

Genocide and Media

A presentation to the **Summer Program on Genocide and Reconstruction**, organized by the *Interdisciplinary Genocide Studies Center (IGSC)* from 24 to 30 June 2013. CNLG, 26/06/2013.

By **Privat Rutazibwa**¹

Introduction

I have been requested to make a presentation on **Genocide and media**. The topic is a bit broad and a number of aspects could be discussed under it. These aspects include:

- The role of Rwandan media during the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi. The infamous contribution of RTLM, *Kangura* and other hate media to the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi has been widely commented on by authoritative authors and other scholars. Jean-Pierre Chrétien (sous la direction de) (1995). *Rwanda. Les Medias du Génocide*, Paris : Karthala, is the main reference in this respect.
- The role of foreign media during the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi in the form of lack of sufficient coverage is another interesting aspect of this topic. Allan Thompson (edited by) (2007). *The media and the Rwanda Genocide*, London: Pluto Press, highlights the negative impact of the “vacuum of information” by foreign media in the 1994 genocide in Rwanda.
- The use of the “hate media” precedent as an excuse for media censorship by the post-genocide Rwandan government is another aspect of the topic mainly developed by Human rights and media freedom activists. Lars Waldorf, “Censorship and Propaganda in Post-Genocide Rwanda”, in Allan Thompson, op.cit., pp 404-416, is an illustration of that sub-topic.

I will discuss none of these aspects, though they may appear of great interest; mainly because they have been widely discussed elsewhere. We may however come back to one or another of these aspects of our topic if you wish, in our later discussion, because none has got definite conclusions.

My focus will rather be **the recurrence of genocide ideology in the media after the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi**. I want to examine how the post-genocide media in Rwanda, in the region and in the world continue to be the channel of genocide ideology. The subject is of particular importance because it does not get the attention it deserves within the circles of genocide scholars. This presentation will discuss mainly the concept of genocide ideology in order to contribute to its better understanding. We shall look at its definition, its roots in the Hamitic Hypothesis, its development into the Hutu supremacy ideology, as well as the way it is presented today in post genocide media.

Defining “genocide ideology”

The concept of genocide ideology was coined after the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi. Early public speeches and publications mention the concept immediately after the genocide (Rutazibwa, 1999), but it is since 2003 that it has been widely popularized into public opinion. The parliamentary report on MDR (2003), the promulgation of the new constitution (June 2003), the parliamentary report on the genocidal killings in Gikongoro (2004), the publication of a Senate study on genocide ideology (2006) as well as another parliamentary (lower house) report on genocide ideology in secondary schools (2007) played a major role in this regard. But the concept of “genocide ideology” is still struggling to win legitimacy within intellectual circles, which are still reticent due, not only to its political and popular use, but also hostility to it by Human rights and political activists.

In a study on Genocide ideology in Rwanda and its typology, “Genocide ideology” is defined as “*a set of organized thoughts and beliefs which uses ethnic identity as a base, primarily for competition for power, but also for stirring up hate, conflict and violence as the main strategy to attain its objectives. It is rooted in the Hamitic hypothesis, has the Hutu supremacy ideology as the core component, and the denial of the genocide against the Tutsi as the main branch.*” (Rutazibwa, 2012).

I will insist, in this presentation, on the two first dimensions of genocide ideology, namely the Hamitic hypothesis and the Hutu supremacy ideology. The denial of the genocide against the Tutsi is well analyzed in various publications (Fierens, 2009), and I understand that a specific presentation on this topic is scheduled on this program, with my colleague Tom Ndahiro.

The roots of genocide ideology in the Hamitic hypothesis

The Hamitic hypothesis is a “*theory claiming that a group coming from the North had progressed beyond the Sahara and brought everything which, from the point of view of Europeans, had a higher cultural and civilizing value.*” (Sanders, 1969; Republic of Rwanda. The Senate, 2006:20). In Rwanda, this theory informed the whole literature of early ethnographers including explorers, colonial administrators and missionaries, while attempting to describe the new society they were discovering. The Hamitic hypothesis set a number of prejudices, from which we can extract three main theses which served as pattern and forerunner to the genocide ideology.

1. First thesis of the Hamitic hypothesis: “**Tutsi, Hutu and Twa are three different races coming from different places**”.

In his book titled “*Le Ruanda Ancien*” considered as the masterpiece of the missionaries’ literature on Rwanda, the Chanoine Louis de Lacger describes the Batutsi as “*a branch of Kushites, Ethiopians or Hamites..., they are brothers of Nubians, Galla, and Danakil*”. He asserts that “*the physical type of the Muhutu is the most common and the most general to the Black...,speaking a dialect from the Bantu languages, ...and settled on the inter tropical Africa as well as on the Oceanian Melanesia.*” Talking of the Batwa, he indicates that “*they are categorized by anthropologists and ethnographers among “Negrilles”, who, with Negritos of Indonesia and Asia constitute the great family of Pygmies*” (De Lacger, 1961:45, 49, 56).²

2. Second thesis of the Hamitic hypothesis: **“Tutsi are strangers and late comers in Rwanda. They conquered and subjugated the Hutu, real Rwandans.”**

Richard Kandt, the first German civilian Resident of Rwanda, making a review of the discoveries of his predecessor, Count Von Gotzen, the first European to visit the Court of Rwanda in 1894, puts the following description: *“Contrary to the other parts of the colony, he found here a dense population: Bantus Negroes counted in thousands and named: Wahutu. This population is enslaved to Watussi, a noble caste of foreigners, Semites or Hamites; whose ancestors, originating from Galla countries in the south of Abyssinia, have subjugated all the interlacustrine regions.”* (Kandt, R., 1905: pp 257-278).

This understanding is further clarified by De Lacger in these excerpts of the mentioned book:

“The Batutsi are, without any doubt, the last comers in Rwanda, and their settlement is relatively recent”. ... “The historical autochthones in Rwanda bear the name of Batwa”. ...The Muhutu is “the vegetarian colonizer,...reducing before him the bush and the inextricable forest..., populating everywhere with overabundant birth rate, ... it is he, who really conquered and created Rwanda, who gave it a way of living which is general nowadays; who imprinted the stamp of his language and institutions; who baptized all its sites, its mounts, its rivers, its “countries” or cantons; its hills and sections of hills.”

“The silent penetration of this pioneer, which certainly took centuries to attain its end, is of the same nature as that of the Slave of the Middle Age in Eastern Europe; of the modern Canadian and Anglo-Saxon in the American Far-West. Thanks to him, the land has been filled and humanized; the ancient tribal organization has transformed into a regime of territorial government.” (De Lacger, 1961:48).

3. Third thesis of the Hamitic hypothesis: **“Tutsi are a minority which exerted power and oppression on the Hutu majority.”**

At their arrival in Rwanda, Europeans were impressed but also mistaken on the configuration of political power in the country. The predominant role of a Tutsi elite, which was the result of a recent and complex evolution (Ntezimana, 1987), was wrongly interpreted as ancient, natural and common to all the Batutsi. The Europeans then decided to strengthen and perpetuate this predominant role of Tutsi elite which was praised all along the colonial era for its alleged natural ability for command.

De Lacger provides the following description: *“On the whole, the Batutsi of pure race do not represent probably more than five per cent, but this percentage is doubled or tripled by the number of those who claim in one way or another, their kinship which is highly regarded. They are, so to speak, a small minority, but it is a ruling minority. Their supremacy is not contested. ...Those are the people born for command, like the Roman of Virgile.”* (De Lacger, 1961:50-51).

In 1920, L. Frank, Belgian minister of colonies initiated a clear policy where the local auxiliaries of the colonial administration in Rwanda had to be exclusively Tutsi. *« The latter (administration) had to be composed of Batutsi only, in consultation with the Mwami »* (Rumiya, 1992).

Bishop Leon Classe, known to have been influential in the Catholic Church leadership for many years and to have inspired the Belgian colonial administration to set up a “Tutsi monopoly” in the distribution of power after the 1926-1931 administrative re-organization (Rutayisire, 1987; Rutembesa, 1984:214; Rumiya, 1992), made this comment in 1921: *“They (Tutsi) have perfect self-control, they have a sense of leadership and real political tact.”*(Republic of Rwanda. The Senate, 2006:25).

Ten years later, Pierre Ryckmans, then Governor of Ruanda-Urundi wrote the following: *“The Batutsi were made for ruling, their very imposing bearing gives them considerable prestige over inferior races around them... It is not surprising that the poor Bahutu, less cunning, simpler, more spontaneous and more trusting, were enslaved without trying anything like revolt.”*(Ryckmans, 1931; Republic of Rwanda. The senate, 2006).

In his monumental book *Caput Nili*, Kandt makes the following description of the “oppression” of the majority Hutu by Tutsi minority:

“The Wahutu have a strange behavior. In the presence of their masters, they look serious and reserved and dodge the questions. But when we are alone with them, they tell us almost whatever we want to know, and even what I would not like to know, because I am helpless before their requests and difficulties, when they complain of the oppression they have to suffer and their total deprivation of any right. Many times I told them to get by themselves, I even made fun of them a little bit, saying that them, who are a hundred times many than Watussi, only know to groan and complain like women.” (Lugan, 1980).

