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The Role of Imperialism in the Rwanda Genocide

During the 1994 genocide in Rwanda more than 800,000 people were slaughtered. The events starting in April of 1994 were simplistically characterized by the world media as yet another episode in the “ages-old tribal warfare” of the Hutu and Tutsi people. In response to the news coming out of Rwanda the international community did nearly nothing for the people of Rwanda - it did absolutely nothing when the Interahamwe and the Rwandan Army Forces were at their most deadly. The impression given out to the world through the media was one of crazed Rwandan tribes-people running around with machetes killing each other again. Many thought the events in Rwanda to be more of what they already knew all about: the Africa problem.

The so called “ages-old tribal warfare” in Rwanda was genocide, of this we may have no doubt. It was a highly organized, well thought out effort to eliminate the Tutsi people of Rwanda. What we must doubt, or at least question, is this story of ages old tribal warfare put forward both within and outside the borders of Rwanda. The explanations available for the use of terms such as “civil strife,” “ages old tribal warfare,” “ethnic warfare,” even “ethnic cleansing” instead of genocide are different for those living within the context of Rwanda and those viewing the events at a distance. But in both cases I will argue that imperialism played an important role.

In this essay I will look at the question of what role Imperialism played in the Rwandan genocide from two perspectives. First I will examine the influence of the ideologies and policies of the German and Belgian colonizers on the Rwandan people. I will argue that the colonial presence served to reify already existing cultural-ethnic patterns within Rwanda in such a way that the people of Rwanda changed the way they viewed each other. Those changes are at the root of the conflicts between Hutu and Tutsi people. Then I will turn to show how the ideology of Imperialism continues to influence those outside of the African continent. Here I will argue that an ideology of a racist nature informs the policies of the most powerful nations of the world. Imperialism and colonialism are driven and justified by racist ideologies. Those ideologies are still present in the Africa policies and practices of the international community. Rwanda serves here as a case study of this claim. Ultimately I will argue that the Rwandan genocide was fueled by a set of ideas which are traceable in part to the German and Belgian colonial presence in Rwanda and Burundi. While it is not my intention to locate blame only on the influences of imperialism and colonialism, it is my intention that the power of this legacy be exposed for what it is: a racist ideology born of the European-North American love of hierarchical categorization of the worth of peoples that continues to do irreparable harm.

Before launching into the body of the essay a distinction in terms must be made. In
the literature on post-colonial Africa it is common to see the use of the terms "Imperialism" and "Colonialism" as interchangeable. In this essay I intend to distinguish between the two terms for practical purposes. When I refer to Imperialism I mean to indicate the practice and attitudes of one nation or metropolitan center that dominates or rules a territory beyond its borders by some mechanism of force or coercion. For example, the establishment of colonies and protectorates in order to dominate the economy and people of a place are both mechanisms of imperial force or coercion. Colonialism will indicate the practice of settling permanently a conquered territory gotten through the practice of Imperialism. 

Setting the Historical Record Straight

While the claim that the Rwandan genocide was simply another chapter in the ages old tribal warfare between the Hutu and Tutsi is a statement based in ignorance of the facts, it is true that the Hutu and Tutsi have been fighting along lines of ethnic identity since the late 1950's. The first clear instance of this occurred 1 November, 1959 when a prominent Hutu political activist was beaten nearly to death by a group of Tutsi activists. It was said that he died immediately after the beating, but this was not true. News of his death spread quickly setting off a wave of violence against Tutsi. This wave, known as the muyaga was wholeheartedly supported by the Belgians, who sent in Col. Guy Logiest from the Congo to supervise the troubles. His attitude was clearly displayed by the manner in which his troops stood idly by as Tutsi homes were looted and then burned by Hutu extremist activists. Some 25 years later Logiest is quoted as saying "the time was crucial for Rwanda. Its people needed support and protection." One must ask, as Philip Gourevitch has, "Were Tutsis not Rwandan People?" It turns out that many believe the Tutsi are not Rwandan. This is a point that will prove important to understanding the conflicts between the Hutu and Tutsi for the last 40 years.

The violence of 1959 was followed by a Belgian supported Hutu coup over the formerly Belgian supported Tutsi monarchy. In the wake of the overthrow thousands (some say more than 100,000) of Tutsi men were killed and countless more Tutsi women, children, and elders were driven out of Rwanda into neighboring nations (Burundi, Uganda, and Democratic Republic of the Congo, formerly Zaire). These eruptions of violence were widely regarded as inevitable - the tensions had been in place between Hutu and Tutsi people throughout the Belgian colonial period. The Hutu, as a group, were oppressed by the colonial regimes. The Tutsi were a tool of both the German and Belgian colonial administrations. Moreover, it was true then, as it is now, that the tensions were not restricted to Rwanda. The salient point is that it is true that the Hutu and Tutsi have been fighting for decades, but not for ages. What they are fighting for has changed a great deal. Prior to the colonial period in the Great Lakes Region, there was a Tutsi monarchy in place. During that time tensions in Rwanda were located between competing factions of the ruling class and between the rich and the poor. The divides between rich and poor were more often between Tutsi and Hutu, but that divide was not enforced on ethnic grounds. One could in fact move from one class to the other by gaining or losing wealth. The shift up was known as becoming Tutsified and the shift down was known as becoming Hutuised. The categorizing of these two groups as "tribes" is problematic within this context. The people of Rwanda all speak the same language, many share the same spiritual
beliefs and above all, marriage commonly occurs across Hutu-Tutsi lines. Until the arrival of the colonizers the distinction between Hutu and Tutsi was not of a racial-ethnic nature. Rather it was a social-economic nature. This is not to say that the physiognomic difference went unnoticed, but it did not matter in the ways that it has come to determine the very possibility of living out one’s life in peace.

What transpired between the Hutu and Tutsi was not simply tribal warfare. Their warring is deeply enmeshed in a social-historical context which must not be overlooked if one is to even begin to understand the events occurring in the Great Lakes region of the African continent. I mean to include in that designation Rwanda, Uganda, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo (formerly Zaire), and Tanzania. In order to retain a focus on the question at hand, I will limit my discussion to Rwanda. It should be understood at the outset that this is a partial examination of the factors contributing to the genocide in Rwanda.

Before I turn to a more detailed explanation of colonialism in Rwanda let us turn briefly to examine the ideology of colonialism and imperialism in general. Then I will endeavor to demonstrate how this ideology significantly contributed to the Rwanda disaster.

