).

The above statements of Bill Clinton, Kofi Annan and Guy Verhofstadt are in the same line with the recent statement of Pope Francis (His full name is Jorge Mario Bergoglio in His meeting with the Rwandan President, Paul Kagame. According to the Vatican press release as it can be seen on www.press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/it/bollettino/pubblico/2017/03/20/0169/00393.html, in this meeting that took place in Rome, on 20 March 2017, Pope Francis:

...implored anew God's forgiveness for the sins and failings of the Church and its members, among whom priests, and religious men and women who succumbed to hatred and violence, betraying their own evangelical mission. ... the Pope also expressed the desire that this humble recognition of the failings of that period, which, unfortunately, disfigured the face of the Church, may contribute to a "purification of memory" and may promote, in hope and renewed trust, a future of peace, witnessing to the concrete possibility of

living and working together, once the dignity of the human person and the common good are put at the centre.

The above apologies contributed to the healing process that Rwandans undertook shortly after the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. For survivors of the genocide against Tutsi, this type of sincere apology boosts their moral and equips them with the courage to live the hard life of the post-genocide era. With experience, for 23 years, it has been observed that it has not been so easy for many countries and the international community, in general, to acknowledge their role in the genocide against Tutsi and ask for forgiveness. As the Rwandan President, Paul Kagame pointed out after his above-mentioned meeting with the Holy Father, Pope Francis, it is not an easy task. *“Being able to acknowledge/apologise for wrongs in circumst [ances]/cases like this is an act of courage and moral high standing typical”* (www.press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/it/bollettino/pubblico/2017/03/20/0169/00393.html).

For the case of UNAMIR, additional information needs to be given. Its failure was predictable. It started at the very beginning of the mission. There were a cold and mistrustful relationships between UNAMIR leaders, the Cameroonian Jacques-Roger Booh-Booh who was the head of UNAMIR and the Canadian Lieutenant- General Roméo Dallaire who was UNAMIR Force Commander, is a good illustration.

This incoherence between the top political and military leaders of UNAMIR was a good indicator of the poor performance of the mission. When leaders do not have good interpersonal relationships, they do not interact well with each other. This is a hindrance to their performance. It even affects the performance of the whole group as it reduces the teamwork spirit. This misunderstanding between Booh-Booh and Roméo Dallaire may even be a good explanation as to why the Bangladesh soldiers who were in UNAMIR decided to disobey orders from their superiors in Kigali and follow direct orders, as earlier explained,

from their country or sometimes pretended to show that they obeyed orders whereas in fact, they did not follow them.

In conclusion, as shown by the examples that were given in this section, there is no doubt that the international community failed in its mission of preventing the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, thus UNAMIR also failed. For those who may still have some doubts, I would recommend them to read deeply the following Dallaire's statement: "*My mission had failed. I, the stubborn lobbyist for and commander of UNAMIR, had failed. There was no chance of sleep*" (Dallaire, 2003:261). If Dallaire, the army commander of UNAMIR and the eyewitness of the genocide from day one to the last day acknowledges that his mission and the international community failed in the genocide against Tutsi, who else would oppose his views?

6.2.3. Naivety

Naivety is the state or quality of showing a lack of experience, judgment, or information. This inexperience and wrong innocence prevent all naive people to be analytical and critical. As a result, it makes them lose a clear understanding of what is happening to them or around them. In many cases, this may be dangerous as that poor appreciation of events or actions can lead to poor decisions that can cause harmful consequences. In reading carefully, Roméo Dallaire's *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*, one realises that naivety is one of the main themes that are developed in his testimony.

The first illustration of naivety is the Belgium government's poor judgement in interpreting the warnings from its Foreign Minister, in February 1994, about two months before the official start of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. In his statement, the Foreign Minister advocated for the empowerment of UNAMIR in order to allow it to fulfil adequately its mission. He gave this recommendation because he had received credible information about what was happening in Rwanda and to UNAMIR in particular.

Dallaire refers to Willy Claes' revelations as follows:

In a testimony to the Belgian Senate some years later, Willy Claes, the Belgian Foreign Minister, claimed that on 11 February [1994] he told Boutros-Ghali that unless the peacekeepers took firmer action, UNAMIR might soon find itself unable to continue at all (Dallaire, 2003:103).

Belgian leaders did not give importance to Willy Claes' warning. If they had considered it, they should have used their influence to lobby all Western countries for the adoption of the decision of empowering UNAMIR. The decision would not have delayed to be adopted.

The second example of naivety is the appreciation of Dallaire when he realised that some of the senior officers of the Rwandan government forces, were not ready to implement the Arusha peace accords:

Among the senior officers of the RGF [Rwanda Government Forces] was a cadre of a few colonels who appeared to be committed to Arusha and who eagerly anticipated the end of the conflict they had lost on the battlefield. But there were many others within the officer corps, particularly from northern Rwanda, who seemed less committed to Arusha and made no secret of their hatred of the RPF (Dallaire, 2003:68).

These soldiers from the northern part of Rwanda were considering themselves as superior to soldiers from other regions. This was a result of the late President Juvénal Habyarimana who institutionalized ethnicity and regionalism in their favour. It is out of this regionalism policy that almost all the presidential guards were from that region. This made them more arrogant. Roméo Dallaire (2003:63) describes this situation as follows:

They were Habyarimana's Praetorian Guard, and they acted with arrogant self-assurance. I did not appreciate their standard of discipline. While they were respectful and obedient to their own officers, they treated all others in the RGF, and even myself, with contempt.

If Dallaire were not naive, he would have exerted a lot of pressure on the UN to ensure that the peace accords between the government of Rwanda and RPF were respected as signed. However, bearing in mind how prior to this situation the UN had refused his other requests that were accompanied by tangible warnings, there was no guarantee that UN would have considered his new request.

The third example of naivety is seen in the nature of UNAMIR. It was acting under chapter six as earlier mentioned. Given the Rwandan situation, and the request of Dallaire to change it into chapter VII that was denied, the failure of this mission was clear. A good example of the weaknesses of this mission was that UNAMIR was restricted to *“run its own intelligence gathering; in the spirit of openness and transparency, it has to be totally dependent on the goodwill of opposing sides to inform the mission command of problems and threats”* (Dallaire, 2003:90). Unfortunately, countries like France, Belgium, and Germany that had much intelligence information from their military advisors and military attachés in Rwanda were not willing to provide Dallaire with that information. This made him wonder how his mission would succeed: *“Our lack of intelligence and basic information, and the reluctance of any nation to provide us with it, helped my first suspicion that I might find myself out on a limb if I ever needed help in the field”* (Dallaire, 2003:90).

Given the situation of insecurity that was growing every day in Rwanda, and the fact that Dallaire was being denied access to intelligence reports from countries that had them, Dallaire, if he were not naive, would have realised that his mission was going to be impossible and tender his resignation to the UN for refusing to give him the support that he was constantly requesting. Threatening the UN that he would resign because it was not properly assisting him, might have forced the UN to change its mind.

The fourth illustration of naivety is how, at the end of February 1994, Dallaire misjudged credible information that was a clear indicator that planners of

genocide were at the final stage of planning the genocide against Tutsi. This happened when one of the UNAMIR member:

Who had been a teacher before joining the army, began visiting schools in remote parts of the country. At one school, he noticed the teachers undertaking an administrative exercise: they were registering ethnic identities of their pupils and seating them according to who was Tutsi and who was Hutu. This struck him as bizarre since children in Rwanda were not required to carry identity cards. As he visited other schools, he discovered that the same procedure was taking place. We mistakenly assumed that this was just another example of ethnicity at play in Rwanda (Dallaire, 2003:198).

If Dallaire, or officer who discovered the above-mentioned information, or the entire leadership of UNAMIR were not naive, they would have realised ahead of time that the genocide machinery was being activated in high gear. Consequently, they would have denounced this plan in time to take appropriate measures.

The fifth example of naivety is the passive attitude of Colonel Luc Marchal, the Commander of UNAMIR's Belgian forces, when Colonel Théoneste Bagosora, the mastermind of the genocide against Tutsi, revealed to him that all Tutsi had to be exterminated: "*Luc remembers Bagosora telling him drunkenly that the only way to deal with the Tutsis was to eliminate them completely, just wipe them out*" (Dallaire, 2003:219). Colonel Bagosora said this in the side-line of his meeting with General Roméo Dallaire. In his drunken status, Bagosora was defending his view that Tutsi had to be killed because they had a plan to form hegemony over the Great Lakes Region.

If Dallaire and his team were not naive, they would have understood that what Bagosora was saying under the influence of alcohol was more likely what was in his hidden thoughts and desires, as suggested by the famous Italian phrase *In vino veritas* (in wine there is the truth). Bagosoro was neither joking nor simply drunk. What he had said happened. Giving the right value to Bagosora's

revelations would have contributed to the prevention of genocide, of course with the right and timely intervention of the international community.