On the footsteps of explorers, missionaries and colonial administrators, a group of researchers working with IRSAC (Institut de Recherche Scientifique en Afrique Centrale) played a key role in systematizing this particular view about the relationships between Tutsi and Hutu, copying the feudal model of medieval Europe. The Tutsi were globally presented as “lords” and “oppressors”, while Hutu were seen as “enslaved” and “oppressed” peasants (D’Hertefeldt, 1954; Republic of Rwanda. The Senate, 2006:26). The views of these researchers, including Jean Jacques Maquet, Jean R. Hubert, Marcel D’Hertefeldt and Jean Hiernaux influenced greatly the subsequent teaching, writing and learning of the Rwandan history (IRDP, 2008:20).

The three theses of the Hamitic hypothesis set a precedent in the perception of the so called “ethnic groups” and their social and political relationships, by educated Rwandan elites (Republic of Rwanda. Parliament: The Senate, 2006: 34-41). These groups are perceived as different races coming from different places; Tutsi as a minority, strangers, rulers and oppressors, while Hutu are described as the majority, real Rwandans, dominated and oppressed. Rwandan elites from both groups (Hutu and Tutsi) adopted and relayed those clichés unquestioned, but more specifically, they made a political use of them which turned pernicious.

Reacting to the Hutu claims and referring to those clichés, a letter from 12 “senior attendants at the King’s Court” (Bagaragu b’ibwami Bakuru) issued in Nyanza on May 17, 1958 stated this: *“... one may wonder how the Bahutu now claim their rights to the sharing of the common heritage. The ones who claim the sharing of a common heritage are those who have links of kinship between them. Now, the relations between us (Batutsi) and them (Bahutu) have always been based on serfdom; so there is no foundation of brotherhood between them and us....History tells us that Ruganzu killed many “Bahinza” (small kings). He and others of our kings killed Bahinza and conquered the countries of Bahutu of whom those Bahinza were kings.... So, if our kings have conquered the countries of Bahutu killing their small kings, and have then subjugated the Bahutu, how come the latter pretend now to be our brothers?”* (Nkundabagenzi, 1961: 35-36).

There is a continuing debate about how representative of the whole Tutsi group this position was, or even to which extent this position was shared by King Mutara III Rudahigwa and other leaders within his council (Conseil Supérieur du Pays). Some consider this position as the royal court’s viewpoint and

the viewpoint of the Tutsi in general (Nkundabagenzi, 1961). Others consider the 12 senior attendants as very marginal to represent the king's view, let alone the Tutsi group as a whole. Whatever the outcome of the debate, the most important thing to notice is how those members of the old Tutsi elite adhered to the clichés of the Hamitic hypothesis, namely one of different races, Tutsi as strangers (late comers), conquerors, rulers and oppressors; all of them strengthening an attitude of hostility between the two groups. History did not grant these senior attendants a dominant political position. So, we cannot predict how their ideology would have evolved. On the other hand, Hutu leaders acceded to power and transformed the same colonial racism into an aggressive and violent national racism (Mugesera, 2003).

Hutu supremacy ideology as core component of genocide ideology

Hutu supremacy ideology can be identified as the core component or even synonymous with genocide ideology, with negationism/denial as its essential complement. The Hamitic hypothesis is more an ideology of social stratification (of classes or "races" according to the colonial literature) for purposes of political domination, with inequality in access to fundamental rights and distribution of privileges, but without a hatred agenda targeting the extermination of a particular group, as later manifested by the Hutu supremacy ideology.

The Hutu supremacy ideology operates on a tri-dimensional register. The first is to delegitimize the Tutsi and legitimize the Hutu with regard to power and citizenship, on grounds of numbers (majority - minority) and time (and way) of occupation of the land (owners- new comers; cutting forest-grazing). The second register is to seek moral justification of the fight for power, using skillful but unfair interpretation of the values of justice (removal of "Tutsi oppression") and democracy (replacement of "Tutsi minority rule" by "Hutu majority rule"). The third register is to develop hate propaganda and other strategies to mobilize first the Hutu community, but also other allies; the guarantee for the control of power being the extermination of the Tutsi group as a last resort. Below are the three theses of the Hutu supremacy ideology:

1. "Hutu are the majority, and real owners of Rwanda; they deserve to rule".

This is the core thesis of the Hutu supremacy ideology. Building on the corresponding assertions of the Hamitic hypothesis on the occupation of the national territory by different groups, it dismisses Tutsi as a small minority who came late to Rwanda and usurped power by cunning. Although the Batwa are considered to be the indigenous people of Rwanda by the same colonial literature, they do not secure the corresponding importance within the Hutu supremacy ideology which considers Hutu as the real owners of Rwanda.

In an article titled "Umusozo w'ikibazo : Muhutu-Mututsi mu Rwanda" (the end of the Hutu-Tutsi problem in Rwanda) published in 1959 through an APROSOMA pamphlet, a militant of that party thought to be Joseph Gitera himself, the founder of the party stated: "*Sons of Gahutu, we are the ones who created Rwanda, cutting the forest. We are the real people of Rwanda.*³ *Our weapons are the hoe and the machete, the very weapons we shall use to defeat the Inyanga-Rwanda*" (those who hate Rwanda; meaning Tutsi in this context).⁴ In another statement, Gitera compares Hutu to grasshoppers in order to stress their numerical importance: "*At Gatutsi's, they swore an important oath. ...They swore that Aprosuma will be defeated; that Gitera and his small group of followers (nevertheless, he is said to be the king of Bahutu, and as a rule, Hutu are as numerous as grasshoppers) will be hunted until they are killed.*"⁵

In another writing meant for King Kigeli V Ndahindurwa and defeated UNAR leaders after their exile, Gitera asserts again the exclusive ownership of Rwanda by the Hutu on a jubilant tone of triumph: *“You Kigeri, and the Lunari of yours, it is long time you have not got news of what happens here, and you can’t be blamed for misrepresenting it: ‘the one who has spent the night outside home ignores what is inside.’ **This is our new Rwanda, we, the Bahutu, owners of Rwanda**; this is the way it is and the way it is structured: 1/ it has a king who is not a child, he is a protector, not a scarecrow. He is the one who is not inspired to bravery by Urwagwa (local beer from fermented banana juice). The one is Yosefu Habyarimana Gitera, the King of Bahutu...2/ His immediate collaborator is Kayibanda Gregori, the leader of Parmehutu, the hand of God in Rwanda. 3/ Munyangaju Aloisi from the Babunda of Save in Bwanamukari, is the faithful and tireless messenger of Gitera and Kayibanda, the two leaders of the party of the Bahutu and the humble people (Abagufi) in Rwanda. Our new Rwanda, we, the Bahutu, have strength all over Rwanda; its chiefs of communes are 229 with their councils. Its followers are countless. And all of those are Hutu exclusively”* (Gitera, 1960).

In Rwandan history, Gitera is generally depicted as an extravagant fellow and a versatile politician. So, critics may consider insufficient the references made to such an individual to illustrate this first thesis of the Hutu supremacy ideology. But many other personalities made similar statements. This indicates how persistent this thesis is. In a joint political rally of Parmehutu and Aprosoma at Butare (former Astrida) in September 1959, Kayibanda declared this: *“Our movement aims at the **Hutu group, outraged, humiliated and despised by the Tutsi invader**. If we want to be of service to him, let’s avoid confusing him with a play on words....Many are those who ask themselves what Aprosoma means. They reply to them that these are “the enemies of the King”, that it is “a monster which is going to eat up the Batutsi” [...] we must enlighten the masses, **we are there to give back the country to its owners; it is the country of Bahutu** (gusubiza igihugu bene cyo; n’icy’Abahutu). The humble mututsi came with the grand. **By who was the forest cleared? By Gahutu**. So what!”*⁶

Makuza Anastase, former foreign minister in the Kayibanda regime made a comparable statement on a Belgian television in an attempt to justify the 1973 anti-tutsi pogrom. After a long explanation aimed at downplaying the extent and responsibilities of the massacres, he resorted to history to reinvent for the regime a legitimacy totally lost in the killing of its own citizens. He went on comparing the 1959 “Hutu revolution” to the French revolution of 1789 describing Tutsi as “lords” and Hutu as “vassals”. And he concluded his long interview on this revealing note: *“**Hutu represent 85% of the population; they are the real people** (le véritable peuple). They cannot be subjugated by a minority of 14%.”*

The notorious « Hutu manifesto » (le Manifeste des Bahutu) was also explicit in opposing the « sons of the people » (les fils du peuple, meaning sons of Hutu), to the « Tutsi youth » (jeunesse Mututsi) ; implying that the Hutu were exclusively the people of Rwanda. The manifesto makes that distinction in one of its claims for Hutu emancipation: *« That education however must be as cheap as possible to allow the **sons of the people** to have access to it. We observe that the rare installations of craftsman’s trade education seem to be designed to receive the excess of the **Tutsi youth** who did not secure places or are not qualified to enter secondary education* (Manifeste des Bahutu, 1957).⁷

Another document known as “la lettre de Rwesero” is also illustrative of that ideology. According to various testimonies, the document was signed in 1972 by 33 extremist catholic Hutu priests on the instigation of André Perraudin, the Swiss bishop who played a notorious role in the 1959 Hutu “revolution”. The document aimed at destroying a newly created association regrouping all Rwandan priests, called Union du Clergé Rwandais. Perraudin rightly feared that the new association could oppose

him and work to reduce the influence of European missionaries which was still dominant in Rwanda since colonial time. So, he inspired a meeting held in Rwesero (Byumba), and regrouping Hutu extremist priests from Ruhengeri and Gitarama mainly, who produced a particularly violent document intended for all Rwandan bishops. The letter denounced the new association as “Tutsi dominated”, as was the whole clergy of Rwanda according to their views. It also denounced the growing number of Tutsi in seminaries, public schools and civil service; and warned that a new revolution was necessary to restore the rights of the Hutu conquered in 1959 and now in jeopardy.