The Ideology of Colonialism

Colonialism is the practice of invading and inhabiting a geographical location outside the borders of one’s own nation in the name of empire building. Colonialism is the “policy by which the mother country, the colonial power, binds her colonies to herself by political ties with the primary object of promoting her own economic advantages.” The practice is thought to be justified for several reasons. First, it is justified by the invading nations because they have run out of space, resources, or work for their own citizens. Second, it is justified on grounds that the values of the invading nation should be spread to other parts of the world since those values have led to such great successes and power. This justification has as one of its assumptions that the value system and lives of the colonized are intrinsically or a priori of less value or importance than those being brought in. The third justification is that those living in a land that can be invaded ought to be invaded because they are not living in a civilization strong enough to resist the invasion. By reason of their inferior capacity to repel invasion they deserve to be invaded, it will even be for the best given that the values brought in will make the colonized land into a better place with better values. Invading nations seek to expand their wealth by taking over other areas where there is land or resources that can produce more wealth for the colonizing nation. The expansion is always hostile to the natives of the invaded land insofar as the expansion is an uninvited invasion and takeover. Though not always the result of a physical war, the act of colonizing an area is always an act of conquering a place and its people. If the people do not submit to the invading group they are made to submit by one means of coercion or another. Imperialism and colonialism are always efforts to dominate and never truly conducted for the good of those they seek to rule. The imposition takes place on every level — economic, legal, cultural, social, and so on.

The rhetoric of the colonizing power always contains two themes. First the colonized were subjugated for the greater glory of the colonizers. Second, the colonizers saw themselves as, if anything, doing the native populations a favor. The colonizers were bringing civilization to the natives; the
natives were being given the opportunity to want and need the same things that Europeans did. What a native population already had was never regarded as possessing any value. The value in Africa was in its resources. Natural and human resources were and are the primary attraction for Europe.

Kwame Nkrumah offers an illuminating analysis of the essence of colonial-imperial efforts. In his essay on “Colonialism and Imperialism” Nkrumah characterizes the basic driving force of imperialism as economic. He explains that there have been three doctrines in the philosophical analysis of imperialism:

(a) the doctrine of exploitation;
(b) the doctrine of ‘trusteeship’ or ‘partnership’ (to use its contemporary counterpart); and
(c) the doctrine of ‘assimilation’.

The exponents of these doctrines believe implicitly and explicitly in the right of stronger peoples to exploit weaker ones to develop world resources, and ‘civilize’ backward peoples against their will.

Historically colonialism, like slavery, was so socially permissible that the real purpose of imperialist colonialism was never even disguised. Quoting first Jules Ferry and then Albert Sarraut, both figures in the French colonial regime, Nkrumah explains that it was always seen as an exploitative effort. Ferry explained that there were three purposes in having colonies:

(i) In order that they may have access to raw materials of the colonies;
(ii) In order to have markets for sale of the manufactured goods of the home country; and
(iii) As a field for the investment of surplus capital.

Sarraut is quoted as saying that the originating force behind colonizing was not to civilize a heathen world but was in fact an act of force motivated by interests. “[It] was an episode in the vital competition which, from man to man, from group to group, has gone on ever-increasing; the people who set out for taking and making of colonies in distant continents are thinking primarily only of themselves, and are working only for their own power, and conquering for their own profits.”

According to Sarraut, colonialism is nothing more than the enterprise of individual interests with no thoughts to the good of those being colonized. It is a “one-sided and egotistical imposition of the strong upon the weak” for the purpose of advancing the typically European “capitalist aggressiveness” which he calls ‘colonial imperialism’.

The ideology of imperialism and colonialism is utterly self-serving. In later years the rhetoric was couched in terms of doing good, but the underlying assumptions were the same as when imperial efforts were regarded as wholly legitimate. Imperialism and colonialism are based in racist ideology. The beliefs about power, wealth, and the proper modes of production are all resting on the idea that the colonizers are superior in all ways to the colonized. The ideology can be stated as follows: the colonized don’t do what we do thus, there must be something wrong with them. What makes the colonized different (e.g. inferior since different) is at least their color which seems to be the key to who they are as childlike and lazy. The belief that color and nature are linked biologically was backed by the sciences of the day.

In what follows, I will link the ideology of imperialism and colonialism to the history of Rwanda. Without a close look at the
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colonial history of Rwanda it is impossible to make any sense of what has happened there. It is important to be aware of the colonial history in order to see how the legacy of colonialism played a significant causal role in the Rwanda genocide.

How Colonial Ideology Played Out in Rwandan History

The influence of colonialism, so steeped in its science of superiority, conferred value only on what the colonizers recognized. If something held value in Europe that thing, when found in Africa, was also valued though perhaps not quite as much since it was merely an African approximation of the European good. In the case of Rwanda the Tutsi were the closest in resemblance to the Europeans. A small ruling class of Tutsi were not only beautiful by European standards, but also rich and powerful. The resemblance consisted in the sometimes similar physical structure to Europeans and the comparable social status of the Tutsi ruling class. These characteristics were important to the German and Belgian colonizers who were looking for the easiest way to gain control of the area. The Tutsi, though in the minority, were the most highly placed members of society in the area. Belgium viewed the arrangement of the Tutsi minority as rulers through the lens the popular science of the day. It was, according to such theories, an arrangement orchestrated by nature: rulers are superior by nature to those they rule over. As the Belgians sought to gain control of the Rwandan people they employed the methods thought to be most effective. Through a process of categorization they could quantify and qualify the very being of individual people. The Belgians implemented this plan to gain control beginning in 1926. At that time each person in Rwanda was issued an identity card stating which ethnic group she or he belonged to. The practice of stating ethnic identity of the identity cards continued into the late 1990’s until Paul Kagame, then President of Rwanda, officially ended the practice. It was a taxonomic process similar to that used in collecting specimens in the natural sciences; measurements, descriptions and pronouncements about what was essential to the character of the thing in question were employed as a way of being able to say just what the thing was. Knowing what a thing is and how it works is instrumental to figuring out how best to put it to use for one’s own purposes and this is precisely what the Belgians had in mind when they undertook to assign identities to each individual member of their new possession. Ultimately each Rwandan was assigned an identity according to their way of living and their morphological characteristics. The Rwandans could belong to one of three categories: Hutu, Tutsi, or Twa. This was the end of the time when one could shift from one group to the next based on a change in wealth or marriage.