The sixth illustration of naivety is what happened shortly after the death of the late President Juvénal Habyarimana:

When an explosion at the airport was heard in Kigali on 6 April 1994 around 20.20: “Our phone began to ring off the hook: Prime Minister Agathe, Lando Ndasingwa and others called seeking information. Madame Agathe said she was trying to get her cabinet together but many of the ministers were fearful and didn’t want to leave their families. She said that all the hard-line ministers from the other parties had disappeared (Dallaire, 2003:221).

Both the late Prime Minister, Madame Agathe and UNAMIR did not quickly understand why all the hard-line ministers had disappeared, at the time that the country was ever in need of them. If they were not naive, they would have understood that they were busy finalising their long set plan of implementing genocide against Tutsi. When on the following day, 7 April 1994, Madame Agathe Uwilingiyima, the Prime Minister, Lando Ndasingwa, some members of the opposition and many Tutsi were killed especially those who were in Kigali, and when it was found out that the hard-line ministers were behind those killings, people then understood that they were naive in interpreting the reasons for their disappearance. If UNAMIR had quickly treated the information that it had got from former Prime Minister, Madame Agathe Uwilingiyimana and others like Lando Ndasingwa, it would have at least immediately taken them to a safer place. However, their naivety and the rapid implementation of the genocide plan could not allow them to predict what would happen to them.

Another example of naivety is what happened to General Roméo Dallaire when he attended an urgent crisis meeting that took place on 6 April 1994 shortly after the death of Habyarimana. Colonel Bagosora whom Dallaire did not trust because of his anti-Tutsi and moderate Hutu convictions chaired that meeting. A telephone rang and there was the voice of Bagosora:

A staff officer picked it up. He briefly listened, then calmly responded in Kinyarwanda. When he hung up, he said that not only had Habyarimana been killed in the plane crash, but so had Cyprien Ntaryamira, the President of Burundi, and Déogratias Nsabimana, the chief of the army. He began to smile as he told us that the plane had crashed in the backyard of Habyarimana's own home near camp Kanombe, but caught himself. Bagosora gave him a dirty look, then turned to me for a response (Dallaire, 2003:223-224).

The words and attitudes of this soldier who received the telephone call and was reporting to the just formed committee that was in a crisis meeting, reveals the existence of betrayal from the extremist Hutu soldiers. This soldier was not expressing regrets over the abrupt death of his former army commander-in-chief, the late President Juvénal Habyarimana. He was very excited to report that Habyarimana was killed just near his residence. Bagosora's dirty look to this soldier, that made him change his behaviour, confirms what some people have said that Habyarimana was killed under the instructions from extremist Hutu, led by Bagosora, who did not want the implementation of the Arusha peace accords between RPF and the former government of Rwanda.

If Dallaire were not naive, he would have immediately discovered that the aim of that meeting that he even attended by surprise, as he was not invited, was to implement the long existing plan of exterminating Tutsi. He would, therefore, have used all his energy to denounce that genocide.

The last example of naivety is the inability of Dallaire to link the message of Bagosora, when he was advising him to send off all Belgian troops of the UNAMIR, to the revelation of Jean Pierre. The latter as earlier explained, had informed Dallaire that the Interahamwe and Hutu extremist soldiers had planned to do everything possible to force the Belgians out of the UNAMIR and Rwanda, as they were the only equipped and organised force in the UNAMIR who could use force and stop the genocide. This is how Dallaire describes this situation:

Out of the blue, Bagosora suddenly volunteered that there was something I should think about: it might be best to get the Belgians out of the UNAMIR and out of Rwanda because of the rumours that they had shot down the presidential airplane. What had happened in Camp Kigali might happen to the rest of the Belgians if the Crisis Committee continued to have problems regaining control of the situation (Dallaire, 2003:251).

If Dallaire were not naive, he would have quickly understood why Bagosora was making threats and suggesting that Belgian troops, why Bagosora was threatening Belgian troops to leave Rwanda and why the 10 Belgian soldiers who were escorting Mrs Agathe Uwilingiyimana, the former Rwandan Prime Minister, were killed on 7 April 1994 together with her. Maybe, a timely understanding and a timely reporting of the situation to the UN would have helped it to change its minds and secure Rwanda. Unfortunately, Dallaire was caught up in Bagosora's trap.

In a nutshell, the eight examples described in this section have justified how the theme of naivety is at work in Dallaire's *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*. The blind innocence that characterised the behaviour of some people in this testimony, including that of Dallaire himself, did not allow people to immediately understand how genocide was being planned and executed. It therefore prevented them from making necessary and timely noise that could have forced UN and the entire international community to change their minds and intervene in Rwanda with the aim of stopping the genocide. However, there is no guarantee that this really could have had a positive impact as the international community had already received all needed information earlier before the official start of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi but had decided to remain silent.

6.2.4. Indifference

Indifference is another theme that is discussed in Dallaire's *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*. With concrete examples, it describes the shocking indifference of the international community before, during and after the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. Indifference appears at the very beginning of this testimony. Dallaire brings it to us:

The international community, through an inept UN mandate and what can only be described as indifference, self-interest and racism, aided and abetted these crimes against humanity-how we all helped create the mess that has murdered and displaced millions and destabilised the whole central African region (Dallaire, 2003:5).

Dallaire further confirms that the failed UN mission to Rwanda that he was heading is linked to the indifference of the international community to the Rwandan crisis that led to the genocide.

This is how he says it:

The cost in human lives of the inflexible UN Security Council mandate, the penny-pinching financial management of the mission, the UN red tape, the political manipulations and my own personal limitations... the fundamental indifference of the world community to the plight of [the then] seven million to eight million [now Rwandans are about 12 million] black Africans in a tiny country that had no strategic or resource value to any world power (Dallaire, 2003:6).

There is a need to elaborate more on what General Roméo Dallaire calls political manipulations. When the genocide against Tutsi started, the attention of the whole world was in South Africa, a country that was organising its first general elections (on 27 April 1994), after the release of late Nelson Mandela who was in prison for 27 years. In addition, it occurred one year after the USA had lost many of its soldiers in the Somalia crisis. The USA did not want to have the same experience in Rwanda. The UN Security Council could not take a decision without the USA because the USA would have used its veto power to reject it. Melvern (2000:79) describes this as well. *"The American soldiers who died in Somalia were killed two days before the Council was due to vote on*

whether or not the UN would provide peacekeepers for Rwanda. It was a grave accident of timing". Indeed, after the Somalia incident, the UN Security Council decided that *"never again should UN undertake enforcement action within internal conflicts of states"* (Melvern:79). However, it has to be mentioned that what was happening in Rwanda was not internal conflicts. It was genocide. To avoid intervening in Rwanda, the international community did not want to refer to the Rwandan killings as genocide; they instead were referring to them as inter-ethnic killings between Hutu and Tutsi.

Furthermore, the intimate relationship between the then UN Secretary-General, Boutros Boutros Ghali and the then génocidaire government of Rwanda that was against the reinforcement of UN forces in Rwanda could also have delayed the decision. As Melvern (2000:79) says, *"The close relationship between Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali and the Rwandan regime had begun with his first official visit to Kigali in 1983. Most of the high-level Egyptian-Rwandan diplomatic dialogue went through him"*.

Another reason was the situation in the former Yugoslavia: *"The West was too obsessed with the former Yugoslavia and with its peace-dividend reductions of its military forces to get involved in the central Africa"* (Melvern, 2000: 79). This explains why Europeans did not want to intervene in Rwanda. They were busy with their own affairs. Rwanda was not presenting anything of great significance to them. This is indicator of tremendous indifference.

The attitude of some of the people whom Roméo Dallaire met when he was briefing Kofi Annan, Maurice Baril Iqbal Riza and others in the DPKO on the situation in Rwanda and with the aim of requesting them to speed up the approval of the deployment of the UN peace forces in Rwanda also reflected the pure indifference of the international community to the Rwandan crisis: *"Some of the people in the meeting made strong comments to the effect"* (Dallaire, 2003:81). They were wondering who had let that *"irresponsible milestone of September 10 even get on the table?"* (Dallaire, 2003:81). It was as if studying

the possibility of helping a poor African country like Rwanda that was representing no strategic interests to those countries was a waste of time! Even after the deployment was approved and countries were asked to contribute troops, Western countries were not willing to do so. That was a good sign of indifference. Only Belgium offered some troops. As for other countries, “*Maurice Baril had made it clear that no other First World country was remotely interested*” (Dallaire, 2003:106).