The document particularly recommended the bishops to intently deploy Hutu priests in Nyakibanda major seminary, in order to facilitate the recruitment and smooth training of **Hutu seminarians**, and therefore, reduce the predominance of Tutsi in the church. *“There should be need to systematically favor more the recruitment (callings) of children of the Hutu majority people in order to decrease the predominance in the church, of sons, grandsons and kin of Tutsi, a minority within the people. This is simple social justice and distributive justice of which the church must show the example, whatever the cost.* And in its conclusion, the document threatens: *“We represent 90% of the Rwandan population, and that is our power....Frankly speaking, what should happen to the church of Rwanda, if a second revolution occurred”?* Indeed, the anti-Tutsi pogrom of 1973 erupted some months later, and the targets were mainly educated Tutsi in schools, University, working places; and Tutsi priests and seminarians were not spared.⁸

Under the Kayibanda regime, the triumphalism of Hutu supremacy ideology legitimizing the rule of Hutu as majority and real owners of Rwanda was instilled deep in the popular imagination through popular songs regularly broadcast on Radio Rwanda. A special choir totally devoted to the diffusion of Parmehutu ideology was created in Gitarama in the pure style of the famous catholic Gregorian music. Named “Abanyuramatwi” (those who please the ears), the choir produced numerous melodious but poisonous songs. One of them titled “Turatsinze” (we have defeated them) celebrated the victory of Parmehutu in these terms:

“Gahutu aho uri hose :	Gahutu, wherever you are
Cyo vuza impundu :	Be delighted
Impaka zirashize:	The quarrel is over
Rwanda ibonye beneyo:	Rwanda has retrieved its legitimate owners
Gahutu ganza nta mpaka:	Gahutu, triumph without dispute
Ganza, Ganza, Gahutu!	Triumph, triumph, Gahutu
Rwanda ni iyawe:	Rwanda belongs to you
Ganza Repbulika:	Triumph Republic
Na Perezida wayo:	And its president
Mu myaka yose amagana:	For centuries to come
Turatsinze ga ye!	We have won then!
Pe!pe! turatsinze”:	Truly, Truly, we have won. (IRDP, 2006). ⁹

Observers have often been misled on the Habyarimana regime, considering it moderate towards Tutsi, compared to the Kayibanda regime. The truth is that he continued in the ideological footsteps of his predecessor, Kayibanda. His regime was also notorious in systematizing the discrimination against the Tutsi in different spheres of national life including education, civil service, army, gendarmerie, etc.... The infamous policy of “équilibre ethnique et régionale” (ethnic and regional balance) imposing especially quotas of Tutsi not to be exceeded in schools and employment was implemented not only in

public institutions, but also in private companies and even in international organizations (Mugesera, 2004).

Habyarimana “second republic” inaugurated a relatively peaceful era for the Tutsi of inside the boundaries, with a particularly well sounding slogan of “developmental ideology” articulated by the new dominant political party, the MRND (Mouvement Révolutionnaire National pour le Développement) (Musanganya, 2005). But this was mere appearance. The real nature of the new regime was ideologically the same as Kayibanda’s. Tutsi were marginalized and continued to endure violence and oppression (Mugesera, 2004), and Habyarimana himself stated allegiance of his regime to the Hutu supremacy ideology.

In a statement delivered on the occasion of the 16th anniversary of independence in 1978, Habyarimana expressed his strong commitment to the 1959 revolution: *“the greatest moment of the History of this country which touches and will never cease to touch the hearts of the daughters and sons of Rwanda is the 1959 Revolution,”* (Présidence de la République, 1982). It is therefore clear that the Parmehutu ideology was still dominant even under the “second Republic”.

In another statement two years before, during a session of questions and answers with the population in provinces, Habyarimana had declared the following:

“With regard to that question of Hutu and Tutsi, we find it in other prefectures as well. When we explore the history of Rwanda, we find that Tutsi call themselves Ibimanuka (coming from Heaven)[...]. Those Tutsi who provoke Hutu seem to ignore that if violence comes back, they will be the ones to bear the cost. Once again, the Hutu are the majority, the power belongs to them” (Habyarimana, 1976). The last sentence of Habyarimana’s statement constitutes precisely the motto of the Hutu supremacy ideology which is: “Hutu are the majority; so, Hutu must rule!” The other part of the statement is simply an incitement to violence against the Tutsi made by the highest state official, who recognizes violence as a usual practice!

During the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi, Hutu militia were fond of remaking religious popular songs and adapting them to the dominant ideology. The sense of Hutu supremacy was so much developed that it could no longer fit in the limited space of the Rwandan territory. It symbolically envisioned covering the whole world. It is in this line that a chorus of a renowned Pentecostal song was transformed to express the ambitions of a worldwide “panhutist” plan. The Pentecostal song plays: **“Iyi si n’ibiyirimo byose, ni ibyawwe Yesu”**: “This world and whatever exists in it, are yours, Jesus.” The genocide militia, after orgies of killings, rapes and lootings could triumphantly sing their following remix version: **“Iyi si n’ibiyirimo byose, ni ibya Abahutu”**: “This world and whatever exists in it, belong to the Hutu.”

The Hutu supremacy ideology considering the Hutu as the exclusive people of Rwanda is also widely illustrated in various post genocide documents and statements where bearers of that ideology express their anger and denounce their overthrow as an injustice, and the rise of RPF to power as a mere usurpation by strangers. Bagosora Théoneste, the mastermind of the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi could state this in an apologetic pamphlet published in Yaoundé, Cameroun in 1995, slightly before his arrest by the ICTR (International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda):

“So, the RPF had managed to attract the sympathy of the international community which had let itself be manipulated and abused by its propaganda. The Tutsi, being the masters of lie, have even started the

*campaign to compare themselves to the Jewish people in order to secure the sympathy of its powerful lobby all over the world. The international community stands a good chance of being once again misled by these inveterate liars in accepting this totally erroneous information. The Jews, remember, at the second destruction of their city Jerusalem in 70 by Titus Flavius Sabinus Vespasianus, were forced to flee once again their motherland. More or less two thousand years later, they had still the right to go back to their homeland in liberating it from its different invaders, whereas **the Tutsi have never had a country of their own to make up a people. There have never been a Tutsi people neither in Rwanda, nor in Burundi, or anywhere else.** There have simply been Tutsi who have been naturalized as they progressively arrived in Rwanda as well as in Burundi.*

*The comparison between Jews and Tutsi being excluded as people, then remains the possibility to resort to the link of kinship which is said to exist between them. In that latter hypothesis, nothing could therefore be asserted before proving if Tutsi are really the descendants of the queen of Sheba or not. Nevertheless, whatever the response to that question, **Tutsi are and will remain Nilotic migrants naturalized either as Rwandans, Burundians, Zairians, Ugandans or Tanzanians** who should rather favor a policy of peaceful coexistence with the people who welcomed them and moderate their behavior, proud and arrogant, prone to impose their supremacy in the Great Lakes region.... On the other hand, the Hutu people invaded since the 1st October 1990 and chased away from its country by those Tutsi with the support of their Hima cousin Yoweri Museveni, has the right, in the same way as the Jewish people, to go back to its motherland. And the day will come. It is a matter of time which, in any case, will be shorter than what has been endured by the Jewish people.”*

It is amazing to note the absence of a guilty conscience in this statement of the planner and executioner of the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi. We rather see a pedantic criminal expressing indignation for what he considers an injustice against the “Hutu people”. He totally denies citizenship to Tutsi whom he considers perpetual migrants; and this conviction is deep rooted in the theses of the Hamitic hypothesis seen above, especially the second of the three forerunner theses of the genocide ideology. This thesis states that: “Tutsi are strangers and late comers in Rwanda. They conquered and subjugated the Hutu, real Rwandans.”

FDLR (Forces Démocratiques pour la Libération du Rwanda), the heir of the 1994 genocidal forces, displays the same belief. In a 2008 reportage from the DRC jungles, Chris McGreal of British newspaper *The Guardian* quotes a 13 years old child combattant who states the following: “*it is the Tutsis, those inyenzi, who are to blame for his predicament, he says, and he must kill them. He hates them all. **They stole his country, Rwanda - a Hutu country, he calls it - and he wants them dead.***” In the same reportage, the indoctrinated boy continues: “***The Tutsis stole our country and they are killing the Hutus or making them slaves. We have to kill them wherever they are. It is the only way to get our country back. When they are defeated I can go home.***”

2. Hutu rule is the only legitimate one: it serves justice and democracy.

Supporters of Hutu supremacy ideology have another set of ingredients to legitimize the Hutu rule, apart from being the “majority” and “real owners of Rwanda”. Justice is invoked to explain that Hutu have suffered an “age-old oppression by the Tutsi”. Consequently, a new rule by the Hutu means liberation from that oppression and restoration of justice. The other ingredient is democracy. Tutsi rule is considered a minority rule, therefore, anti-democratic. So, a new rule by the Hutu is naturally considered democratic, because it is supposed to represent the Hutu population which constitutes the majority.