In what follows, I will argue that the influence of colonialism on both the local population of Rwanda and its neighboring nations cannot be underestimated. Under the colonial presence a pseudo-scientific doctrine was imported into most of colonial Africa. The taxonomic theory of the races of the world, “race science” was very popular in the late nineteenth century. An important figure within this field was John Hanning Speke of England. Along with his exploring partner Sir Richard Burton, he is credited with the discovery of Lake Victoria and identifying it as the source of the Nile river. Speke is important with respect to Rwanda because he authored an anthropological theory based in the Hamitic myth or hypothesis. He held that all culture and civilization in central Africa had been introduced by the taller, sharper-featured people, whom he considered to
be a Caucasoid tribe of Ethiopian origin, descendants of King David, and thus a superior race to the native Negroid people.\textsuperscript{22}

According to Speke the social order of the peoples of this region were a “strikingly existing proof of the Holy Scriptures” in the primitive races of central Africa.\textsuperscript{23} In the myth of Ham, Noah curses all the sons of his son, Ham, to be “a slave of slaves” to their brothers for the rest of time as punishment for shameful behavior.\textsuperscript{24} Among other strange interpretations of this passage is the claim that Ham must therefore be the first black man.\textsuperscript{25} In pondering “these sons of Noah” as Speke called them, he marveled that “as they were then, so they are now.”\textsuperscript{26} In other words, he thought it made perfect sense that there was one group of people with dark skin seemingly superior in all ways, dominating another, with even darker skin. He thought that this fact simply supported his notions of the natural order of things. Further, he believed that all the superior Tutsi race needed was the presence of a colonial government styled on the British form in India and this might save the whole race from perdition. What’s more, he thought the Tutsi needed only some British education and then they might just become nearly as superior in all things as the British themselves were.

The colonizers embraced Speke’s ideas about the origins of the Tutsi ruling class. It set them at ease and gave them justification for allowing the Tutsi to be the apparent rulers of Rwanda and further justified the unchecked oppression of the poorer, largely Hutu, classes. The Tutsi, though still uncivilized by European standards, were believed to be clearly superior to the apparently different and necessarily inferior Hutu and Twa who farmed the land or lived in the jungles. It is important to remember here that even at this time the lower classes were a mixture of Hutu and Tutsi and that the primary means of categorizing a person was by looking to his source of income (typically one was either farming the land or raising cattle) and her or his facial features. It is still the case throughout much of rural Africa that owning and grazing cattle is regarded with more esteem than farming the land. There is no freedom in farming, one is tied to his plot of land and dependent upon the whims of nature for his survival.

Speke’s doctrine is by no means passe more than 100 years later. In November of 1992 a Hutu Power leader, Leon Mugesera, gave a now notorious speech where he called on Hutus to send the Tutsi back to Ethiopia by way of the Nyaborongo River.\textsuperscript{27} In April 1994 the river was choked with the bodies and reddened by the blood of tens of thousands of dead Tutsis. These bodies later washed up on the shores of Lake Victoria. It is also true that Radio Mille Collines was able to put these same ideas to good use in spreading the fear of the Tutsi to every corner of Rwanda. Recall now Speke’s claim that the Tutsi had come from Ethiopia; a claim that has never been substantiated, but is widely believed. The power of one man’s ideas can not be underestimated here.

It might be helpful to digress for a moment to fill in a few details that will explain the apparently sudden and extreme efforts of the Hutu against the Tutsi in Rwanda. In brief, there was great pressure from the international aid community (in particular the U.N., the IMF, and the World Bank) for Rwanda’s government to democratize and cease the systematic oppression of the Tutsi living in Rwanda. If democratization did not proceed Rwanda was threatened with losing a large and reliable source of income, foreign aid.\textsuperscript{29} The Rwandan government was to make it possible for
Tutsi living in exile to return to Rwanda as well as to eliminate the official oppression of the Tutsi within its borders. Tutsi from Burundi and Uganda, many organized as the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), began returning under the auspices of implementing the Arusha Peace Agreement (also known as the Arusha Accords). It was signed by parties from the Republic of Rwanda, the Rwandan Patriotic Front, and the negotiating party to the agreements the United Republic of Tanzania, on August 4, 1993. The Arusha Peace Agreement was written as part of the process to democratize and introduce an egalitarian spirit into Rwanda's government and society. Among the goals of the Agreement was to repatriate the thousands of now adult children of the Tutsis exiled in neighboring countries since the 1959 atrocities against the Tutsi people. There was a great deal of opposition on the part of the Hutu extremist factions to implementing the Arusha Peace Agreement. As a result the process failed to move forward along the agreed upon time line. The RPF were no longer willing to wait for the democratization that until then had proceeded very slowly, if at all. Within Rwanda there was a fear that the incoming Tutsi/RPF would take revenge for the preceding 30 years of living in exile and the deaths of their fathers and grandfathers. It was claimed by extremist Hutu factions that those Tutsi within Rwanda would also seek revenge for the last 30 years of oppression. The government had made a point since independence of keeping the Tutsi minority as an underclass just as the reverse had been true prior to independence.

The Arusha Peace Agreement required that a government be formed which included leadership by both Hutu and Tutsi. The fears of the Hutu extremists were centered in the loss of government power which would translate into loss of power everywhere. Rwanda was and is a highly centralized state, government power and position are very important. Recall the state issued identity cards always identified a person’s ethnic identity. The identities of Hutu and Tutsi were relevant to all of this because everything had been set up in terms of the fundamental political divisions between the two groups - belonging to one group or the other did carry meaning but at this point it was almost exclusively politically based. To the average person living in rural Rwanda these things were largely immaterial. But as the forces of democratization encroached on the Hutu dominated regime there were scrambles to stay in power. The Hamitic myth, its terminology and claims were resurrected on the radio and in the press. It is worth noting that the rhetoric of the Hutu extremists sounded much like that put forth during the Nazi propaganda campaigns of WWII. In both cases the enemy was depicted as a monster bent on killing babies, raping wives and daughters, and murdering all the men so that they could take over the state and run it on the backs of good innocent people: these are often the terms of war. In this sense what happened in Rwanda is nothing new. Hate radio played a significant and diabolic role in the success of what turned out to be a genocidal campaign sponsored and organized by a small but powerful faction within the reigning Hutu government known as the Akazu or “little house.” The Akazu were a Hutu-extremist elite very close to, but deeply antagonistic to shifting loyalties of President Habyarimana.