Though Belgium offered some troops and contributed a lot in the implementation of the Arusha Peace Accords, when the genocide started, it also showed indifference to what was happening in Rwanda. This took place on April 11, 1994, when Belgian soldiers refused to evacuate some Rwandans who had sought refuge at ETO Kicukiro that was under their protection. Mrs Florida Mukeshimana, the widow of Boniface Ngulinzira, former Rwandan foreign minister who was killed by the génocidaires on April 11, 1994 shortly after Belgians troops had left them, describes it well:

Le 9 avril 1994, les Casques-bleus ont commencé à organiser l'évacuation des expatriés à Kicukiro. Mon mari a demandé à ce que nous soyons à également évacués. Un des chefs lui a dit que ça ne le dérangeait pas de le faire. Cependant, le chef de l'évacuation à partir de Kicukiro à catégoriquement refusé. Les autres réfugiés étaient consternés par ce refus, ils ont supplié les Casques bleus d'évacuer au moins mon mari, ce chef a continué à refuser, il s'est catégoriquement opposé à l'évacuation de notre famille. À un moment il a dit à mon mari: “Nous ne pouvons pas prendre le risque d'emmener avec nous un ministre d'un parti d'opposition, qu'il est du gouvernement de Dismas Nsengiyaremye, d'Agathe Uwilingiyimana ou du future gouvernement elargi au F.P.R” (Morel, 2010:564).

On 9 April 1994, [the UN] Peacekeepers [Belgians] began to organize the evacuation of expatriates in Kicukiro. My husband [Boniface Ngulinzira who was the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Chief negotiator (Rwandan side) in the Arusha peace talks between the Government of Rwanda and RPF, and the opponent to Habyarimana's regime) requested to have his family evacuated as well. One of the commanders told him that he did not mind doing it. However, the commander of that evacuation categorically refused. Other refugees were shocked by that refusal; they even begged the peacekeepers to

accept to evacuate at least my husband, but that commander continued to refuse, he categorically opposed the evacuation of our family. At one point, he told my husband: “We cannot take the risk of bringing with us, a minister from an opposition party, whether he is from the government of Dismas Nsengiyaremye [former prime Minister and member of M.D.R], Agatha Uwilingiyimana [former prime Minister and member of M.D.R] or a member of the future Broad-Based Transitional Government which would include representatives of.

Another illustration of indifference in *Shake Hands with the Devil* is the lack of proper appreciation of the information that Dallaire received in December 1993, about four months before the genocide:

On December 3, I received a letter signed by a group of senior RGF and Gendarmerie officers, which informed me that there are elements close to the president who were out to sabotage the peace process, with potentially devastating consequences. The conspiracy’s opening would be a massacre of Tutsi (Dallaire, 2003:81).

The above indifference was caused by the naivety that characterised Dallaire in some situations. It did not allow him to have full understanding of how what was previously described as the war conflict between RPF and the then government of Rwanda was escalating into genocide against Tutsi.

Another indicator of indifference is shown in the complaints of Roméo Dallaire about the lack of basic needs like fuel, barbed wire, sandbags, lumber, spare parts, night vision equipments, radios and vehicles that would help them to carry his mission. This is how he says it:

Every week in our situation reports and almost daily by phone we begged for these shortfalls to be addressed; we knew there was equipment sitting at the UN depot in Pisa, Italy, but we were obviously a low priority, and everything seemed to go to missions such as the one in the former Yugoslavia (Dallaire, 2003:135).

The above quotation describes how the UNAMIR, compared to other the UN missions, especially the ones in Western parts of the world, due to the

indifference of the international community, especially developed countries of the West to African countries was less considered.

An additional example of indifference is the decision of UN to keep the former ambassador of Rwanda at the time of genocide to stay as a member of the UN Security Council where all decisions to intervene in Rwanda were being taken. It is even worse to learn, through the following lines, that the extremist Rwandan Ambassador had managed to have allies among strong countries that had a veto right.

The future of UNAMIR's participation in implementing the Arusha peace Agreement was being decided by fifteen men sitting in backroom beside the Security Council hall in New York, one of whom was a hard-line Rwandan extremist. He represented a group in Rwanda that was against Arusha and now found himself allied with Americans, Russians and Chinese, who all wanted the mission to end (Dallaire, 2003:219).

If the UN was really willing to seriously deal with the Rwandan situation, with all the information it had on how the then Rwandan government was organising the genocide against Tutsi, it would have suspended with immediate effect, the Rwandan ambassador to the UN from being a member of the Security Council. This would have prevented the UN from being misled by that Rwandan hard-line ambassador. It would also have helped the UN to keep secret what was being discussed about Rwanda and communicate it in due time. Otherwise, having the Rwandan ambassador on board in the UN was a way of informing Rwanda of each step of the decision that was being taken against it.

The behaviour of some members of the UNAMIR after receiving, on 7 April 1994 many telephone calls from people who were requesting the UNAMIR assistance as their lives were in danger, after they had noticed that presidential guards were going house to house with pre-established lists of people who had to be exterminated, is another indicator of indifference: *"We began to get ever more disturbing phone calls reporting elements of the Presidential Guard, the army,*

the Gendarmerie and the Interahamwe were going from house to house with a list of names" (Dallaire, 2003:231). The indifference is found in the use of the verb "disturb". If the UNAMIR were not indifferent, it would not have referred to telephone calls of people whose lives were in danger as disturbing calls! They would have instead considered them as calls for help.

Another example of indifference is the behaviour of some of the French soldiers in their Amaryllis operation that I have earlier described. This happened when they were evacuating some international expatriates who were in Kigali when the genocide against Tutsi started. On one occasion, Dallaire was shocked to witness how these French soldiers were indifferent vis-à-vis a large number of Rwandans who were fleeing the attacks of the génocidaires:

Hundreds of Rwandans had gathered to watch all these white entrepreneurs, NGO staff and their families making their fearful exits, and as I went my way through the crowd, I saw how aggressively the French were pushing black Rwandans seeking asylum out of the way. A sense of shame overcame me (Dallaire, 2003:286).

Dallaire who had done all he could to stop the genocide but was not able due to the indifference of the UN and the international community to the genocide against Tutsi became pessimistic. He lost his faith in God and started to think that God was also indifferent to the Rwandan problems: *"My Christian beliefs had been the moral framework that had guided me throughout my adult life. Where was God in all this horror? Where was God in the world's response?"* (Dallaire, 2003:289).

Another important example of indifference is the inhuman behaviour of both the French troops who went to evacuate the international experts who had taken refuge at the Don Bosco School located in Kimihurura, Kigali. French took only those experts and left Rwandans. International laws punish people who do not rescue people in danger when they are able. As if what French soldiers had done was not enough, the Belgian Captain Lemaire who was the commander of the company that was camped at the Don Bosco School decided

to also leave in the hands of the génocidaires those unprotected Rwandans who had come to look for protection from a UN well-armed force. This French and Belgian indifference is described as follows:

Two thousand Rwandans had lost their lives that day [April 11th, 1994] as a direct result of the Belgian withdrawal. They had taken refuge after April 7 at the Belgian camp set up at the Don Bosco School, joined by a few expatriates. That morning, French troops had come to the school to evacuate the foreigners, and after they left, the company commander Captain Lemaire, called Lieutenant Colonel Dewez, his CO, to request permission for his company to consolidate at the airport. He didn't mention the 2,000 Rwandans his troops were protecting at the school. When Dewez approved the move and the troops pulled out, the Interahamwe moved in, killing almost all of the Rwandans (Dallaire, 2003:289-290).

The above indifference went hand in hand with betrayal. Without it, the 2,000 innocent Rwandans would not have been killed by génocidaires. French and Belgians had all the needed military and political powers to save those people, but they never used them. Captain Lemaire in particular, should be brought to book and explain why he did not inform Lieutenant Colonel Dewez, his CO that he was with Rwandans who were in bad need of protection. If he had done it, maybe, his commander, Lieutenant Colonel Dewez, would not have approved his request of allowing him to quit *Don Bosco School* and consolidate his company at the Kanombe international airport where other Belgian soldiers were.

Another illustration of indifference is what was discussed in a meeting between Roméo Dallaire and Major General Paul Kagame, the then army chief commander of RPF, now the Rwandan President Kagame. This discussion took place at the early beginning of May 1994. It was held in Murindi where RPF had its headquarters. In their discussions, Kagame clearly explained to Dallaire that France, the UN, and Booh-Booh, the UNAMIR SRSG were all indifferent to the genocide that was being committed by the then Rwandan government and all génocidaires:

He [Kagame] berated France and the world indifference and blamed the UN for not giving me an appropriate mandate when the time was right. And then, as a final shot, he banished Booh-Booh: “The SRSG is not welcome anymore in Rwanda. We do not recognise him, and if he stays we will cease to collaborate with the UN (Dallaire, 2003:342-343).