The first Europeans who visited Rwanda, explorers as well as missionaries often mention the “subjugation, domination and oppression of the Hutu by the Tutsi” (Kandt, 1905; De Lacger, 1959,...). This view however turns fallacious, because as rightly noted by two respected historians, a Rwandan and a Belgian, “*that affirmation results, in fact, from an identification –constant in the writings of catholic missionaries of that time- of the Tutsi with the chiefs, two terms which are not synonymous*” (Mbonimana, 1995; Minnaert, 2006). This misleading confusion was later extended to the Hutu, the leaders of the “Hutu revolution” and the two successive republics being identified to the whole community, though none of them had ever been elected or mandated by a single Hutu!

But beyond the harmful confusion between the ruling elite and the whole Tutsi community, supporters of the Hutu supremacy ideology tend to attribute to the same elite and the whole Tutsi community, injustices and inequalities created by the very Europeans through colonial order and Catholic Church policies. In this regard, we can mention the “Tutsi monopoly” in education as well as in administration (Rutembesa, 1984), a policy promoted and shared both by missionaries and colonial leaders. Missionaries also introduced forced labor using local Tutsi chiefs to recruit manpower to build new churches. Colonial masters also imposed new taxes and labor for the advancement of the colony, but most importantly, for metropolitan interests. The various demands and required labor were too heavy and too oppressive that analysts say it was unprecedented in Rwandan history (Rumiya, 1992).

But strange enough, the responsibilities of all those odds fell on the Tutsi elite, and by extension, to the whole Tutsi community. An excerpt of a pamphlet published in 1991 by the foreign affairs ministry under Habyarimana regime sums up this historical misunderstanding: “*The majority of the Rwandan population oppressed by a Tutsi minority which held the power, expressed itself on the 25th of September 1961, by way of polls, against the feudal – monarchic regime, under which the masses had suffered, four centuries long, of every kind of injustices*” (République Rwandaise. Livre Blanc, 1991). It is also important to note that for propaganda purposes, the so called injustices and oppression by the Tutsi have often been exaggerated. The Ubugabuka system has been misrepresented and identified with the European middle age feudalism (IRDP,2006). Some atrocities attributed to the Tutsi elite are also pure imagination meant for raising the hatred of Hutu against the Tutsi (Lizinde, 1979:51-52).

Towards the 1959 « revolution », the highest representatives of the colonial and missionary orders in Rwanda also joined the critics to denounce the Tutsi monopoly and oppression - a move that smells of irony and hypocrisy when we consider the responsibility of their respective institutions in developing inequalities and oppression! Jean Paul Harroy, then Vice-governor General of Congo Belge and governor of Ruanda-Urundi declared this: « **But there is a real problem, in this country of inequalities of conditions, to which it is necessary to bring solutions. There is a problem of generalized poverty which affects masses which are numerically more important in the population, with, in those economically weak masses, a convention which seems to increase every year, of political, social and economic oppression, from a number of representatives of their local leaders....But much modesty, badly used, can harm, the fact is undeniable that today- I insist, today- some people who call themselves Tutsi, who are Tutsi, constitute in enormous majority the leading groups of the country, possess in proportionally enormous majority the wealth in real estate and non fixed assets of this territory** » (Kagame, 1975).

André Perraudin, archbishop of Kabgayi and then the highest representative of the catholic church in the country¹⁰, published in February 1959 the notorious « mandement de carême », ironically titled « super omnia, caritas » (above all, Love) ! In this episcopal document meant for the faithful during Lent period,

the bishop said : « **In our Ruanda, differences and social inequalities are for the most part related to differences of race, in the sense that wealth, on one hand, and the political power and even judicial on the other hand, are in reality in considerable proportion in the hands of one single race** » (Perraudin, 1959).

These statements were carefully prepared and made in a context of preparation and support to the 1959 « Hutu revolution ». Another missionary who for a long time played the role of ideologist of the White Fathers congregation, -the missionary organization active in Rwanda- tried to justify and theorize the political involvement of his organization soon after the « Hutu revolution ». The themes of liberation, justice and democracy are a leitmotiv of his statements, along with cynicism and hatred for the Tutsi. After the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi, he was still jubilant about his involvement in the « liberation » of the Hutu in the sixties, without the least trace of repentance.

«For us, History started in 1959. Whatever existed before was the culture of the Tutsis. The revolt of the Hutus, I lived through it in a painful way, because there were corpses. But deep inside, I was happy. Something historical was happening: the liberation of a people. I still remember the death of the Mwami : I communicated the news to my students of the college, and I told them that the following day, we were going to celebrate a mass of requiem. But I added that in fact, it is a Te Deum that we had to sing....I buried the first Tutsi chiefs in Gitarama. The Hutu stamped their feet with machetes and shouted: «They must go back in Abyssinia ». They were not angry with us for burying those people, they were only telling us: « Father, come back tomorrow, we will have once more » (Aelvoet, 1994).

After the 1959 « revolution », he published a long article in the White Fathers' magazine *Vivante Afrique*, where he describes the events as a liberation from injustices and a democratic storm. « ... *because the three races, for a short time, have parted, in the blood and the smoke of burning huts... Indeed, there were too much injustices; there was-which is more serious- an unjust system to which the social doctrine of the church could not subscribe. ... and when, on Sunday 1st November, one Hutu sub-chief is beaten by young Batutsi, it is the revolt which breaks out. A tremendous awareness of those vassals, « at the mercy of ruthless lords » (taillables et corvéables à merci), chases out of their lands the Batutsi who reigned over them for centuries....Indeed, many had not understood that historical trends, you never stop them, that the democratic pressure sweeps away all those who cling to expired privileges* » (Aelvoet, 1961).

Legitimizing the Hutu rule as naturally just and democratic goes hand in hand with an opposite attitude which consists of denouncing a different rule labeled as Tutsi for being undemocratic, a minority rule, lacking a social basis as a notorious Belgian academic turned political activist, Filip Reyntjens (Mugesera,2011) termed it. The post-genocide regime in Rwanda has generally confronted with that problem since its rise to power in 1994. International observers are always divided in a tense controversy about it. Labeled « Tutsi dominated » by various media and other activists, it is described by some as « undemocratic », « press freedom predator », « basic human rights violator », whereas others present it as an exceptional example of quick recovery, state building and good governance.¹¹ In a number of cases, the negative attitude about the new rule in Rwanda is no stranger to this particular thesis of the Hutu supremacy ideology, stating that “Hutu rule is the only legitimate: it serves justice and democracy”.

3. Automatic Hutu rule requires perpetual conflict between Hutu and Tutsi.

After the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi, some media and political leaders or analysts in the West put forward the explanation of “inter-ethnic conflict, more or less hereditary and traditional” (Gouteux, 2002:137). Yet Rwandan history shows that there had never been violence involving ethnic groups before the 1959 “Hutu revolution”. Local supporters of the Hutu supremacy ideology also participate in that distortion of history, putting forward age-old oppression and conflict between Tutsi and Hutu, and presenting or working to make that conflict endless.

This strategy of distorting history (hereditary, traditional and endless conflict between Hutu and Tutsi) serves two important aims. For foreigners involved in Rwandan matters, it helps to eclipse real issues and their own responsibilities in those issues. Belgium had to hide behind Hutu-Tutsi problem to deny the real problem which was the claim for independence. France also thought it comfortable to put forward “inter-ethnic, hereditary and traditional conflict” between Hutu and Tutsi to hide its involvement alongside the planners and perpetrators of the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi (Gouteux, 2002). Rwandans getting some benefits from the Hutu supremacy ideology also need a perpetual conflict between Hutu and Tutsi to maintain an advantageous position with regard to power.

In the first instance, they resort to the first forerunner thesis of genocide ideology in the Hamitic hypothesis stating that “Tutsi, Hutu and Twa are three different races coming from different places”. More specifically, they present Hutu and Tutsi as two irreconcilable ethnic groups, incapable of forming a nation together. The discourse of national common identity and citizenship is dismissed with vigor and suspicion (Lizinde, 1979). The only tolerated form of “unity and reconciliation” is a “peaceful coexistence” of Hutu and Tutsi where the latter accept to live in a condition of second rate citizenship. The preface of Lizinde’s book by one Spiridion Shyirambere states this: ***“They have sometimes tried, due to political reasons, to deny even the existence of different ethnic groups in Rwanda, to state that there exists only one ethnic group, one of the Banyarwanda. A short-lived attitude, because it is unrealistic....It is only when everyone will occupy his right place, without trying to cut down on other’s place, that the country will constitute a harmonious set.”***(Lizinde, 1979).¹²

At the beginning of the Hutu supremacy movement towards the end of fifties and early sixties, Hutu leaders were not yet confident enough to gain the control of political power. So, they were the zealous advocates of the partition of the country into a Hutuland and a Tutsiland, under the pretext that the two groups were unable to live peacefully together. In January 1960, eighteen (18) Parmehutu leaders signed a six page petition stating this: « ... *Considering the quasi irreconcilable difference between the tutsi and the hutu conceptions on social relationships and life, ...considering that the popular common sense recommends as a measure of durable pacification, the organization of Ruanda into hutu zone and tutsi zone, ... The respect of local ethnic composition of the population leading to a federative organization of the country, federating territories of hutu regime and the tutsi regime zone is an element of common sense that every interested politician, knowledgeable of the country’s realities, cannot blame the trusty’s administration for. We consider that that is precisely a sound base for an authentic democratization, a necessary condition to a sane and quick independence which will give to Ruanda the possibility of harmonious relations with Belgium as well as African Free states.* ”¹³