All of this then can return us to the import of colonial ideology and its role in the history of Rwanda. From here we can develop the line of influence that the Belgian policy of using ethnic identity cards had on the tensions between Hutu and Tutsi. Those tensions can be further
understood by looking at ethnic identity as a corporate concept. The Hamitic myth is not all that the colonizing nations brought with them. When the Belgians replaced the Germans in Rwanda they extended Speke’s racist ideology by imposing it in a concrete way through the ethnic identity cards. Suddenly the once fluid tribal or ethnic identities of Hutu, Tutsi, and Twa became rigid and essentialized. It is this imposition and its accompanying ideology that I argue is at the heart of the Hutu-Tutsi animosities of the past 40 years.

Let me elaborate on the effects of this Belgian colonial action. It has fundamentally changed the manner in which the people of Rwanda relate to one another. The methods by which it was determined who was Tutsi, Hutu, or Twa were based in notions of physical appearance and source of income. Using the distinctions mentioned, a Belgian scientist would come to Rwanda, have a look at a person (measure his cranial capacity, his height, the width of his eyes, the length of his nose), and ask whether he had cattle or farmed the land. Based on these two sets of information it was determined which “tribe” a person would henceforth belong to. The children of each family, regardless of the mother’s assigned identity, were assigned to the same tribe as their fathers.

In the section that follows I will show the direct influence of the Belgian policy and practice on the Rwandan people. My central question is this: what is it that led the Hutu and Tutsi people to the point where genocide was enacted? A search of the literature published subsequent to the genocide shows that much of what transpired can be traced to identity construction and the continued use of ethnic identity cards after independence. More specifically, it can be traced to the ways in which members of Hutu and Tutsi groups construct their own identities and the ways in which that construction was influenced by the colonial presence between 1894-1959.

Corporate Identity as the Conceptual Workhorse of the Rwanda Genocide

Among the writers seeking to understand Rwanda, Catherine and David Newbury have developed a concept of corporate identities expressly related to the situation of the Central East African region. In their work, they say that the corporate view of ethnicity resulted in the Hutu, Tutsi, and Twa coming to be viewed as internally homogeneous groups, their members came to be treated in distinctive ways by the state. This made groups that had previously shown more “internal flexibility” appear more like biological groups...the ideology constructed to rationalize this process portrayed the groups as racially, culturally and historically different. It can also be noted here that these three characteristics: race, culture, and history, came to be viewed as more or less synonymous with each other. The actual structure of the individual groups, their individual cultures and histories were disregarded completely. “Although it is unclear exactly how the three groups related to one another and themselves prior to the colonization, it is known that the divisions in this society fell along more strictly political lines informed by elements of clan, lineage, and family ties, rather than a group politics connected to ethnic identity.” The framework imposed by the Belgians assumed the intellectual and political superiority of the Tutsi group - they did this because of their appearance and the fact that there was already a Tutsi monarchy in place. The Belgian aim was to achieve a social order which rationalized and standardized
heterogeneous social relations. They sought to accomplish this by re-enforcing, even reinventing the power of the "natural rulers" of the land. These assumptions were made explicit in nearly all the bureaucratic documentation on the creation and maintenance of the colonial social organization of Rwanda.

The effects of corporate identity and the imposition of identity cards had many results for the Rwandan people. In the past it was common practice to allow only Tutsi males to be educated by the Belgians. The Tutsi were also favored for jobs. Further the power structures in place were preserved and even strengthened by the Belgians. On the other hand, the Hutu were denied access to education, wealth, and power. The Twa were and are more or less ignored by everyone.

In more recent years the effects of corporate identity can be seen in the use of this kind of identity construct to target all Tutsi as enemies of the state. This was also said of any Hutu favoring policies friendly to Tutsi. Subsequent to the genocide the same identity constructs were used to label all Hutu, and especially long-term refugees, as genocidaires and members of the Interahamwe. (Recall the efforts of the Congolese forces in conjunction with the RPF forces to hunt down and kill all Hutu refugees in the Congolese camps.\textsuperscript{34}) Members of each ethnic group have now and have had since 1960 a program of reclamation of land, power and position as well as one of vengeance for the harm done to them and their predecessors. While it is true that there was a time when it did not make sense to say that there were three separate "tribes" in Rwanda, there is now a sense in which this is true. But the tribes are not composed of essentially distinct people. The way that the term "tribe" is used connotes a group held together by a common set of characteristics, occupations, or interests usually the binding is familial or clan related. In the case of the Rwandans these lines have been blurred for many generations. The relevant distinction between one group and another has come to be an identity card, rather than a set of beliefs or practices or even a set of characteristic morphological features. In the next section, I will elaborate on what this construction of ethnic identity has come to mean for the people of Rwanda.

\textbf{Imperialism, Rwanda, and the International Community}

During the 100 days following the assassination of President Habyarimana on April 6, 1994, an individual's life was lost or saved by virtue of the identity card she or he was carrying.\textsuperscript{35} Rwandan society and government was highly centralized; every village was organized in such a way that every one was known to everyone else. In the years leading up to May 6, 1994 careful stock was taken of each person's ethnic identification by government officials and members of the \textit{Interahamwe} at the direction of the Presidential Guard under orders from the \textit{Akazu}. All of this was expedited by the colonial legacy. In the period 1960-1990 it mattered very much which group an individual belonged to, just as it had during the Belgian colonial period. As these cards were established to categorize and separate, so they did. The designation came to determine not just what group one belonged to, but rather who one essentially was in the eyes of those in power. By the 1990's it was all that mattered to those in power. According to ordinary Rwandans now living as refugees in Kenya and Tanzania it was of little importance to them in their day to day interactions with one another. Unfortunately, it does matter now and their lives do seem to depend on having the right
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designation. To this day people of Rwanda are killed or allowed to live based on the ethnic identity assigned to them by a colonial bureaucracy using a bogus scientific theory. It seems clear that at least some of Rwanda’s people adopted whole cloth the racist ideologies of the Belgian and German colonizers. The reasons for this can be speculated upon, but in my reading I have not come across any explicit justifications for such a practice. At the very least it can be seen that a powerful group of people still believed that there is a fundamental and moral difference between ethnic groups.