What the above quotation says on the indifference of UN is emphasized by the deception of Dallaire after he was informed of the 17 May 1994 UN Security Council decision to approve the rapid deployment of a force of 5,500 men that was tasked to immediately stop the genocide that was at the beginning of its second month. What made Dallaire understand, with much disappointment, that the UN decision in question was yet another indicator of its indifference to what was happening in Rwanda, was that the promised troops did not arrive rapidly at all:

On May 17th, 1994 the UN Security Council approved the immediate change in UNAMIR’s mandate and the rapid deployment of 5,500 men. Dallaire commented on this late decision: “After nearly a decade of reliving every detail of those days, I am still certain that I could have stopped the madness had I been given the means. But as the days went by and no troops arrived, it was clear that the Security Council had once again passed a resolution that did not truly represent the intentions of its member states (Dallaire, 2003:374).

Indeed, as Dallaire correctly describes it, the indifference of the international community continued to delay the deployment of the much-awaited troops. As an example, “*On June 19 [1994], the date that UNAMIR 2 should have had 4,600 soldiers in Rwanda, my troops strength stood at 503, and we were still living with all problems and shortages that had plagued and undermined us in April [1994]*” (Dallaire, 2003:432).

Dallaire goes on and reveals: “*UNAMIR 2 did not complete its deployment until December 1994, fully six months after the genocide and civil war were over and when it was no longer required*” (Dallaire, 2003:433). With no doubt, this behaviour of the UN and the international community is a complete indifference and betrayal. They should be held accountable for the death of

more than one Tutsi executed in genocide while waiting to be saved by them in vain.

The indifference of the international community worsened on 22 June 1994. On this date,

...the UN Security Council approved Resolution 929, which provided France with a chapter-seven mandate to assemble a coalition and intervene in Rwanda. The OAU initially opposed the intervention but, under the pressure from the Franco-African states, changed its mind. At the vote, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Brazil and China had abstained (Dallaire, 2003:437).

One may wonder why on the above date, within a short time, a resolution that allowed the deployment of a French-led force, under chapter seven mandate, was adopted, while this was denied to the UNAMIR under Dallaire's request. The abstention of the mentioned six countries is an indicator of how the world remained indifferent to what was happening in Rwanda. Though these countries took a wise decision, it does not prevent them from being responsible for the international betrayal in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. Indeed, countries like China, with its veto powers, should have used these powers to stop that deployment. As the reasons for this quick approval of the force that was led by the French were earlier given, I will not come back to them here.

The last example of indifference comes from the heartless words that were uttered by an American staffer when he wrongly justified why USA did not intervene in Rwanda to stop the 1994 genocide against Tutsi:

As to the value of the 800,000 lives [more than one million according to the census carried by the Rwandan Government in 2002 with names of victims] in the balance books of Washington, during those last weeks, we received a shocking call from an American staffer, those names I have long forgotten. He was engaged in some sort of planning exercise and wanted to know how many Rwandans had died, how many were refugees, and how many were internally displaced. He told me that his estimates indicated that it would take the deaths of 85,000 Rwandans to justify the

risking of the life of one American soldier. It was macabre, to say the least (Dallaire, 2003:498-499).

This arrogant and inhuman comparison made by an American staffer might be one of the main hidden explanations of why the international community did not intervene in Rwanda. To their eyes, Rwandans had few values! I earlier described how Rwanda was not even strategically important to the west.

In conclusion, all the examples and explanations that were given in this section are enough to justify to any person who may question that the theme of indifference was at work in Dallaire's *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*.

6.2.5. Hatred

Hatred is another theme that is discussed in Roméo Dallaire's *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*. Dallaire goes beyond and explains how hatred had physical and psychological consequences to Tutsi who were targeted by génocidaires.

The first example of hatred resulted in psychological suffering experienced by Tutsi in general due to the former poor Rwandan leadership that was oppressing them: "Overall they were a people suffering from psychological depression because of legitimate or imagined past grievances. They had a pessimistic, though perhaps realistic, view of the future" (Dallaire, 2003:61). This quotation proves how Tutsi had lost hope in their lives. It was quite impossible for them, who were considered as foreigners in their own country, to think of a better future. Their bad past experience was even supported by rules that made them think that they were created to receive unequal treatment compared to other Rwandans. This was not appropriate, but they had no choice.

The second example is the hatred that was aired by the hate radio, RTLM, before and during the genocide:

All day long “The station [RTL] encouraged its listeners to kill Tutsis and called for the death of all moderate Hutus, calling them traitors. The statements were accompanied by taped music from popular singers, violence-provoking songs with lyrics such as “I hate Hutus, I hate Hutus, I hate Hutus who think that Tutsis are not snakes” (Dallaire, 2003:261).

This quotation is a good example of how RTL, the pro-genocide extremist radio station, played a key role in teaching divisions and hate among Rwandans. It started to broadcast anti-Tutsi hate messages including dehumanizing names like “cockroaches” and “snakes” on 8 July 1993. After this date, messages like the above were regular.

The third example of hatred is illustrated by different accounts from various members of the UNAMIR who were deployed in some parts of the country. They experienced how Tutsi were humiliated and killed as dangerous animals:

In Gisenyi, a tourist town on Lake Kivu, an Austrian MILOB reported a festive spirit on the part of killers, who seemed oblivious to the sheer horror and pandemonium as they cut down men, women, and children in the streets. In Kibungo, government soldiers were running a scorched earth policy against Tutsi and Hutu moderates. In parts of Kigali, bulldozers had been brought in to dig deeper trenches at the roadblocks to reduce the piles of bodies. Prisoners in their pink jail uniforms were picking up corpses and throwing them into dump trucks to be hauled away (Dallaire, 2003:291).

Killing people by cutting them into parts, using bulldozers to dig deeper trenches to reduce the piles of bodies of who were killed by génocidaires or picking up corpses and throwing them into dump trucks to be hauled away, as described in the above quotation, is a result of hatred that characterised génocidaires. Indeed, as earlier explained, génocidaires were taught, for more than 35 years, that Tutsi were bad people whom they had to avoid. Hutu, from their early age were regularly told that Tutsi were their enemies. This hate policy started with the colonial era that Rwanda went through. It was shaped and nourished by the bad leadership that Rwanda knew under the First and

Second republics. The apogee of this bad leadership was the preparation and execution of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi.

Another example that is linked to the hatred that was experienced by UNAMIR staff is the report that Major Diagne submitted to General Roméo Dallaire on 7 April 1994 shortly after the death of President Habyarimana. The report was describing what had happened in Gisenyi, the western part of Rwanda where President Habyarimana was born:

By noon on the 7th [April 1994], they were going house to house... they killed some people on the spot but carried others away to a mass grave near the airport where they cut their arms and legs and finally massacred them, as observed by the UNMOs (Dallaire, 2003:313).

Being able to savagely kill innocent people as described in the above quotation is beyond the mind of any normal human being. Humans were created to love and help each other. When it happens that they kill each other, they are violating the order that God has given them. It becomes even worse when the killing is organised in the most dreadful way like cutting arms and legs of victims as happened in the above report to Dallaire.

The fourth illustration of hatred is from other stories of massacres that other eyewitnesses reported. These accounts were not different from the ones of UNAMIR staff. A good example is what was seen and reported by a Polish Pallottine priest who was at the Gikondo Parish in Kigali City. Interahamwe militia under the close supervision of the Hutu presidential guard committed the extermination of Tutsi that occurred on 9 April 1994, as Dallaire narrates quoting the Polish priest:

A priest assembles in the church about 200 children for protection, after prayers the killers opened the doors and massacred all of them [...] another chapel was burned with hundreds of people inside. Children between the ages of 10 to 12 years old killed children. Mothers with babies on their backs killed mothers with babies on their backs. They threw babies into the air and mashed them on the ground (Dallaire, 2003:314).

The last example of hatred is contained in the comments that were made by Shaharyar Khan, the new SRSG-Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United States, when he arrived in Kigali in July 1994. He observed that:

The Interahamwe [had] made a habit of killing young Tutsi children in front of their parents, by first cutting off one arm, then the other. They would then gash the neck with a machete to bleed the child slowly to death but, while they were still alive, they would cut off the private parts and throw them at the faces of their terrified parents, who would then be murdered with slightly greater dispatch (Dallaire, 2003:462).

Finding the words to explain the above inhuman ways that were used by génocidaires to kill, in a humiliating way, Tutsi children in front of their parents whom they would later kill with slightly greater dispatch, is hatred in its highest dangerous form.

In conclusion, the five examples that were given in this section, are good indicators of the existence of the theme of hatred in Roméo Dallaire's *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*. Hatred made génocidaires lose natural human characteristics and made them blind and motivated them to kill innocent Tutsi as if they were exterminating dangerous animals that were threatening their security.

6.2.6. Inhumanity and evil

In chapter three, I defined inhumanity as the extremely cruel and brutal behaviour and evil as the absence or opposite of that which is recognized as being good. I used some examples from Yolande's *La mort ne veut pas de moi*, to explain how the behaviour and actions of génocidaires during the 1994 genocide against Tutsi were inhuman and evil. What was described in *La mort ne veut pas de moi*, is also at work in Roméo Dallaire's *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*.