The second step consists of radicalizing the speech and developing hate propaganda, leading to, and accompanying in some cases, violence and genocide. At this stage, Hutu are called upon to express their solidarity, either to win elections, or defeat the Tutsi in case of confrontation because they outnumber

them. Gitera Joseph, the Aprosuma leader, made this recommendation (among many others) to the Hutu in 1959: *“wake up, unite, vote for your fellow hutu as leaders, your fellows whom you know as competent, and everywhere. Elections are scheduled for soon during these three remaining months of the year. Leave this place with that determination, without risk to regress; as for them, they don’t sleep, they don’t breathe, they don’t rest, they are just preparing for the same so as hutu are not weaned from them, which would mean their end. And you, you are just sleeping.... Don’t vote for them, even a hutu who associates with them, he is your enemy, get rid of him and don’t vote for him.”*¹⁴

The same Gitera calls for Hutu solidarity while praising the big number of the Hutu: *“you are a force which inspires fear, in Rwanda there are one and a half million hutu: so you understand who the majority are. If you use all that force, meaning if you unite, who, who will dare to oppose you?”*

Even in the case of a war waged by the tutsi, they can be exterminated with a corresponding number of hutu, but still hutu can survive in big numbers; it is just like pulling one hair from someone’s head. Also with no need to fight, there is a way of overcoming them and reduce them into serfdom; usually you know that it is thanks to you that they live: you cultivate for them, you fetch water for them, you transport their people on your back, you are their messengers, you feed them with your crops, you are servants in their homes; you are the ones who give weight to their bellies, but they make holes in yours, do you understand that? The one who supersedes you in food matters has not necessarily killed you. That power they exert, that force they use to kill you, if you unite it against them, can they survive? They did not have and they don’t have mercy on you, so, you also, don’t be stupid. Wake up, I hate you never changes into I love you.

In order for you to fulfil all that without difficulties, make a chain of fingers from here at Kanyaru to the Birunga in Mulera and to Mutara at Muvumba, from Kinyaga, at Kivuno, from Gisenyi, in Bugoyi to Bugesera, at Kagera, then join your objectives, join your hands and build Rwanda, greet each other joining your arms and crush Gatutsi so that he can’t breathe anymore....

*Let officials and leaders be ours from among us and our King Ndahindurwa be ours as he is now, a king who is not associated with old customs. Wherever you are, wherever you meet, wherever you sit, unite and talk about your sufferings, remind yourself the hatred of gatutsi and resolve to unite and keep, follow and respect the laws we are going to give to you so as you can be able to liberate yourself. May these laws be for us also laws of the new testament of the resurrection of bahutu starting from this year 1959 because they intend to subjugate us anew, though White people had taken us from far, in the old testament of Gatutsi.”*¹⁵

Hutu are even sensitized to go beyond their community to mobilize the so called “Bantus” and other potential allies to defend the “Hutu cause.” Article 9 of the Hutu ten commandments published by Kangura newspaper in December 1990 reads: *« the Bahutu, wherever they are, must be united, show solidarity and be preoccupied by the fate of their brothers Bahutu. The Bahutu inside and outside Rwanda must constantly look for friends and allies for the Hutu cause, starting with their bantou brothers. They must constantly thwart the tutsi propaganda. The Bahutu must be firm and vigilant against their common enemy, the tutsi.”* (Kangura, 1990).¹⁶ In the same vein, Parmehutu leaders formulated in January 1960, a congratulatory message for the upcoming independence of Congo, calling *“their Congolese kin to contribute to stopping the Tutsi colonialism which handicaps the development of bantu populations in Ruanda- Urundi.”* *“We conclude addressing our brotherly congratulations to our next of kin from the Kongo state that will get independence on June 30, 1960. We beg them to*

contribute to the lifting of feudal colonialism which handicaps the development of the bantu populations of Ruanda-Urundi. The liberation of the populations of Ruanda-Urundi from tutsi colonialism is a precondition to a real independence of that region of Africa."¹⁷

Tutsi are also accused of the same, in what some specialists have termed "accusations in mirror" (Braeckman, 1994). The most illustrative of that "accusation in mirror" is the document titled: "Le plan de la Colonization Tutsi au Kivu et région centrale de l'Afrique" - a forged document attributing to the Tutsi the intention to conquer the Congolese eastern province of Kivu (Rutazibwa, 1999: pp 148-149; Chrétien, 1997: p. 371; Gouteux, 2002: pp 156-157). There is also the "Hima-Tutsi empire" propaganda developed recently, since the launch of the liberation war by the RPF in 1990. The ultimate objective of this "accusation in mirror" seems to convince hesitant Hutu that Tutsi are exerting a similar, if not bigger threat; so, they'd better join the extremist camp to defend the group.

Hutu who associate themselves with Tutsi are despised, disapproved, threatened or even fought as enemies (Gitera, 1959; Kangura, 1990). The 4th of the 10 commandments of Kangura states: *"Every Muhutu must know that every Mututsi is dishonest in business. He only aims at the supremacy of his ethnic group. Consequently, every Muhutu who makes joint venture with the Batutsi in his businesses; who invests his money or the money of the state in an enterprise belonging to a Mututsi; who lends or borrows money from a Mututsi; who gives favors to the Batutsi in businesses (granting of importation licenses, bank loans, construction plots, public tenders is a traitor).*"¹⁸

Gitera also published numerous insults in his pamphlet "Ijwi rya rubanda rugufi", designed for those he called "Ibyihuturu" (Hutu who become Tutsi through social mobility), or Hutu who politically associated themselves with Tutsi. This is one of his texts: *"...do you see any Muhutu chief or judge? Even if you say that there are some, these are those instituted by white people, but who became ibyihuturu, went in the footsteps of their masters with whom they live, in order for them to get also some personal interests for a while. Those are not ours, let them go the same way as their tutsi masters, if we do not wake up and supersede them, take up our own political leadership in the country, the sole refusal will be of no help; we will never be able to get out of the situation where they will have put us, indeed, it will be a complete extermination.*"¹⁹

The hate propaganda is developed and channelled through various means of communication, the most notorious being the codified commandments. These include, in their respective order of publication, the 10 commandments of Gitera titled *"Amategeko ya buli muhutu wese ushaka kwibohora ku ngoyi y'ubuja bga bene gatutsi"* (Commandments of every muhutu willing to liberate himself from the bond of serfdom of the sons of Gatutsi) of September 27th, 1959²⁰; the manifesto of MAGRIVI (Mutuelle des Agriculteurs des Virunga) comprising more than 10 commandments titled *"Quelques elements pour la promotion du peuple Hutu du Zaire"* (Some elements for the promotion of Hutu people in Zaire) distributed underground since the eighties; *"les dix commandements"* (the ten commandments) included in an article titled "Appel à la conscience des Bahutu" in Kangura, n° 6, December 1990; and *"Amategeko dukwiye kugenderaho buri muni"* (commandments we ought to follow every day) of Musangamfura Sixbert published in the newspaper ISIBO, n° 6 of January 10th, 1991, as part of an article titled: *"Umututsi muri iki gihe cy'Inkotanyi"* (the Mututsi in this period of Inkotanyi).

Although it is probably the less known of the series by the wider public, the MAGRIVI manifesto is as virulent as the Kangura Ten Commandments. The document states this in its introduction: *« the awareness currently manifested by the Hutu group is a logical but belated result of the notorious*

unconsciousness and stupid tranquility it has often demonstrated, ... The confusion created and kept up for its own profit by the Tutsi ethnic group under the term « Rwandan » which unfortunately grouped and still groups unfortunately every person speaking the Kinyarwanda language and living in the Republic of Zaire has brought about a total misunderstanding of our Zairian compatriots with regard to the distinction between Hutu and Tutsi ethnic groups. The Muhutu is a muntu of the bantou race who has been colonized by the Tutsi invader towards the 13th-14th centuries. ”²¹

Among the objectives of MAGRIVI, the document mentions: « seek for the cohesion between bantou ethnic groups », and in its plan of action: « you don't ignore that tutsi introduce themselves to other ethnic groups as Banyarwanda of North-Kivu, originating from Masisi for some, and from Rutshuru for the others and state everywhere that they are our brothers; hence the name of « Rwandan » which never ceases to humiliate us before our compatriots and compromise our Zairian nationality... The Hutu should remind their Nande and Hunde neighbors of the division created by the Tutsi among different ethnic groups of North Kivu in order to explain their policy of hegemonism.... The compatriots informed beforehand on the whole situation (history of the hutu ethnic group, politics of tutsi) will then allow influential politicians to distinguish a hutu from a tutsi and will also be useful to steal from tutsi information related to their politics towards the ethnic groups in the North-Kivu and towards hutu in particular.... Hutu pupils will participate in one way or another in destabilizing the politics of the tutsi (ex. sabotage, tarnish the image of the tutsi before friends of other ethnic groups, etc...). ”²²

With this propaganda, every means of misinformation is used to make the Tutsi odious. Not only do they become collectively responsible for the historical domination of the “Tutsi elite”, but also they have to answer for imaginary crimes. This is well illustrated by the notorious story widely taught in schools after the “Hutu revolution”, with the aim of depicting the Tutsi as cruel and bloodthirsty. “*The regime was oppressive and bloody. For example, the queen mother Kanjogera, in order to stand up from her seat, used to lean on two swords stuck in the shoulders of two young Hutu.*”²³

At the ultimate stage, the hatred of Tutsi no longer needs justification. The Tutsi is considered “evil” by nature. Gitera is probably the pioneer and the most illustrative of this hate propaganda. In one of his numerous documents dated 27/9/1959, he states this: “*Bahutu, and humble people, know that our Rwanda was a nice country. Its epidemic is tutsiness (hamitism)*”. And his second commandment reads: “*Never swear again mentioning a Tutsi. The name mututsi deserves to be fully hated.*” And, as an introduction to his ten commandments, Gitera pronounced the infamous words implying the impossibility for Tutsi and Hutu to live together:

The cohabitation of a mututsi and a muhutu is a festering wound on the leg; a blood consuming worm in the body; pneumonia.”²⁴

Genocide ideology in post-genocide media

In a survey conducted in 2005 by the Senate on genocide ideology, 75% of the respondents show that the media (internet included), publications of the “Rwanda experts” as well as NGOs’ reports deny genocide or nurture its ideology (Republic of Rwanda. The senate, 2006: 106). We may expand the understanding of the concept of media as all the communication channels through which ideas (and images) are disseminated to the public.²⁵ So, beyond the traditional print (press) and audio-visual (radio,

television) media outlets, we can also look at social media, online publications, books, reports and press releases from various actors.