Earlier in this essay I asserted that the ideology of imperialism continues to influence those outside the African continent as much as it does within it. I want to reassert that claim here. I also want to express a certain caution after stating such a claim. I do not mean to say that there are persons who publicly endorse the racist ideology of the early explorers and colonizers. It is not part of my claim here that the international community continues to actively propagate the idea of different biological races or the nonsense of stories like Speke’s version of the myth of Ham and his sons. Rather I am asserting that there is a continued, if not directly intended, practice of evaluating Africa and Africans using a different set of terminology and standards than is used in assessing the people and places of other locations in the world. Let me begin to sketch what I mean here by turning to some practical examples.

More than six years later people in Europe and the Americas still do not have much idea of what happened in Rwanda. They have even less of an idea about why it may have happened. What they speak of is how such savagery is still possible in our modern world. People here do remember that much of the killing was conducted by use of simple farm instruments such as machetes and hoes. They don’t remember who was doing the killing or that no one intervened to stop the killing. What they remember are the newscasts of refugee camps full of diseased and starving orphans or the churchyards and schoolhouses densely covered with the slaughtered bodies of men, women, and children who died at their countrymen’s hands.

The beliefs of ordinary citizens living in the developed world are culpably ill informed. They are often quite casual about claiming that Africans are like children, or worse yet, like juvenile delinquents. It is hard to know just what to say when otherwise apparently decent people utter claims about an entire continent of people as if they do know of what they speak and in terms so deeply steeped in racist ideology. People outside of Africa continue to believe, perhaps without thinking, what was claimed about Africans more than 100 years ago by men who ventured into Africa and came back with theories and ideas about the nature of the world and the things they found in it. Their theories have long since been exposed as false (or at least badly misinformed), but this has done little or nothing to change the ideas of people all over the world. Using a more severe reading of these claims one could say that the debunking has largely been rejected or ignored because of the tensions that result in continuing to benefit from a racist legacy while also claiming to be involved in humanitarian and egalitarian efforts throughout the world. If it is admitted that the colonial legacy is ongoing and fundamentally racist, then we are at least under pressure to renounce its tenets and the consequent privileged position they yield to those living in the world’s powerful nations. This assumes that debunking of racialized myths carries with it the
obligation to undo the system that continues to oppress through formerly overt and now covert or unintended racist ideas and institutions. While I believe this assumption to be correct, I am not in a position to argue for it here.

The problem of the international community's understanding of Africa has been assessed quite simply by Ngugi Wa Thiong'o:

The study of the African realities has for too long been seen in terms of tribes. Whatever happens in Kenya, Uganda, Malawi is because of Tribe A versus Tribe B. Whatever erupts in Zaire, Nigeria, Liberia, Zambia is because of the traditional enmity between Tribe D and Tribe C. A variation of the same stock interpretation is Moslem versus Christian or Catholic versus Protestant where a people does not easily fall into 'tribes' This misleading stock interpretation of the African realities has been popularized by the western media which likes to deflect people from seeing that imperialism is still the root cause of many problems in Africa.

Ngugi captured here a truth that prevails today. The West has simplified Africa too much when it pays any attention at all. The terms used to describe Rwanda and the genocide are telling; it was characterized as a bloodletting whose motives were primal, based in ancient hatreds between tribes and this characterization was repeated time and again in well known Western media. The public chooses to not see Africa. There is a belief that Africans are not the same as those of us living here. There is an otherness about them that is accompanied by the tendency to be unpredictable, violent, tribal and bloody. The Africans have been made unreal or at the very least essentially and importantly unlike us. In so far as that sense of the differences is used to formulate policy and practice for Africa it will be Africa's downfall. The whole continent is seen as being beyond the reach of the "West." It is too wild.

In this context the international community has also adopted a corporate view of the identity of all African peoples. Although the effects of this view have not resulted in wars against African states and peoples, it has resulted in a slanted view of what is happening, why it is happening, and who is involved in the events taking place on the African continent.

Insofar as a corporate view of identity is an "ideology constructed to rationalize [the] process [of] portraying [a] group as racially, culturally and historically different," then the view that the international community often takes with respect to the people of Africa is corporate. Africa is often referred to as if it is a nation and not a continent. That location is presumed to be home to tribal peoples who are capable of such unspeakable acts as machete genocide.

The important characteristics that help us to identify groups of people as groups - race, culture, and history - have come to be viewed as more or less synonymous with each other when thinking about Africa. The actual structure of the individual groups, their individual cultures and histories is frequently disregarded completely.

As this essay comes to a close I want to contextualize the effects of the widely held beliefs about Africa and its people. Imperialism and colonial ideology proved quite deadly for many in 1994. Now that the role of imperialism in Rwanda and outside of Rwanda is more clear let us return to examine the genocide. There are
facts here that speak to the devastating effects of corporate notions of ethnic identity which were made possible by imperial and colonialist policy.

**Setting the Record Straight: A Genocide Unfolded Unimpeded by the Humanitarians**

In 1994 the U.N. had a peacekeeping unit in place known as UNAMIR. This unit was neither mandated nor equipped to act as a protective, let alone a preventive force in Rwanda. The UNAMIR force was in place to help in a peaceful transition to a new, more democratic, form of government. On April 6, 1994 a plane carrying the presidents of both Rwanda and Burundi was shot down as it approached the airport in Kigali. All aboard the plane were killed. The UN Security Council (UNSC) ordered that UNAMIR do nothing other than protect foreign workers at the various UN and Non Government Organization (NGO) offices as they attempted to flee Rwanda. UNAMIR was ordered specifically not to help any Rwandans, not even the ones who worked for them in their homes and offices.

Before the killing began on May 6, it was clear to those in UNAMIR as well as others that the peace process was in jeopardy. According to well placed informants, military advisors, and some media correspondents on the ground in Rwanda, something horrible was taking formation well before the spring of 1994.

There were persons who came to UNAMIR with warnings and concrete information that a “final solution” to the Hutu-Tutsi conflicts was planned and likely to occur soon. Those in charge at UNAMIR did contact the U.N. Security Council in New York. They asked for clarification of the UNAMIR mandate and permission to act on the information they received. There is still some debate as to what happened next. But just 15 days after the genocide began the UNAMIR forces were reduced from approximately 2,000 to just 250 persons. Not only was the size reduced, but they were denied permission to act for protection or prevention purposes. In those first 15 days it is estimated that some 200,000 were already dead, that is more than 1,300 people a day; and still the U.N. reduced the forces. It must be asked why the U.N. Security Council refused to act. There have not yet been any adequate explanations offered although it has been determined by an independent commission that choosing not to intervene was in fact a failure on the part of the U.N. to act in accordance with its Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights.