With the themes of inhumanity and evil, as Semujanga (2008:201) puts it,

Dallaire expects the reader to be exasperated and revolted by the humanitarians' behaviour; faced with the mass slaughter of innocent civilians, their inaction is inexplicable according to the logic of their responsibility to protect civilians whose government has decided to decimate. This is another form of unspeakable which, from the perspective of Dallaire, escapes any discursivity.

Inhumanity and evil are found in the rapid and cruel assassination of few moderate political leaders that immediately followed the crash of the airplane that was carrying President Habyarimana on 6 April 1994. "...by noon on April 7 [1994] the moderate political leadership of Rwanda was dead or in hiding, the potential for a future moderate government utterly lost." (Dallaire, 2003:232). Indeed, by 7 April 1994, Mrs Agathe Uwilingiyimana, the former Rwandan Prime Minister when the genocide kicked off, and "*The UNAMIR-protected VIPs-Lando Ndasingwa, Joseph Kavaruganda, and many other Hutu moderates-had been abducted by the Presidential Guard and militias and had been killed, along with their families*" (Dallaire, 2003:242-243).

Equally important, inhumanity and evil are also found in the assassination of the 10 UNAMIR Belgian soldiers who were killed along with the former Prime Minister, Mrs Agathe Uwilingiyimana whom they were protecting. Roméo Dallaire himself was the first to discover their elimination. This happened when he was being given a ride by a major of the former defeated army on 7 April 1994 the Presidential Guards refused him to use the service car. At that time, Dallaire was trying to meet Bagosora who was in a meeting in the [Kigali] *Ecole Supérieure Militaire/Officer Cadet School*, the current University of Rwanda, College of Sciences and Technology:

We backed up and drove south along *Avenue de l'Hôpital*, past the second gate to Camp Kigali, heading for the military school entrance. Inside the gate, I got a glimpse of what looked like two Belgian soldiers lying on the ground at the far end of the compound. It was a brutal shock. (Dallaire, 2003:236).

At that time Dallaire saw only two Belgian soldiers. Later, he learnt that the total number of Belgians who were killed was ten. Probably, he was not able to

notice that all the ten Belgians who were with Mrs Agathe were killed because the Major who had given him the ride did not want him to know that. He was driving fast. Later, the reliable information that reached UNAMIR's office revealed that killings of all Tutsi and moderate Hutu were directly carried out under the full responsibility of the Presidential Guard.

The [Presidential] Guard appeared to be behind all the altercations with and killings around town, I said. Bagosora claimed he was negotiating their commanding officer to get them back into their garrison. There was no panic, no sense of urgency animating this man. Bagosora was either the coldest fish in Africa or he was the ghost of Machiavelli executing subversive plan (Dallaire, 2003:249).

The inhumanity and evil that Dallaire experienced when he saw the two slain Belgians was even worse when, on the same date, 7 April 1994, he went to Kigali Hospital/CHUK with the aim of finding other Belgian troops who were still missing since 6 April 1994. Major Ndindiriyimana then accompanied him.

What he saw when he arrived in the Kigali Hospital was a terrible disaster:

We were nearly plunged into an operating theatre where the doors were open to let in fresh air. There was screaming, moaning, blood on the tables and floors, and staff in red-stained medical gowns. The room seemed full to overflowing with wounded, both military and civilian, lying on cots and even on the floors. The nearest doctor growled angrily at us to get out.... There were more injured in the yard, along with dozens of bodies. I could not believe that this scene was unfolding so close to the meeting room where I sat all evening (Dallaire, 2003:255-256).

The above description is enough to explain how inhumanity and evil were at the heart of the genocide. Death was felt everywhere. What Dallaire experienced was beyond his control. It looks as if he were watching an action movie full of many unreal cinematographic scenes. However, it was true. Evil and humanity were leading Rwanda. What he saw inside CHUK was not different from what

was happening in the whole Kigali and the entire Rwanda: *“There were bodies on the street, surrounded by large pools of blood that had turned black in the heat of the sun, which made the corps look burnt”* (Dallaire, 2003:277).

Another indicator of the existence of the theme of inhumanity and evil is the heartless behaviour of a group of Interahamwe and that of soldiers of the FAR who were looking like wild animals when Dallaire saw them on 9 April 1994.

This is how he describes them:

Groups of Interahamwe and RGF soldiers were roaming between roadblocks, which were simply a few stones or empty crates. The guards at the barriers were aggressive, more like animals that have had the taste of blood than security officers legitimately seeking supposed RPF “infiltrators”..... Returning to the Force HQ, I saw more dead bodies discarded like piles of rags beside the road as displaced people streamed past them, looking to escape the same fate (Dallaire, 2003:277-278).

It is important to give more details on the choices of the words that Dallaire has used to describe how dangerous were both Interahamwe and the soldiers. The use of the adjective “aggressive” which is followed by comparative words that explain how those génocidaires had lost characteristics of normal human beings is a proof of their satanic behaviour.

What Dallaire saw on 9 April 1994 is a carbon copy of what Brent, Pazik and Stec noticed on 10 April 1994, when they went to rescue Polish officers who were at Gikondo Catholic Parish Church:

They confronted a scene of unbelievable horror - the first such scene UNAMIR witnessed-evidence of the genocide, though we didn't yet know to call it that. In the aisles and on the pews were the bodies of hundreds of men, women and children. At least fifteen of them were still alive but in a terrible state. The priests were applying first aid to the survivors. A baby cried as it tries to feed on the breast of its dead mother.... Some people died immediately, while others with terrible wounds begged for their lives or the lives of their children. No one was spared. A pregnant woman was disembowelled and her foetus severed. Women suffered horrible mutilation. Men were struck on the head and died

immediately or lingered in agony. Children begged for their lives and received the same treatments as their parents. Genitalia were a favourite target, the victims left to bleed to death. There were no mercy, no hesitation and no compassion (Dallaire, 2003:279-280).

Each scene in the above quotation represents horror that is not normal to the minds of human beings. Though since 1959 Rwanda had experienced killings of Tutsi in a dehumanising way, the killings of 1994 were one of a kind. The description of a crying child who was trying to feed on the breast of its dead mother or the fact that génocidaires left victims alive and bleeding to death suffice to explain the uniqueness of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. In all previous killings that Rwanda had known, there were no reports of similar evil and inhuman ways of killing people.

Another example of evil and inhumanity is the use of diesel oil to burn the corpses of victims of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. This took place on Sunday, 10 April 1994 when UNAMIR realised that such a large number of unburied murdered Tutsi could cause diseases. Dallaire as the commander-in-chief of the force ordered UNAMIR staff from Ghana to burn those corpses:

I directed the Ghanaians to sweep the area for corpses and to remove them in order to minimise the risk of diseases to us and the Rwandans sheltering with us. They found eighty dead people with a few hundred meters of the Force HG behind a slope in a local slum. They put the bodies into a pile, poured diesel oil onto them and burned them. The terrible smell lingered in the heat (Dallaire, 2003:284).

Burning corpses as earlier said, was not in the culture of Rwandans. It is also the same in many countries. In Rwanda, normally bodies of dead people are buried in graves that are in cemeteries. In the past, it was commonplace for many Rwandans to bury their relatives in their own pieces of land. However, since 2012, the Rwandan Parliament passed an amendment to the law on organisation and operation of cemeteries in Rwanda and made cremation an accepted form of interment. Even if this law exists, many Rwandans still consider cremation as a taboo.

Coming back to the situation that was prevailing in April 1994 when genocide was at its peak, one may try to understand Dallaire's decision. Failing to take it could have led to the additional death of many people to disease.

Examples of human evil and inhumanity are many in almost the whole testimony of Dallaire's *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*. Another typical example that cannot be left out is what Dallaire experienced when he was driving out of his office. He saw: "*One body [that] had no head. Five blood-spattered youths sat on the curb, smoking cigarettes beside the ambulance. Their machetes were stained red. At most they may have been fifteen years old*" (Dallaire, 2003:298). If one concludes that these young génocidaires who had killed and beheaded that innocent person and were smoking as if nothing had happened and carrying their machetes full of blood were no more normal human beings he/she would not be wrong.

Another description of inhumanity and evil is what soldiers of RPF Inkotanyi were finding in their struggle to stop the genocide against Tutsi. In all places that RPF captured, it found many people who were killed in a dreadful way: "*The eastern rivers were packed with bodies that flowed into Uganda and Lake Victoria. So far, an estimated forty thousand bodies had been recovered from the lake. The crocodiles had had a feast*" (Dallaire, 2003:336).