The way Rwanda and the Great Lakes region are depicted in post genocide world media continues to bear the stamp of genocide ideology. The efforts of the Rwandan leadership to reconcile and rebuild a nation of citizens instead of ethnic groups are jeopardized by those still convinced that “Hutu and Tutsi are two different races and irreconcilable groups.” Political and administrative leadership in post-genocide Rwanda is described as “Tutsi minority rule,” therefore illegitimate; and advocacy is indirectly made for the restoration of a “Hutu majority rule” even if it was responsible for the genocide against the Tutsi. Some media turn even to be true replica of the infamous RTLM radio (Radio Television Libre des Mille Collines) and Kangura newspaper of the 1994 anti-Tutsi genocide era, when it comes to instilling hatred and violence against the Tutsi.²⁶ The following paragraphs specifically comment on the two first aspects of the genocide ideology spread with subtlety by hardly suspected “respectable” media and scholars!

Perpetuating the divide between Hutu and Tutsi, Bantu and Nilotic!

Talking about the 2003 elections in Rwanda, the *Sunday Monitor* of Uganda finds that “Kagame won, a little too well.”²⁷ A week earlier, *The New Vision* had published an article titled “A look at Kagame’s landslide win,” where the authors wonder if it was possible for Kagame “to win with such an enormous 95.5% under current circumstances in Rwanda?”²⁸ Both articles set out to demonstrate that in a country with “a Hutu majority”, the victory of “a Tutsi from the minority” could only be a result of fraud. Such analysis that mistakes ethnic majority for ideology-based majority oils the machine of division.

During the second war in DRC, French newspaper *Le Monde*, discussing the intervention of Angola and Zimbabwe on Kabila’s side, talked of “Bantu alliance (the ethnic group that populated the entire half of Southern Africa) led against Tutsi Governments in power in Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi.”²⁹ The editorial of another French newspaper, *Le Figaro*, commented that “Museveni is trying to build a “Tutsiland” comprising all the Nilotic ethnic groups. That political union would integrate, besides Uganda and Rwanda, Kenya, Tanzania, Burundi and the eastern provinces of ex-Zaire.” And in conclusion, *Le Figaro* editorialist talked of a possible “call into question borders inherited from colonization with a sharing (which) is outlined between two zones: one for the Nilotics, the other for the Bantus.”³⁰ Instead of looking at the real causes of the conflict in DRC and different geopolitical motivations of the various state and non state actors³¹, these “respected” French newspapers prefer simplistic analysis based on “hereditary” and “perpetual” conflict between Hutu and Tutsi, Bantu and Nilotic (or Hamite)!

Delegitimizing post-genocide Rwandan leadership as “Tutsi dominated,” “minority rule.”

World media have accustomed us to the expression “Tutsi dominated” or “Tutsi minority regime” while describing the post-genocide leadership in Rwanda. Belgian academic turned political activist Professor Filip Reyntjens has probably been the most active in portraying and accrediting this view. As early as October 1994, he came out with the expression “narrowness of the political and social basis of the regime in Kigali” (étroitesse de la base politique et sociale du pouvoir en place à Kigali).³² He simply wanted to mean that the leadership was Tutsi and therefore, could not get the support of the “Hutu majority;”

something of “great concern” (profond pessimisme), according to the professor, with regard to the “stability of the country and the sub-region.”

The professor went further and started publishing lists (sorts of “who is who”) indicating who is Tutsi and who is Hutu in the leading political and administrative institutions in post-genocide Rwanda.³³ When it became evident that Hutu had greater proportion in a number of institutions like government, the professor coined a new expression: “Hutu for hire” (Hutu de service), meaning that the Hutu who participated in the new institutions were just puppets of the Tutsi, without real power! It is important to note here that the professor’s reasoning is exactly similar to that of the ten commandments of Kangura and Gitera for whom “*every Muhutu who associates himself with a Tutsi is a traitor,*” be it in politics, business or marriage.³⁴

Conclusion

In this presentation, I tried to explain what genocide ideology is, and demonstrate that it is real, despite sarcastic and cynical denial by some political and Human rights activists. It is still spread by world media and it represents a permanent threat to peace, security and stability in Rwanda and the whole Great Lakes region.

As Richard Johnson rightly notes, “*Germany’s good faith reckoning with the Holocaust is an exceptional case, and came after complete defeat by the Allies, rapid symbolic justice at the Nuremburg trials, significant “denazification” programs, the quasi-universal condemnation of Nazi ideology and Holocaust denial, the banning of Nazi or successor party activities and propaganda, the Marshall Plan, and decades of German soul-searching with regard to criminal, political, and moral responsibility.*

In contrast, while the Rwandan genocide leaders and followers have suffered major military defeats, first throughout Rwanda in summer 1994 and then in eastern Congo and northwest Rwanda in 1996-98, these defeats were not complete. ... thousands of perpetrators and supporters have benefitted from what amounts to a peculiar life-support system outside Rwanda: de facto safe havens in many parts of Africa, Europe and North America, and extensive (whether witting or unwitting, voluntary or involuntary) material, political and moral support from a range of UN agencies and Western officials, churches, NGOs, and intellectuals. ...

In this context, those Rwandan Hutu who continue to draw a permanent fault line between purported Hutu and Tutsi communities, to hold that this alleged fault line must define Rwandan politics, and to hope to return to power, have done none of the soul searching done by post-Holocaust Germans.”³⁵

So, genocidal forces in Rwanda may have almost been militarily defeated; but ideologically, not yet. Why? And what can be done?

Those are some of the questions I’d like to suggest for discussion.

Thank you!

¹ Published in Revue *Dialogue*, juillet 2013.

² The translation of quotations from French and Kinyarwanda to English in this presentation is my own.

³ We are the one who chose to put in bold the most significant parts of the quotations.

⁴ Ishyaka Iya Bahutu. c/o APROSOMA J.H. Gitera & Frères. Astrida B.P.99, (1959). “Umusozo w’ikibazo: Muhutu – Mututsi mu Rwanda.” (polycopied paper n°13 from the archives of Thomas Munyaneza; Kigali). The original text in Kinyarwanda is this one: “*Bene Gahutu, nitwe, twaremye Urwanda dutema ishyamba, tugize Urwanda. Intwano zacu n’isuka n’umuhoro, nizo tuzatsindisha INYANGA-RWANDA.* »

⁵ Joseph Habyarimana Gitera. Umuhutu. Umutura-Rwanda. (s.d). « Bahungu n’abakobga b’ishyaka ly’Abahutu. » (A reaction to a document he calls “ibarua y’Abatabazi b’u Rwanda”.) The original text in Kinyarwanda is as follows: “Imihigo yarakomeye kwa Gatutsi,... barahilira ... ko Aprosoma izatsindwa, nuko Gitera nutwe duke (nyamara ngo ni Umwami w’Abahutu, kandi ubundi Abahutu ni inzige!), bazabahiga mpaka kubica.”

⁶ Musangamfura Sixbert, *Le Parti MDR Parmehutu. Information et propagande, 1959-1969*, Mémoire de licence, Ruhengeri, 1987, p.70. Quoted in Jean Pierre Chrétien, *Le Défi de l’Ethnisme*, p.71. Also quoted in République du Rwanda, MINALOC, *Dénombrement des victimes du génocide*, rapport final, avril 2004, p.13.

⁷ The original text in French reads: “cet enseignement doit cependant être autant que possible à peu de frais pour permettre aux *filles du peuple* d’y accéder. Nous remarquons en effet que les quelques essais d’installations artisanales semblent destinés à recevoir le trop-plein de la *jeunesse mututsi* qui n’a pas de places ou capacités pour entrer dans le secondaire.»

⁸ A students organization created by a Belgian priest (le père Naveau), played a notorious role in these 1973 pogroms.

⁹ IRDP gives the Kinyarwanda text with a French translation between parentheses. The translation from Kinyarwanda to English in this work is proposed by the author.

¹⁰ There were only two catholic bishops in the country, André Perraudin and Aloys Bigirimwami of Nyundo, who was not of the same ideological board, and therefore, could not have much influence as a Rwandan bishop.