There is speculation about the reasons for the U.N.'s actions and inactions. Some are quite sure that racism plays a role in the Africa policies. While I am not in a position to prove this claim, I think it can be said that there remains a tendency to see Africa through the lens of imperial and colonial interests which are inherently racist, or at the least oppressive. The agents who determine Africa policy throughout the world are largely elected or appointed officials who are accountable to their governments and often the citizenry of their countries. The processes of accountability leave open the possibility that this is the way the international community wants to deal with Africa. But we must ask, how can that be? I have argued that it is possible because the same ideas about who and what Africans are hold now as did over one hundred years ago. The colonial methodology was dominated by the need to control or manage the indigenous population of a colonized territory in such a manner that they will facilitate as much as possible the supply of the wanted goods while posing as little obstacle to getting the goods as possible - keeping the natives in power.
happy is all that was really necessary. Regard for personhood, dignity, or worth of the native populations was not a part of the policy then or now. It was certainly never the case that a colonial power would be willing to expend its own resources either financial or human in order to better the lives of those they were busy exploiting - the Africans were not regarded as being worth the trouble. That ideology seems to have changed only a little bit. During the colonial days the Africans were popularly thought too stupid or childish to merit any efforts on behalf of humanitarian concerns, now they are thought to be too violent and childish to merit significant or dangerous efforts on behalf of humanitarian concerns. The African people have gone from being viewed as children to be controlled to being juvenile delinquents beyond the reach of control. It’s as if the world powers regard themselves as the parents of a bunch of children for whom they have done their best but can do no more. A policy of “tough love” seems to have been implemented; they must sort things out for themselves and if this means that half of them die well then so be it. Admittedly, in order to ground such claims an investigation of the agencies in charge of humanitarian interventions would have to be made. The line of inquiry might be to look first at what the mandates for policy and action are. Then the inquiry could turn to see what kinds of policies and actions have taken place in Africa. In particular it will be important to look at the reasons offered for the particular policies and actions taken in light of what the mandates say. It is my firm conviction that the Rwanda genocide could have been prevented. The responsibility for the nearly one million deaths is a shared burden between those who actively committed the atrocities and those who failed to act to prevent or stop the actors. The efforts to implement a peaceful transition to democracy in Rwanda through the Arusha Peace Agreement were perhaps a good start. However, it appears that the U.N. and other negotiating parties seriously underestimated the volatility of the situation as well as the depth to which the animosities and fears of Rwanda’s people were entrenched.

In the meantime it is clearly safe to say that imperialism and colonialism continue to have an effect on the devastated lives of the people of Rwanda. They live on in the ideas of the world leaders who will take all they can from Africa and then shrug when all hell breaks loose again. Many in the U.S. say we had no business going in to Rwanda. They say this even now that we know what happened, that it could have been stopped, and should have been stopped. Perhaps it is true that the African continent would be better off if the western nations would simply stay out of things, but they don’t. And so long as the world powers are loaning money, selling weapons, and extracting resources from the land they once officially dominated as colonies and now unofficially dominate by being the only reliable source of income for the continent there will be a pressure to come to the assistance of the people they exploit. An argument will have to be constructed that will ground this kind of claim. Thus far there have been few works considering this sort of argument.

The US as well as most of Europe was built on the backs of the colonized peoples of the world. Ultimately I want to argue that when those first moves for domination were taken by the colonizers they were inextricably bound to those they colonized. Even after independence they were bound. If imperialism and even colonialism are still actively forming the Africa policy of the U.N. and other important decision making bodies in world politics then something needs to be done about it. This paper was meant to be an exploration of
whether or not the influences of imperialism and colonialism could be traced through history and into the Rwandan genocide. I believe an adequate case has been made to demonstrate the fundamentally important role that colonial implements and concepts were put to work in the effort to exterminate a whole people. Further I believe it is clear that the legacy of imperialism and colonialism is present in the policy and actions of the U.N. and other decision making bodies involved in Rwanda at the time of the genocide. Lastly, though with less completeness, it has been shown that the influences of a racist ideology are still present within the everyday thoughts of people as evidenced by the articles in the *New York Times*, and the presidential debates.47

There is more to be said on this topic. At this point I want to close with a few statements. It is important to remember that the Rwandans are the ones who picked up the machetes to kill their neighbors. But it is also important to remember what Bill Clinton said in his statement to the Rwandans in March of 1999. He said, “All over the world there were people like me sitting in offices who did not fully appreciate the depth and the speed with which you were being engulfed by this unimaginable horror... the world did not act quickly enough when the horrors of the 1994 massacre in Rwanda emerged... never again must we be shy in the face of the evidence.” Similarly Kofi Annan, Secretary-General of the United Nations uttered these words on December 16, 1999, “All of us must bitterly regret that we did not do more to prevent it... On behalf of the United Nations, I acknowledge this failure and express my deep remorse.” And finally I will turn to the oft referred to pledge made by the international community at the end of the Nuremberg Trials to “never again” allow monstrous crimes against humanity or genocide to take place. The United Nations was created in the wake of World War II while the international community was still reeling from the Nazi Holocaust. The Charter was a document unparalleled in international society for its noble goals and solemn undertaking. Given the series of massacres that have occurred throughout the world since the signing of the Charter in 1945 one must wonder just what is happening to prevent those promises from being kept.
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1 Since giving this paper at the ISAPS conference in March, 2000 I have endeavored to revise it. I owe a debt of gratitude to Malam Olufemi Taiwo and Gail Presbey for their patient and thoughtful suggestions.

2 A quick look at the reports from Rwanda published in the *New York Times* from 7 April, 1994 through the end of May were enough to see this sort of reference 15-20 times.

3 The *Interahamwe* is the youth militia group of the Hutu-led government party, the MRND (*Mouvement Revolutionnaire Nationale pour le Developpement*). They were trained and supplied with weapons by the Hutu-led Rwandan army (RPA) and the elite Presidential Guard who were a branch of the RPA most closely associated with the President's party.