The bodies that were in Lake Victoria were coming from bodies of people who were killed in Rwanda and thrown into the Nyabarongo and Akagera rivers. The intention of génocidaires was to send them to Ethiopia via Lake Victoria and River Nile. These Hutu extremists were saying that Tutsi had to go back in Ethiopia where they had come from (further details about this were given in chapter one).

Another illustration of inhumanity and evil is a description of what Dallaire noticed when he went to Camp Kigali, on 1 May 1994. His aim was to try to convince the self-proclaimed interim government and the FAR leadership to facilitate the implementation of the approved deal of transferring the refugees

who were at Mille Collines Hotel, then under their control but who wanted to be in the zone that was controlled by RPF. These refugees had to be exchanged with those who were in Remera Amahoro Stadium, then under RPF control but who wanted to join the zone that was under the control of FAR. When Dallaire reached the place of the meeting, he noticed evil and a close complicity between Interahamwe militia and the interim government and the FAR in particular. This took place on May 1st, 1994 when Dallaire met leaders of Interahamwe who were with Bagosora and Bizimungu. When he realised that “*the middle guy’s open-collared white shirt was spattered with dried blood*” (Dallaire, 2003:347), he nearly lost his composure.

He then realised that the links between the army, the militia and the interim government were real. On the way back to the Force HQ:

I felt that I had shaken hands with the devil. We had actually exchanged pleasantries. I had given him an opportunity to take pride of his disgusting work. I felt guilty of evil deeds myself since I had actually negotiated with him. My stomach was ripping me apart about whether I had [the] done right thing. I would only when the first transfer happened (Dallaire, 2003:347).

The remorse that Dallaire is expressing in the above quotation shows how he was shocked to have met Mr. Robert Kajuga, the national president and leader of the MRND-affiliated Hutu power extremist militia. Until today, he cannot understand why he accepted to meet him, shake his hand and negotiate with him. Kajuga’s white shirt that was spattered with dried blood inspired the title of the testimony of Dallaire: *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*. The devil is Kajuga.

As génocidaires continued to kill Tutsi, various reports continued to reach UNAMIR headquarters’. Each time that it was possible Dallaire and his team went out to witness what was happening. It is in this context he went to *Sainte*

Famille Parish after he was informed that there were many casualties after mortar rounds had fallen in the UNAMIR protected site at the compound. What he observed was a result of human evil and inhumanity: “*Several limbs and heads, children ripped in two, the wounded turning their bewildered eyes toward you at the moment at which you can actually see the life expires from them, the smell of burnt explosives mixed with burning blood and flesh*” (Dallaire, 2003:348).

Another indication of evil and inhumanity is exemplified by the response of the USA and UK governments when they were requested to assist the UN to stop radio RTLM that was playing an active role in inciting Hutu to kill Tutsi.

The feedback of these two powerful countries as mentioned in the below quotation was a disaster:

The United States and the United Kingdom committed other acts of sabotage on deployment to Rwanda. For instance, I had long been arguing with New York that RTLM had to be shut down, as it was a direct instrument on promoting genocide. (As UN had no means to do it) The issue was studied at the Pentagon, which in due course recommended against conducting the operation because of the cost - \$8,500 an hour for jamming aircraft over the country.... The Pentagon judged that the lives of the estimated 8,000-10,000 Rwandans being killed each day in the genocide were not worth the cost of fuel or the violation of Rwandan airwaves (Dallaire, 2003:374).

This insensitive decision by the Pentagon that the deaths of about 10,000 Rwandans daily were not worth the cost of fuel or the violation of Rwandan airwaves is one of the most inhuman and evil decisions. If the USA and the UK had accepted to use their advanced technology and shut down the RTLM, the number of innocent Tutsi and few moderate Hutu who were killed in genocide would not have reached over a million. The RPF that stopped the genocide against Tutsi would have found alive many people who were targeted by the génocidaires.

The animosity of Interahamwe in killing even innocent children, who were not able to know whether they were Hutu or Tutsi, because of their early age, is also another good example of human evil and inhumanity. One of the scenes that Dallaire describes is the following: *“And then, on June [1994] the Interahamwe entered the St. Paul Church site, collected about forty children, took them out into the street and killed them, just to show they could”* (Dallaire, 2003:420). Interahamwe did this to threaten RPF not to attack Saint Paul Centre that was by then a safe haven to more than five thousand Tutsi who were being helped by Father Celestin Hakizimana, now Bishop of Gikongoro Roman Catholic Diocese. These threats did not prevent soldiers of RPF Inkotanyi from organising, on 16 June 1994, a risky operation that rescued more than 2,000 hostages from the Saint Famille and Saint Paul Parishes after exchanging gunfire with Government troops and militias. The Rtd Colonel Jacob Tumwine who was the commanding officer in Bravo battalion and the commander of the Saint Paul rescue operation confirms how this operation was risky:

It was a risky decision; the government soldiers had surrounded us with heavy tanks; one at Kigali main round-about, another at Kabuga building and several others in Kacyiru and Kimihurura respectively... Patriotism was at play; we were left with no option but to give our lives for the rescue of innocent civilians (<http://ktpress.rw/2016/06/how-rpf-soldiers-rescued-2000-tutsi-at-saint-paul-church/>).

Examples of evil and inhumanity as described by Dallaire in this testimony that is being analysed are so many. They can, however, all be summarised by this one:

There was always a lot of blood. Some male corpses had their genitals cut off, but many women and young girls had their breasts chopped off and their genitals crudely cut part. They died in a position of total vulnerability, flat on their backs, with their legs bent and knees wide apart (Dallaire, 2003:430).

In short, during the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, the heartless mission of the génocidaires was to destroy and exterminate all Tutsi. As far as the description

of inhuman and evil in *Shake Hands with the Devil* are concerned, there is no better description as the following one that is given by Roméo Dallaire: “*To my mind, their crimes had made them inhuman, turned them into machines made of flesh that imitated the motions of being humans*” (Dallaire, 2003:457). In the argumentative strategy, the unspeakable takes a diabolical form.

F.3. Conclusion

This chapter revealed, in detail, the fateful experience that Roméo Dallaire went through during the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. It closely analysed six main themes that are at work in the testimony, namely betrayal, failure, naivety, indifference, hatred, and inhumanity and evil. To help the reader to understand well themes that were analysed, different quotations from the testimony were used. As per Dallaire style, all the themes were arranged in a chronological order.

CHAPTER SEVEN: GENERAL CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This PhD dissertation was divided into seven chapters. The first chapter was a general introduction. It dealt with the rationale and methodology of this PhD research. It further explained how the Rwandan socio-colonial-political history is the root of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi and exposed the problem of the study.

The second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth chapters deeply analysed the main themes that are found in Mukagasana Yolande's *La mort ne veut pas de moi* (1997), *N'aie pas peur de savoir* (1999) and *Les blessures du silence* (2001); and Roméo Dallaire's *Shake hands with the devil: The failure of Humanity in Rwanda* (2003). The seventh and last chapter is the general conclusion and recommendations.

In analysing these testimonies, it was found that there are similarities and differences between the two authors of the testimonies. As for similarities, both authors deal with the unspeakable cruelties that took place in Rwanda mainly during the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. However, both authors also deal with some tragic events that were warning signs that indicate how the genocide against Tutsi was planned and this for a long time. In common, the two authors condemn the international community and some powerful countries especially France, that betrayed Rwanda in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. They also condemn the brutal pre-genocide Rwandan leadership that prepared and executed the genocide and Rwandans of all walks of life who were heavily involved in that genocide.

As for differences, a close analysis of what Yolande and Dallaire wrote, shows that they mainly differ in their personalities. For Yolande Mukagasana as a survivor of the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, her main preoccupation is to narrate how she survived and how she was affected by that genocide. Telling her suffering becomes a healing exercise and a justification of why she escaped

that genocide: to tell her horrible experience so that it may never happen again. In her *Les blessures du silence* (2001), she goes beyond and talks to both survivors of genocide and those who were suspected to have played an active role in genocide, two journalists of the hate Radio Television Station (RTL), a priest, soldiers of the defeated former Rwandan forces, politicians, women, young including teenagers, and adult people. In doing this, she aimed at having a full understanding of what really happened in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi.

As for Dallaire, he was an eyewitness of how the genocide against Tutsi was committed. As the commander-in-chief of UNAMIR, he was allowed to move around the country, even in the zone that was under RPF Inkotanyi. In addition, he was also receiving reports from his staff who were deployed throughout the country and informing him of what was happening. Furthermore, before and during genocide, he held meetings with different members of the génocidaires governments, the interim génocidaire government, the leadership of the génocidaire army and that of Interahamwe militia, some representatives of powerful countries in Rwanda such as France, Germany and Belgium, the leadership of UN, as well as the leadership of RPF Inkotanyi. All of these made him an incredible eyewitness of what really happened in the 1994 genocide against Tutsi.