¹¹ See numerous reports from Human Rights Watch, Reporters without borders, etc... on one hand, and reports from the World Bank mainly, for the other side.

¹² The original in French reads: “*L’on a parfois essayé, à cause des mobiles politiques, de nier jusqu’à l’existence d’ethnies différentes au Rwanda, d’affirmer qu’il n’en existe qu’une seule, celle des Banyarwanda. Attitude éphémère parce qu’irréaliste. ...C’est dans la mesure où chacun occupera sa juste place, sans essayer de rogner sur celle d’autrui, que le pays constituera un ensemble harmonieux.*”

¹³ « ...*Considérant la différence quasi irréductible entre la conception tutsi et la conception hutu notamment sur les relations et la vie sociales, ... Considérant que le bon sens populaire préconisent (sic) comme mesure de pacification durable l’organisation du Ruanda par zone hutu et zone tutsi ; ... Le respect de la composition ethnique locale des populations allant jusqu’à donner au Pays une organisation fédérative, fédérant les TERRITOIRES de régime Hutu et la zone de régime tutsi est un élément de bon sens que tout politicien non intéressé et connaisseur du Pays ne peut reprocher à l’Administration Tutélaire. Nous estimons que c’est là une base (sic !) [base ?] solide à la démocratisation authentique (sic !) [authentique ?] condition nécessaire d’une Indépendance saine et rapide qui donnera au Ruanda la possibilité de relations harmonieuses avec la Belgique ainsi qu’avec les Etats libres d’Afrique.* » » (Prise de position du Mouvement de l’émancipation Hutu, Gitarama (Ruanda), le 30 janvier 1960 ; in Supplément à *Jya mbere* n° 5 du 3 janvier 1960).

¹⁴ “*Nimukanguke, nimushyire hamwe, mutore abategetsi banyu babahutu, banyu muzi babishoboye, kandi hose. Dore itora lili hafu muli aya mezi atatu asigaye yuyu mwaka. Muve hano mubyiyemeje ntagubira inyuma ; bo ntibaryama, ntibahumeka, ntibaruhuka, ibi nibyo baliho bategura ngo abahutu batabacuka bakaba baheze, naho mwebwe murasinziriyeye....Ntimuzabatore, n’umuhutu ubanye nabo, n’umwanzi wanyu, nimumwiceho ntimuzamutore.* » (Aprosoma – Parti social hutu- ishyaka rya Abahutu, Astrida, « Uko Abahutu bagomba kwica ku ngoyi ya abatutsi n’uko u Rwanda dushaka ko rumera muli iki gihe kiri imbere », in *Ijwi rya Rubanda rugufi*, 27/09/1959).

¹⁵ « *Muli inguvu iteye ubgoba, mu Rwanda hali abahutu imilyoni I n’ibihumbi nka amajana atanu : murumva lero abenshi abo alibo. Iyo nguvu yose muyikoresheje, n’ukuvuga mushyize hamwe ninde, ninde wabakandiraho ?*

Niyo haba intambara abatutsi bayiteje, bashira bagahwana n’umubare w’abahutu ungana n’uwabo ; aliko abahutu basigara benshi nanone ; mbese ni nko kukura (gukura ?) agasatsi kamwe ku mutwe w’umuntu. Mutalinze kandi kurwana, haliho uburyo bwo kubaneshya mukabahaka ; ubundi muzi ko alimwe mubagize murabahingira, murabavomera, murabahekera, murabatumikira, mubaha imyaka yanyu kubatunga, mukabakorera mungo zabo ; nimwe mubyibusha inda zabo, aliko izanyu barazitobora, aho murabyumva ; ugutanze kunda ntaba akwisha Ayo maboko yabo izo ngufu babicisha

mubibagirirye hamwe babaho, ntibababariye kandi ntibababarila namwe mwiba ibicucu, ni mukanguke, ndakwanze ntivamo ndagukunze.

« Kugira ngo mubigereho ibyo byose bitabaruhije, nimufatane agatoki kuva hano ku Kanyaru kugeza ku Birunga mu Mulera no mu Mutara ku Muvumba, ku Kinyaga, ku Kivuno, ku Gisenyi, mu Bugoyi kugera mu Bugesera, ku Kagera, maze muhuze imihigo, musabanye amaboko mwubake Urwanda, muhoberane muhombanye Gatutsi abure umwuka... Abakuru n'abategetsi babe abacu mu bacu N'Umwami wacu Ndahindurwa abe uwacu nkuko ubu ali Umwami udahuje n'imico ya kera. Aho muli hose, aho muhuriye hose, aho mwicaye hose, mushyire hamwe muganire akababaro kanyu, mwiyebutse, urwango rwa gatutsi muhigire gushyira hamwe no gukomeza, no gukurikiza no kubaha amategako tugiye kubaha ngo mushobore kwibohora. Azatubere natwe ay'ikiragano gishya cy'i izuka ly'abahutu guhera uyu mwaka 1959 kuko ubu baliko bashaka kutworeka kure bundi bushya, Abazungu badukuye kure mu kiragano cya kera cya Gatutsi. » (Aprosoma – Parti social hutu- ishyaka rya Abahutu, Astrida, « Uko Abahutu bagomba kwica ku ngoyi ya abatutsi n'uko u Rwanda dushaka ko rumera muli iki gihe kiri imbere », in *Ijwi rya Rubanda rugufi*, 27/09/1959).

¹⁶ “*les Bahutu, où qu'ils soient, doivent être unis, solidaires et préoccupés du sort de leurs frères Bahutu. Les Bahutu de l'intérieur et de l'extérieur du Rwanda doivent rechercher constamment des amis et des alliés pour la cause Hutu, à commencer par leurs frères bantous. Ils doivent constamment contrecarrer la propagande tutsi. Les Bahutu doivent être fermes et vigilants contre leur ennemi commun tutsi.*” (Kangura, n° 6, décembre 1990).

¹⁷ « *Nous terminons en adressant nos fraternelles félicitations à nos congénères de l'état du Kongo qui accèdent à l'indépendance le 30 juin 1960. Nous les conjurons de contribuer à la levée du colonialisme féodal qui handicape l'essor des populations bantu du Ruanda-Urundi. La libération des populations du Ruanda-Urundi du colonialisme tutsi est un préalable à une indépendance véritable de cette région de l'Afrique.* » (Prise de position du Mouvement de l'émancipation Hutu, Gitarama (Ruanda), le 30 janvier 1960 ; in *Supplément à Jya mbera* n° 5 du 3 janvier 1960).

¹⁸ “*Tout Muhutu doit savoir que tout Mututsi est malhonnête dans les affaires. Il ne vise que la suprématie de son ethnie. Par conséquent, est traître tout Muhutu: qui fait alliance avec les Batutsi dans ses affaires; qui investit son argent ou l'argent de l'Etat dans une entreprise d'un Mututsi; qui prête ou emprunte de l'argent à un Mututsi; qui accorde aux Batutsi des faveurs dans les affaires (l'octroi des licences d'importation, des prêts bancaires, des parcelles de construction, des marchés publics).*” (Kangura, n° 6, décembre 1990).

¹⁹ “*... hali shefu, juji muhutu muruzi, naho mwavuga ngo baliho n'abahawe na abazungu, aliko babaye ibyihutur, bakurikiza ba shebuja babana ngo babe ba Sumilinda nabo kabili ; abo s'abacu, bazajyane na bashebuja abatutsi, nitidakanguka ngo tubajye hejuru, dufate ubgacu butegezi mu gihugu ; guhakana gusa ntaho bizotugeza ; aho bazadushyira ntiduteze kuzahava, nako n'ukuzashirira kw'icumu.* » (Aprosoma – Parti social hutu- ishyaka rya Abahutu, Astrida, « Uko Abahutu bagomba kwica ku ngoyi ya abatutsi n'uko u Rwanda dushaka ko rumera muli iki gihe kiri imbere », in *Ijwi rya Rubanda rugufi*, 27/09/1959).

²⁰ Aprosoma-parti social muhutu-ishyaka ly'abahutu, “*Umunsi mukuru w'ibohorwa rya abahutu ku ngoyi yu ubuja bga Batutsi mu Rwanda*”, in *Ijwi rya rubanda rugufi*, 27/9/1959. From the personal archives of Thomas Munyaneza, Kigali.

²¹ “*... la prise de conscience dont se fait actuellement l'écho le groupe hutu est une résultante logique mais tardive de l'inconscience notoire et de la tranquillité béate dont il a souvent fait montre,... La confusion créée et entretenue à son profit par l'ethnie tutsi sous le vocable “Rwandais” qui groupait et groupe malheureusement encore toute personne parlant la langue Kinyarwanda habitant la République du Zaïre a entraîné une incompréhension totale de nos compatriotes zairois quant à la distinction des groupes ethniques hutu et tutsi. Le Muhutu est un muntu de la race bantoue qui a été colonisé par le conquérant tutsi vers le 13e-14e siècles*”.