It is interesting to note the roots of the term ‘Interahamwe’. ‘Gutera’ means any of four things: a) to attack, b) to sing, c) to get a common goal, or d) to sow or to plant. ‘Hamwe’ means 'together'. Thus, the term *interahamwe* signified an effort to unite to attain a common goal which can range from singing to fighting to agriculture. The terminology used by the *Interahamwe* during the genocide was decidedly oriented in this way. They referred to killing as “work” often singing songs or chanting about the need to “clear the bush” of weeds, roaches, vermin, and pests (these are all terms commonly applied by Hutu extremists to Tutsi throughout the 1990's) in order to prepare the land for the future (see references throughout Gourevitch, Prunier, and De Forges).
In lay terms the Africa problem amounts to this: a popular belief that those living on the African continent are constitutionally incapable of living side by side without killing each other; it is said they live in a Hobbesian world. Further, it is believed there is nothing, as far as anyone can tell, that the rest of the world can do but send aid and weapons to those in power for their defense and then food and medicine when the killing dies down. This sort of thinking can be seen most clearly in articles from the New York Times covering Rwanda during the genocide (See bibliography for specific references to a small sampling of the new coverage). The claims of Africans living in Hobbes' State of Nature can be found throughout the news reports of 1994-1996 when the coverage shifted back to the conflicts in Ethiopia and Eritrea and then back again to the Democratic Republic of the Congo (formerly Zaire). For a further analysis of this line of thought see John Mueller's article (2000) *The Banality of 'Ethnic War'* in International Security, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp 42-70.

It is not the case that I want to support the thesis that Africa or Africans are in a hopeless situation. (See the Economist, *The Hopeless Continent*, May 13-19, (2000) for this line of thought.) But rather that the harms done cannot be repaired. Society cannot be restored to its precolonial state. The people and states of Africa can and have recovered and created new societies. The point I want to insist on is that the harm done by racist ideology cannot be undone.

This particular set of definitions are made by Edward Said in a lecture entitled *Culture and Imperialism* given at York University in Toronto, Canada on 10 February, 1993.

I want to take a moment to clarify what I mean when I use the phrase “ethnic identity.” In Rwanda “ethnic identity” is not a straightforward cultural or racial designation. The relevant lines of distinction between the Hutu and Tutsi people are based on one or two factors. The first was an individual's actual identity as indicated by the governmentally issued identity cards that specify which ethnic group one belongs to; either Hutu, Tutsi, or Twa. I will discuss this aspect of the formation of ethnic identity in Rwanda within the body of the paper. The second factor, and generally only important with respect to those who were politically active was to know whether or not one was a moderate. To be moderate was to favor new government policy that worked to reintegrate the remaining Tutsi within Rwanda into mainstream society and to move to bring back those Rwandan Tutsi who were forced to flee in the wake of the anti-Tutsi violence at independence in 1959.

A kind of racism has been in place throughout the Great Lakes Region, but especially within the Rwandan and Burundian borders that uses the terminology common to an essentialized, biologically based racism. It is entirely similar in nature and practice to the kind of racism that has historically existed between white Americans and people of color in the U.S. I will use Kwame Anthony Appiah's explanations of racialism and racism, and further between intrinsic and extrinsic racism. The kind of racism at work in Rwanda stems from what he calls “Intrinsic Racism.” First, in line with what he says about racialism, it has to be believed that there are some differences between groups of people that constitute sufficiently essential lines of division according to morphological characteristics as well as certain traits or tendencies which are shared “with each other [but not] with members of any other race” (p. 13). This in itself may not be problematic. But in Rwanda, as in the U.S., there are those who further believe that these differences justify differentiation on moral grounds between members of different races “because they believe that each race has different moral status, quite independent of the moral characteristics entailed by racial essence” (p.15). In essence it is decided that because someone belongs to a certain group she is by default a certain kind of person. In the case of Rwanda what this came to mean was that Hutu extremists regarded the Tutsi as essentially and inherently a dangerous and malignant group of people who were bent on destroying all Hutu. This designation applied to all Tutsi regardless of sex, age, behavior, stated beliefs, and so on.
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8 Gourevitch, pp 59.
9 Translated from Kinyarwanda as “wind of destruction.”
10 Gourevitch, pp 59.
11 Gourevitch, pp 59.
12 The Belgians had supported a Tutsi monarchy but as the ruling Tutsi began to agitate for independence the Belgians shifted their allegiance to the less powerful and more cooperative Hutu political activists.
13 See Prunier’s sections on “Myths and realities of pre-colonial Rwandese society” and “The Dynamics of Rwandese history” (pp 9-24). See also: C. Newbury’s “Ethnicity and the Politics...,” D. Newbury’s “Irredentist Rwanda.....,” and Gourevitch, pp 47-48.
14 The ideas expressed here are largely informed by a number of Africanist scholars. Of particular importance are Aimé Césaire, Kwame Nkrumah, and Mahmoud Mamdani. The relevant works are cited in the bibliography.
16 *Colonialism and Imperialism* can be found in Nkrumah’s *Towards Colonial Freedom*.
18 Ibid., pp 3.
19 Ibid., pp 3.
20 To be sure the natural resources found in Africa were highly valued, but only as a source of revenue for the motherland and self in the case of the early adventurers.
21 Speke discovered Lake Victoria in the same sense that Columbus discovered America.
22 See Gourevitch (pp 50-54), Prunier (pp 9-35), and Speke (Chapter IX).
23 Gourevitch, pp 51.
24 He used the story from Genesis 9 wherein Noah, after safely steering his Ark to dry land, got drunk, passed out naked in his tent. When he came to he learned that his youngest son, Ham, had told his brothers Shem and Japheth, of the spectacle. The two older brothers, with great respect for their father had covered him while keeping their backs turned so as not to disgrace Noah. Noah’s response to the news of Ham’s behavior was to curse the progeny of Ham’s sons saying, “A slave of slaves shall he be to his brothers.”
25 One has to wonder what it might mean to say that Ham is the first black man. Was he somehow changed? Does this mean that blackness suddenly acquired a new meaning? Or is it rather that he was blackened by the sun more than his brothers who did not have to work in the way that a slave as Ham had become would?
26 Gourevitch, pp 51.
27 The Nyaborongo is a tributary of the Nile running through Rwanda.
28 See Berkeley, “Sounds of Violence...” in its entirety for an examination of the kinds of terminology put to use in Rwanda against the Tutsi.
29 There was great international pressure to bring peace and to uphold human rights in the region. Certainly there were decent, respectable motivations and actors involved in the effort to democratize the Great Lakes region of Africa. But there is also an underlying pressure to bring peace and democracy for non-humanitarian reasons as well. Rwanda lies in the center of a resource rich terrain. It is in the economic interests of the world powers to secure control over the entire Great Lakes region in order to facilitate extraction of the
natural resources. The motivations to improve the lot of Africans are rarely ever purely humanitarian. Nations rarely move to invest their own resources (human, financial, and otherwise) in another nation without an incentive directly linked to their own interests. In this essay one can look at the tone and content of the presidential election debates between George W. Bush and Al Gore to get a sense of what I mean by this claim.