In analysing the four testimonies, in light of the socio-political approach, axiological or argumentative dimension and the comparative research methodology that were used in analysing the four testimonies, there are some important points that I have found out.

- a) In general, testimonies on the 1994 genocide against Tutsi share the same main purpose. Their aim is to preserve the memory of what happened during that genocide. In so doing, they reveal to the public, both national and international, the cruelty of genocide. This is done

with a specific objective: to ensure that people understand well what happened so that it may never occur again.

- b) Genocide is a result of the inhuman and immoral actions of human beings. This is found at all steps of genocide from classification to denial. It is this inhumanity and immoral actions that make blind all actors, including the international community and prevent them from intervening and stopping the genocide.
- c) To have a comprehensive understanding of what happened in the genocide against Tutsi, testimonies should give the floor to victims, génocidaires and other people who witnessed either the preparation or execution of the genocide (or one of the two). This is what Mukagasana did typically in her *Les blessures du silence / The Wounds of Silence* when she decided to talk to both victims and perpetrators of genocide. The latter helped her to access to information that was not revealed to any other writer on the genocide against Tutsi by the time she published her book. Probably, her decision might have inspired Bamporiki Edouard who, in May 2017, published his book, *My Son, It Is A Long Story: Reflections of Genocide Perpetrators*. This book deals with first-hand information from the perspective of the perpetrators genocide. It also shows how people who were too young such as Bamporiki and whose families in one way or another decided to stand up and fight against genocide and its ideology. This may be a good trend for the better future of Rwanda. Given the importance of getting the information from people of all walks of life, especially those who witnessed the genocide, it should be good to sensitise them to write their stories. Having the information from genocide survivors does provide all details on genocide.
- d) Though in general genocide testimonies deal with trauma, horror denial, despair, trauma, deception, guilty, remorse, repentance, hate, betrayal, evil, extremism, injustice, and hatred, it has to be noted that they also deal with hope. This may sound strange to some people but it is true. Mukagasana and Dallaire, in the four analysed testimonies, proved the

importance of hope in the aftermath of genocide. Indeed, all authors of genocide testimonies, except deniers, end up by expressing the need for a better new life. The theme of hope is also illustrated in different channels that deal with the genocide of the 1994 against Tutsi. Some of them are songs, especially those in Kinyarwanda, artistic arts, poems, novels, essays, oral testimonies, movies and drama. A close analysis of the hope that is described by these authors reveals that it is linked to the leadership of Rwanda of the post 1994. This leadership that Kinzer describes well in his *A Thousand Hills: Rwanda's Rebirth and the Man Who Dreamed It*, is based on three fundamental choices: to stay together, to be accountable to ourselves and to think big. Hope contributes a lot in the new life after genocide. It both helps people to go beyond their trauma and see life in a positive way. It is also one of the best ways to teach people the importance of setting up strategies to ensure that genocide does not happen again. For this reason, people should be encouraged, on a regular basis, to never allow actions that may hinder hope between Rwandans.

- e) Finding words to tell testimonies of genocide is not easy. This is because of the nature of the unspeakability of these testimonies. Given the emergency of testifying after genocide, as Muligo points it out (2012:52), it is a must to find strategies that can help people to tell their stories. Doing this is one of the best ways to tell the truth of what happened in 1994 genocide against Tutsi and to fight against all deniers/negationists. Some of the strategies include but are not limited to: encouraging survivors of genocide to tell their stories as it plays a therapeutic role in helping them to deal with their trauma; sensitising survivors to use both conventional and unconventional methods of giving testimonies and find experts in telling testimonies who can shape them into a good literary work; provide a psychological support to survivors in order to make them able to reveal their testimonies and finally remind them that they have a moral obligation to give their testimonies.

- f) In order to better sensitize the audience to hate genocide and its ideology, authors of testimonies on genocide must cause emotions in the minds of readers. Mukagasana and Dallaire used correctly this technique. Therefore, all people who are interested in telling genocide testimonies should use a technique that touches the hearts of their audience and force them to take action.
- g) Writing testimonies of genocide requires the respect of writing techniques. This explains why Mukagasana whose works were analysed in this PhD research had to go and look for an experienced author, as she had no experience on how to put to paper her testimony. Mukagasana shares the same writing challenges with many people who would like to write their testimonies on the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. Her strategy to overcome them is also valid to them.
- h) This study was a textual and thematic discourse analysis of Mukagasana and Dallaire's testimonies. It helped to identify themes within the texts that were analysed. It provided socio-psychological characteristics of a people rather than text structures. Analyzing the testimonies on the basis of their linguistic make-up may bring new inputs to the findings of this study. I, therefore, recommend future stylistic analyses of genocide testimonies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY**I. CORPUS**

Dallaire, Roméo. *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*. London: Arrow Books, 2003.

Mukagasana, Yolande. *La mort ne veut pas de moi*. Paris: Edition Fixot, 1997.

-----*.N'aie pas peur de savoir*. Paris: Robert Laffont, 1999.

Mukagasana, Yolande and Kazinierakis, Alain. *Les blessures du silence: Témoignages du génocide au Rwanda*. Paris: Actes Sud, 2001.

II. BOOKS

Auron, Yair. *The Banality of Denial: Israel and Armenian Genocide*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 2003.

Barnett, Michael. *Eyewitness to a genocide: The United Nations and Rwanda*. London: Cornell University Press, 2002

Bartrop, P.R. *Encountering Genocide: personal Accounts from Victims, Perpetrators and Witnesses*. California: Santa Barbara, 1995.

Bartov, Omer and Mack, Phyllis (Ed.). *In God's Name: Genocide and religion in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2001.

Bornkamm, Paul Christoph. *Rwanda's Gacaca Courts: Between Retribution and reparation*. London: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Braun, Virginia and Victoria Clarke. *Using thematic analysis in psychology: Qualitative research in psychology*. Bristol: The University of the West England, 2006.

Byanafashe, Déo. et al. *Histoire du Rwanda: Des Origines à la fin du XXe Siècle*. Butare: Université Nationale du Rwanda, 2011.

Carla, Willing. *Introducing qualitative research in psychology*. Berkshire: Open University Press, 2013.

Dean, J. White. *The Ignorant Bystander? Britain and the Rwandan*

Genocide of 1994. Manchester: Manchester In Verity Press, 2015.

Des Forges, Alison. *Leave None to tell the Story*. New York: Human Rights Watch, 1999.

Destexhe, Alain. *Rwanda and genocide in the Twentieth Century*. New York: New York University Press, 1995.

Donals, Michael Bernard and Glejzer, Richard. *Between Witness and Testimony: The Holocaust and Limits of Representation*. New York: State University of New York Press, 2001.

Elringham, Nigel and Maclean, Pam (Ed.). *Remembering Genocide*. London: Routledge, 2014.

Erny, Pierre. *RWANDA. 1994:Clés pour comprendre le calvaire d'un peuple*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 1994.

Felman, Shoshana and Laub, Dori. *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis and History*. Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group, 1992.

Figley, Charles R. *Trauma and its wake, Volume I: The Study and Treatment of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder*. New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1990.

Gasnabo. J.D, Simon, D.J and Ensign. M. *Confronting Genocides in Rwanda: Dehumanization, Denial, and strategies for Prevention*. Bogota: Apidama Ediciones, 2014.

Guest, Greg. *Applied thematic analysis*. California: Thousand Oaks, 2012.

Guichaoua, André. *Les crises politiques au Burundi et au Rwanda (1993-1994), Analyse, faits et documents*. Paris: Karthala, 1995.

Grünfeld, Fred and Huijboom, Anke. *The Failure to Prevent Genocide in Rwanda: The Role of Bystanders*. Leiden: Transnational Publishers, 2007.

Habumuremyi, Pierre Damien. *Rwanda: Building a Model Nation-State*. Bogota: Apidama Ediciones Ltd, 2013.