²² ... « *rechercher la cohésion entre les ethnies bantoues* »... “*vous êtes sans ignorer que les tutsi se présentent auprès d'autres groupes ethniques comme des Banyarwanda du Nord-Kivu, originaires de Masisi pour les uns et de Rutshuru pour les autres et affirment partout qu'ils sont nos frères; d'où l'appellation “Rwandais” qui ne cesse de nous humilier auprès de nos compatriotes et compromettre notre nationalité zairoise.... Les Hutu devraient rappeler à leurs voisins Nande et Hunde de la division que les Tutsi ont créé parmi les différents groupes ethniques du Nord-Kivu pour pouvoir expliquer leur politique d'hégémonisme... Les compatriotes préalablement informés sur toute la situation (historique de l'ethnie hutu, politique des Tutsi) permettront ainsi aux politiques influents à différencier un hutu d'un tutsi et seront aussi utiles pour ravir aux tutsi des informations relatives à leur politique envers les groupes ethniques du Nord-Kivu et de hutu en particulier.... Les élèves hutu participeront d'une façon ou d'une autre pour la déstabilisation de la politique des tutsi (ex: sabotage, salir les tutsi auprès des amis d'autres groupes ethniques, etc...)*”. (Rutazibwa Privat, *Les Crises des Grands Lacs et la Question Tutsi*, pp 151-152).

²³ Les étudiants rwandais de l'université de Laval, "La vérité sur l'invasion des rebelles tutsi au Rwanda", Canada, 7 octobre 1990. Published in Kangura, n° 5, décembre 1990. Another version of the same story can be found in Lizinde Théoneste, op. cit. p 51-52.

²⁴ All these excerpts can be found in Ijwi rya rubanda rugufi, of 27/9/1959. The original texts in Kinyarwanda are the following: "ntuzigere kongera kwirahira umututsi. Izina mututsi ryuje ubgangwe"....

"bahutu namwe bagufi, nimumenye ngo Urwanda rwacu rwali igihugu cyiza, icyorezo cyarwo ni ubututsi (hamitisme)".
... « Umubano w'umututsi n'umuhutu : n'umufunzo ku kuguru n'umusundwe mu mubili, nu musonga mu rubavu ». Documents from the personal archives of Thomas Munyaneza, Kigali.

²⁵ <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/media.html>. Consulted on 08/07/2013.

²⁶ Congolese radio and television broadcast of 25/08/1998 with President L.D. Kabila urging Congolese to "crush the enemy, otherwise we will become slaves of the Tutsi;" or his advisor Abdoulaye Yerodia Ndombasi calling Congolese "to eradicate and completely crush that vermin." Radio La voix du Patriote broadcasting near Bukavu at the same period could denounce "those Tutsi killers who invaded our country. ... you know the malice of those enemies who pretend to be Zairians."

²⁷ *The Sunday Monitor*, 14/09/2003.

²⁸ *The New Vision*, 03/09/2003.

²⁹ *Le Monde*, 21/08/1998.

³⁰ *Le Figaro*, 24/08/1998.

³¹ See Rutazibwa P. (2013). "Contexte géopolitique de la région des grands lacs et spécificité des provinces de l'Est de la République Démocratique du Congo (RDC)". Presentation at a "training workshop of parliamentarians on threats to peace and sustainable development in the Great Lakes region: case of illegal armed groups." Organiser: AMANI Forum/Rwanda Chapter. Venue: Hotel Gorillas/Rubavu, 26-28 October 2012. Published in *La Nuit Rwandaise*, April 2013.

³² Reyntjens, Filip (1994). "Sujets d'inquiétude au Rwanda en octobre 1994", in *Le Messenger-Intumwa*, n° 47 of 31/12/1994 ; pp 10-12.

³³ See the yearly publication *Annuaire des Grands Lacs* led by Reyntjens himself at the university of Antwerp.

³⁴ See for example the 1st, 4th and 7th of the 10 commandments of Kangura, as well as the 4th of the 10 commandments of Gitera.

³⁵ Richard Johnson, *The Travesty of Human Rights Watch on Rwanda*, March 19, 2013.

References

Aelvoet, Walter (1961), « l'Eglise au Rwanda », in *Vivante Afrique*, n° 212, janvier-février 1961, pp 4 & 54.

Aelvoet, Walter (1994), Interview with *De Morgen* newspaper, 16 April 1994, quoted by Colette **Braeckman**, (1994), *Rwanda. Histoire d'un génocide*, Paris : Fayard, pp. 42.

Chrétien, Jean Pierre (sous la dir.), (1995). *Rwanda. Les médias du génocide*, Paris : Karthala.

Chris McGreal, 'We have to kill Tutsis wherever they are', [The Guardian](#), Friday 16 May 2008.

De Lacger, Louis (Chanoine), (1961), *Le Ruanda Ancien*. Kabgayi.

Fierens, M. (2009). *Le négationnisme du génocide des Tutsi au Rwanda*. Villeurbanne Cedex : Golias.

Gouteux, J.P., (2002). *La Nuit rwandaise. L'implication française dans le dernier génocide du siècle*. Paris: L'Esprit Frappeur.

Habyalimana, Yuvenali, (1976). *Ikiganiro Prezida wa Repubulika, Prezida-fondateri wa MRND yagiranye na ba Militantes na ba Militants bo muri za Prefegitura z'u Rwanda, 16 mata- 6 gicurasi 1976*, Kabgayi.

IRD. (2006). *Génocide des Tutsi du Rwanda: Causes, Exécution et Mémoire*. Kigali.

IRD. (2008). *Amateka n'Amakimbirane mu Rwanda: Impinduka mu mibereho na politike. 1946-1962. (Incamake y'ibyavuye mu bushakashatsi)*. Kigali.

Kagame, A. (1975). *Un Abrégé de l'Histoire du Rwanda de 1853 à 1972*. Butare.

Lizinde, T. M. (Major). (1979). *La Découverte de Kalinga ou la fin d'un Mythe. Contribution à l'histoire du Rwanda*. Kigali. pp27-28.

Lugan, Bernard. (1980). « Sources Ecrites pouvant servir à l'histoire du Rwanda (1863-1918) », in Université Nationale du Rwanda, *Etudes Rwandaises*, volume XIV, numéro spécial, Butare.

Mbonimana, Gamaliel (1995). "Ethnies et Eglise catholique", in *Cahiers Centre Saint-Dominique*, n°1, 8 août 1995, pp56-57.

-
- Minnaert, S.** (2006). *Premier voyage de Mgr Hirth au Rwanda*. Kigali.
- Mugesera, A.** (2004). *Imibereho y'abatutsi kuri Repubulika ya mbere n'iya kabiri (1959-1990)*. Kigali : les éditions rwandaises.
- Mugesera, Antoine** (2003). « Prépondérance de l'idéologie sur l'économie dans la crise identitaire », in Rutembesa F., Semujanga J., Shyaka A., *Rwanda. Identité et citoyenneté*. Butare : éditions de l'université nationale du Rwanda.
- Mugesera, Antoine** (2011). *Filip Reyntjens: du chercheur engagé au militant enragé*. A 48 pages text posted on October 21 on various social networks.
- Ntezimana, Emmanuel** (1987, juillet-septembre). « Histoire, culture et conscience nationale: le cas du Rwanda des origines à 1900. » *Etudes Rwandaises, vol.1 (4)*, pp. 462-497.
- Perraudin, A.** (1959). *Super Omnia, Caritas*. (Mandement de carême 1959). Kabgayi.
- Présidence de la République (1982). *Discours du Président Habyarimana: Discours et entretiens*. Kigali.
- Republic of Rwanda (The Senate)** (2006). *Rwanda. Genocide Ideology and Strategies for its Eradication*. Kigali.
- Repubulika y'u Rwanda, Inteko Ishinga amategeko** (2003). *Raporo ya komisiyo idasanzwe yashyiriweho gucukumbura ibibazo biri mw'ishyamba MDR.*
- Repubulika y'u Rwanda, Inteko Ishinga amategeko. Umutwe w'Abadepite** (2004). *Raporo ya komisiyo idasanzwe ishinze gucukumbura ubwicanyi bwabereye ku gikongoro n'ingengabitekerezo ya jenocide mu gihugu hose*. Kigali.
- Repubulika y'u Rwanda, Inteko Ishinga amategeko. Umutwe w'Abadepite** (2007). *Raporo ya komisiyo idasanzwe ishinze gucukumbura ikibazo cy'ingengabitekerezo ya jenocide ivugwa mu bigo by'amashuri*. Kigali.
- Richard Johnson** (2013). *The Travesty of Human Rights Watch on Rwanda*. A 53 page PDF text shared online in March 2013.
- Rumiya, Jean** (1992). *Le Rwanda sous le Régime du Mandat Belge (1916-1931)*. Paris : L'Harmattan. (a published version of his doctoral thesis of 1983 titled : *De la Royauté au Sultanat Belge du Rwanda, 1916-1931*).
- Rutayisire, P.** (1987). *La Christianisation du Rwanda*. Fribourg : éditions universitaires.
- Rutazibwa, Privat** (2012). *"Genocide Ideology" in Rwanda: a Typology*. A dissertation submitted for a Master's Degree of Arts in Genocide Studies and Prevention. National University of Rwanda.
- Rutazibwa, Privat** (Ed.). (1999). *Les Crises des Grands Lacs et la Question Tutsi. Réflexions sur l'idéologie du génocide dans la sous-région*. Kigali: éditions du CRID.
- Rutembesa, Faustin** (1984). «La réorganisation administrative et ses conséquences au Rwanda entre 1926 et 1931 », in *Cahiers d'Histoire, n°4 Numéro 2 C.H., Histoire rurale, Université du Burundi et Centre de Recherches africaines, Université de Paris I., Bujumbura*.
- Thompson, A.** (edited by), (2007). *The media and the Rwanda Genocide*, London, Pluto Press.