30 See Abela, None Is Too Many...

31 President Habyarimana was seen to shift his politics as the pressure to abide by the Arusha Peace Agreement mounted. There were many within the Akazu who viewed him as a traitor. At the time of his death it was widely rumored that his own government forces were responsible for shooting down his plane, though this has not yet been proven.


33 C. Newbury, pp 4.

34 An article in the Washington Post on March 16, 2001 entitled “Vital Ore Funds Congo’s War” adds the following at the end of an article pointing out the continued involvement of Kagame’s Rwandese forces within Congo: “Back in Mumba, the miners leave for home well before dark. The ethnic Hutu militias that Rwanda was still trying to eliminate when it first invaded Congo in 1996 continue to hold sway in the hills. “We could be rich, but there is still the problem of insecurity,” said Alex Kabongo, who, like most of the miners in Mumba turned to digging only after the Hutu militias stole his cattle. He pointed toward the darkening hills. “They are coming in the night,” he said.

35 I have not come across any specific statements justifying the continued use of ethnic identity cards. However, given the conditions under which independence was granted and the continued animosity of the ruling Hutu party toward persons of Tutsi ethnicity, the continued practice was an efficient and ultimately necessary tool for distinguishing between people on ethnic grounds. After all, since intermarriage between Hutu, Tutsi, and Twa has gone on for a very long time, it no longer makes sense to think a person belongs to one ethnic group simply based upon her or his appearance. Yet it is true that persons were and are killed simply because they do possess the stereotypical physical features of one ethnic group or another.

36 Of course, which ethnic identity counts as the ‘right’ or safe one depends very much on what part of the region one lives in. The ongoing tensions between Hutu and Tutsi extremists are highly active and dangerous. In addition, the battle for territory currently spans across borders into neighboring countries.

37 It may be important to note again that it is not all but rather only a few who are still busily wreaking havoc on a largely innocent population. It takes only a few people with evil beliefs and sturdy weapons to lay waste to years worth of peace and reconciliation efforts if a people are frightened enough.

38 Ngugi, Decolonizing the Mind, pp 1.


40 UNAMIR stands for United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda. The UNAMIR forces were composed of troops from Bangladesh, Belgium, Ghana, and Tunisia under the leadership of Brigadier General Romeo Dallaire of Canada.

Much of the information in this section is taken from Henry Kwami Anyidoho’s first hand account of the events in Rwanda titled Guns Over Kigali. Mr. Anyidoho was the Deputy and Chief of Staff for the UNAMIR mission.

41 See Carlson, Invar et al, Report of the Independent Inquiry...
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42 This includes both President George Bush the younger and former Vice President Al Gore during the nationally televised Presidential debates in Winston-Salem, NC, 10/11/2000. The speakers are Jim Lehrer, then Vice President Al Gore, and then Governor of Texas, George W. Bush. The following is an edited portion of the debate transcript (note: material italicized is of particular relevance to the U.S. position on Rwanda and foreign intervention policy):

Lehrer: But the reverse side of the question, Governor, that Vice President Gore mentioned, 600,000 people died in Rwanda in 1994, no U. S. intervention, no intervention from the outside world. Was that a mistake not to intervene?

Governor Bush: I think the Administration did the right thing in that case, I do. It was a horrible situation. No one liked to see it on our TV screens, but it's a case where we need to make sure we've got kind of an early warning system in places where there could be ethnic cleansing and genocide the way we saw it in Rwanda. That's a case where we need to use our influence to have countries in Africa come together and help deal with the situation... I thought they made the right decision not to send U. S. troops to Rwanda.

Lehrer: Any second thoughts on that based on what you said a moment ago? [Question to V.P. Gore]

Gore: We did actually send troops into Rwanda to help with the humanitarian relief measures. In retrospect, we could have gotten in there sooner. We could have saved more lives if we acted earlier. I do not think it was an example of a conflict where we should have put our troops in to try to separate the parties for this reason, Jim. One of the criteria that I think is important in deciding when and if we should ever get involved around the world is whether or not our national security interest is involved. If we can make the difference with military force, if we tried everything else, if we have allies. In the balkans, we had allies, NATO, ready, willing and able to go and carry a big part of the burden. In Africa, we did not. ...Because we had no allies and because it was very unclear that we could actually accomplish what we would want to accomplish by putting military forces there, I think it was the right thing not to jump in. As heartbreaking as it was, I think we should have come in much quicker with the humanitarian mission.

Lehrer: So what would you say, Governor, to somebody who would say, wait a minute, why not Africa? I mean, why the Middle East? Why the balkans but not Africa, when 600,000 people's lives are at risk?

Bush: Well, I understand. And Africa is important. And we've got to do a lot of work in Africa to promote democracy and trade. ...It's an important continent. But there's got to be priorities. The Middle East is a priority for a lot of reasons. This is Europe and the Far East and our own hemisphere. Those are my priorities should I be president. Not to say we won't be engaged nor should we work hard to get other nations to come together to prevent atrocity....

42 Both President Clinton and Secretary-General Kofi Annan have issued apologies to Rwanda for the failure to act in accordance with the U.N. Charter and the U.N. Declaration on Human rights. In both cases they acknowledged that more could have been done to save lives and even to take preventive measures against the genocide before it started. Clinton

43 For a full explication of this thesis see Michael Maren’s work *The Road to Hell*...

44 Stanley Hoffman’s work *Duties Beyond Borders*, Immanuel Kant’s work *Perpetual Peace*, and Joseph Carrens’s “Aliens and Citizens” all seem to make the kinds of arguments necessary for claiming that nations ought to cross borders under circumstances such as those that played out in Rwanda. This is a theme I will have to develop elsewhere.

45 See footnote #2 for references to New York Times articles.