Harvey, Walter James & Pauwels, Brian. *Posttraumatic stress theory:*

- research and application*. Philadelphia: Brunner-Mazel, 2000.
- Herman, Judith. *Trauma and recovery*. New York: BasicBooks, 1997.
- Hitvhcott, Nicki. *Rwanda Genocide Stories: Fiction after 1994*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015.
- Jeppie, S and Soudien, C. (eds). *The struggle for District Six: Past and present*. Cape Town: Buchu Books, 1990.
- Jenkins, Bruce. *The Lost History of Christianity: The Thousand-Year Golden Age of the Church in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia-and How It Died*. (First edition). New York: Harper One, 2008.
- Jha, Uma Shankar et al. *Rwanda: Towards Reconciliation, Good Governance and Development*. Delhi: Association of Indian Africanist, 2003.
- Kalibwami, Justin. *Le Catholicisme et la société Rwandaise (1900-1962)*. Paris: Présence Africaine, 1991.
- Kinzer, Steven. *A Thousand Hills: Rwanda's Rebirth and the Man Who Dreamed It*. Colorado: Wiley, 2009.
- Laure, Sjoberg and Canon, E. *Mothers, Monsters, Whores: Women's Violence in Global Politics*. London: Sed Books, 2013.
- Mbanda, Laurent. *Committed to conflict: The destruction of the Church*. Wiltshire: Cromwell Press, 1997.
- McCann, Lisa and Pearlman, Laurie Anne. *Psychological Trauma and the Adult Survivor: Theory, Therapy, and Transformation*. Routledge: London, 1990.
- Melvern, Linda. *A people Betrayed: the Role of the West in Rwanda's Genocide*. London: Zed Books Ltd, 2000.
- Meredith, Martin. *The Fate of Africa: A History of Fifty Years of Independence*. New York: PublishAffairs, 2006.
- Morel, Jacques. *La France au Coeur du génocide des Tutsi*. Paris: Esprit Frappeur/Izuba, 2010.
- Mukagasana, Yolande. *L'Onu et le chagrin d'une négresse: Rwanda/RD-Congo, 20 après*. Paris: Aviso, 2014.
- Muligo, Emmanuel. *Écrire l'indicible: Pour une étude du témoignage de*

- Yolande Mukagasana, Kingston: Queen's University, 2012.
- Mustafayev, Chingiz Feyruz. *Terrorism: Definition, Causes, Awareness and Prognostication*. Baku: CINAR-CAP, 2005.
- Nabelkopf, Ethan and Phillips, Mary. *Healing and Mental Health for Native Americans: Speaking in Red*. Plymouth: AltaMira Press, 2004.
- Névine, El Nossery and Amy, L. Hubbell (Edit.). *Unspeakable: Presentation of Trauma in Francophone Literature and Art*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars publishing, 2013.
- Nkundabagenzi, François. *Rwanda politique*. Brussels: C.R.I.S, 1961.
- Nkunzumwami, Emmanuel. *La tragédie rwandaise, historique et perspective*. Paris: Editions l'Harmattan, 1996.
- Raphael Lemkin. *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*. Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1944.
- Parker, Ian. *Qualitative Psychology: Introducing Radical Research*. Glasgow: Open University Press. 2005.
- Perks, Robert and Thomson, Alistair. *The oral history reader*. London: New Fetter Lane, 1998.
- Ryckmans, Pierre. *Dominer pour servir*. Brussels: Edition Universelle, 1931.
- Saint-Exupéry, Patrick. *Complices de l'Inavouable: La France au Rwanda*. Paris: Éditions des Arènes, 2009.
- Scherrer, Christian P. *Genocide in Central Africa: Conflict Roots, Mass Violence and Regional War*. New York: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2002.
- Semujanga, Josias. *Narrating Itsembabwoko: When Literature Becomes Testimony of Genocide*: Wissenschaften: Peter Lang, AG, 2016.
- .Le Génocide, sujet de fiction? Analyse des récits Du massacre des Tutsi dans la littérature africaine*. Québec: Nota bene, 2008.
- . Récits fondateurs du drame rwandais. Discours social, idéologies et stéréotypes*: Paris: L'Harmattan, 1998.

Seigneuret, Jean-Charles et al. *Dictionary of Literary Themes and Motifs A-J*. London: Greenwood Press, 1988.

Sherbok, Dan Cohn. *Holocaust Theology: A reader*. Washington: New York University Press, 2002.

Sjoberg Laura and Centry E. Caron. *Mothers Monsters Whores: Women Violence in Global Politics*. London: Zed Books, 2007.

Straus, Scott. *The Order of Genocide: race, power, and war in Rwanda*. London: Cornell University, 2006.

Thompson, Allan. *The Media and the Rwanda Genocide*. London: Pluto Press, 2007.

Twagilimana, Aimable. *The Debris of Ham: Rwandan Regionalism, and the 1994 Rwandan Genocide*. Lanham, M.D: University Press of America, 2003.

Villa-Vicencio, Charles and Savage, Tyrone. (Editors). *Rwanda and South Africa in Dialogue: Addressing the Legacies of Genocide and Crime against Humanity*. Cape Town: Institute for Justice and Reconciliation, 2001.

Wallis, Andrew. *Silent Accomplice: The Untold Story of France's Role in the Rwandan genocide*: London: I.B Tauris and Co. Ltd, 2006.

Waller, James. *Becoming Evil: How ordinary People Commit Genocide and mass Killing*. London: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Wiesel, Elie. *Night*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2006.

III. UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS

Corianne Wielenga. *The role of narrative in healing in Rwanda*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Durban: University of Kwazulu - Natal, 2010.

Gilbert, Catherine. *Writing Trauma: The Voice of the Witness in Rwandan Women's Testimonial Literature*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Nottingham: The University of Nottingham/United Kingdom, 2013.

IV. ARTICLES AND NEWSPAPERS

Bauer, Yehuda. *Rethinking the Holocaust*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.

Funga. F. "A la recherche de la démocratie" in *Dialogue*, No161, Décembre, 1992, P.27.

Gigliotti, Simone. *Genocide yet again: Scenes of Rwanda and Ethical, Witness in the Human Rights. Memoir Australian Journal of Politics and History: Volume 53, Number 1, 2007, p. 84, 2007.*

Human Rights Watch. *Shattered Lives: Sexual Violence during the Rwandan Genocide and its Aftermath*. New York: Human Rights Watch. p.39, 1996.

Kagame, Alexis. *Le Rwanda et son Roi*. In *Equatoria*. N° 2, p. 45, 1945.

Kaminer, D. *Healing processes in trauma narratives: A review*. *South African Journal of Psychology*. University of Cape Town: Rondebosch. p. 481-499, 2006.

Kangura Newspaper, N° 6 of December 1990.

Kinyamateka, N° 1344, May 1991. *Kwiyuburura kwa MRND kujyanye no kwicuza*, P.8.

Gonidec, Philippe Poullaouec. *Les systèmes politiques Africains*. Tome XIV, Paris, 1971.

Semujanga, Josias. "Rwanda 1994. Analyse des récits de témoignages de l'Itsembabwoko", in *Présence francophone*, N° 69, P.3., 2007.

V. REPORTS AND DOCUMENTS

AGIR ICI-SURVIE. "Rwanda, la France choisit le camps du génocide" in *Dossiers noirs de la politique africaine de la France*, N°1-5, L'Harmattan. P. 29, 1996.

Annuaire Statistique de l'Enseignement Supérieur au Rwanda, 1986-1987. Kigali: Rwanda, 1989.

Mukantaganzwa, Domitilla. *Report on the activities of the Gacaca Courts*. Kigali: Rwanda, 2010.

ONAPO. *National census of the population*. Kigali: Rwanda, 1978.

VI. WEBSITE SOURCES

Stanton, F.H, 2013. The ten stages of genocide. <http://genocidewatch.net/genocide-2/8-stages-of-genocide/> (accessed 10 February 2014).

<http://www.icc-cpi.int/NR/rdonlyres/64FA6B33-05C3-4E9C-A6723FA2B58CB2C9/277758/ICCOTPSummary20081704ENG.pdf>, (accessed on June 25, 2015)

Gugelberger, G., and M. Kearney. "Voices for the Voiceless: Testimonial Literature in Latin America." *Latin American Perspectives* 18.3 (1991), (accessed 11 February 2014).

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Armenian_Genocide, accessed on June 22, 2015.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Duty_to_rescue, accessed on January 12, 2016.
<http://ktpress.rw/2016/04/alain-juppe-genocides-in-rwanda/> accessed on June 8, 2016.

<https://www.hrw.org/reports/1996/Rwanda.htm>, accessed on June 20, 2016.

<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CrimeOfGenocide.aspx>, Accessed on September 27, 2016

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12288419>, accessed on September 10, 2016.

<https://www.quora.com/How-can-one-tell-whether-someone-is-Hutu-or-Tutsi/>, accessed on September 20, 2016

<http://popups.ulg.ac.be/1784-6390/index.php?id=99#ftn1>, accessed on November 5, 2016.

<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/text-of-clintons-rwanda-speech/>, accessed on March 21, 2017.

<http://www.cnbc.com/id/100546207>, accessed on March 21, 2017.

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/feb/25/sarkozy-rwanda-genocide-kagame>, accessed on March 21, 2017.

<http://www.un.org/press/en/1999/19991216.sgsm7263.doc.html>, accessed on March 21, 2017.

<http://articles.latimes.com/2000/apr/08/news/mn-17377>, accessed on March 21, 2017.

<http://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/it/bollettino/pubblico/2017/03/20/0169/00393.html>, accessed on March 21, 2017.

<https://twitter.com/PaulKagame>, accessed on March 1, 2017.

<http://ktpress.rw/2016/06/how-rpf-soldiers-rescued-2000-tutsi-at-saint-paul-church/> accessed on April 10, 2017.