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ABSTRACT

Rwanda and Burundi are both poor, densely populated, multiethnic countries that formally began the process of democratization in the early 1990s. Shortly thereafter, resistance to reform led to coups d’état and the assassination of both countries’ presidents. It is here that the parallel paths of the two similar countries diverge. In Rwanda, a total genocide of the country’s Tutsi population was perpetrated by extremist Hutu factions in 1994. In Burundi, however, genocide did not occur. The country instead collapsed into civil war. This variation in outcome is inadequately explained by the micro-, meso-, and macro-level theories frequently applied to one or both cases. This theoretical deficiency is attributed to problems of structure and agency, and an over reliance on the assumption that actors behave as rational utility maximizers. To better explicate the relationship between democratization and collective violence in Rwanda and Burundi, this dissertation utilizes an integrative approach that combines two distinct, but compatible theories: historical institutionalism and prospect theory. This dissertation argues that institutional legacies influenced the success of democratization and the degree of collective violence that occurred in both countries. Consistent with the core assumptions of both theories, the results of a most similar systems analysis demonstrate that an institutional legacy characterized by an asymmetrical distribution of power between groups induces incumbent leaders to perceive joint-rule from the domain of losses. Conversely, when a country has had greater experience with formal and informal democratic traditions and practices, the likelihood that multiparty democracy will be perceived by incumbent elites
from the domain of gains is increased. The results of the content analysis performed by this study further
demonstrate that actors who perceive multiparty democracy as a loss are more likely to favor risk-seeking
strategies in response to political liberalization. Additionally, the analysis reveals that actors who
perceive multiparty democracy as a gain are more likely to favor a risk-averse policy course.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In the early 1990s, the neighboring countries of Rwanda and Burundi each began a process of institutional transformation from single party rule to multiparty democracy. Rwanda and Burundi are small Central African republics of nearly equal size and population.¹ Both countries have a Hutu majority and a Tutsi minority. In both countries, resistance to democratic reform led to coups d’état and presidential assassinations.² It is here that the parallel paths of these seemingly identical countries diverge. In Rwanda, genocide was perpetrated by extremist Hutu factions, including government officials, upon the country’s Tutsi and politically moderate Hutu populations. In Burundi, however, no genocide occurred. A coup d’état failed and instead ushered in a lengthy period of civil war. This divergence of outcome—the occurrence of genocide in Rwanda but not in Burundi—is puzzling given the striking similarity of the two countries.

This variation in outcome is not adequately explained by studies that address collective violence in Rwanda and Burundi or by theories that explain the relationship between communal violence and the process of democratization in Africa more generally. In particular, any of the macro-, meso-, or individual-level theories of group violence that are frequently applied to one or both of these cases fails to establish a clear connection between larger-scale factors and the decision-making processes of individual actors. As a result, an explanatory gap is created that is worthy of further examination.

¹ Both countries are between ten and 11,000 square miles. By 1993 Burundi and Rwanda had populations of 5.8 and 7.6 million, respectively.
² The President of Burundi, Melchior Ndadaye, was assassinated by a conservative faction of the Tutsi-led army on 21 October 1993. In Rwanda, President Juvénal Habyarimana was assassinated on 6 April 1994 when his plane was shot down over Kigali. The identity of his assassins remains a mystery although several studies conjecture that Hutu extremists were responsible for his death.
Two related puzzles are evident. Firstly, the occurrence of genocide in Rwanda but not in Burundi is puzzling given the striking similarity between the two countries. Secondly, a gap in the literature exists in regard to the explanation of this outcome. This study investigates these puzzles by addressing the following question: *Why did total genocide occur in Rwanda but not in Burundi?* The research presented in this dissertation argues that a synthesis of historical institutionalist and prospect theory approaches best explains why genocide was undertaken by segments of the ruling elite in Rwanda in the early 1990s.

The current chapter is structured as follows. The chapter first briefly addresses the variety of explanatory models used to explain group violence in Rwanda and Burundi, including studies that address the relationship between institutional factors and collective violence in the African countries. This chapter places special focus on the difficulties these theories share in regard to structure and agency, as well as the common assumption that actors behave as rational-utility maximizers.

The current chapter next presents an integrative approach to explaining the relationship between democratization and collective violence, along with a brief discussion of the two theories that provide the rationale for this approach: historical institutionalism and prospect theory. This dissertation suggests that this new approach resolves a number of the shortcomings in the previously described literatures. This chapter next provides a brief discussion regarding the methodology used in this dissertation, and concludes with an outline of the chapters that follow.

**Summary of Existing Explanations**

Most of the major studies that have been written on the Rwandan genocide explain the genocide as the outcome of a variety of structural conditions, including a pluralized society, civil war, economic stagnation, and resource scarcity. What all of these macro-level theories assume in essence is that a combination of bad circumstances predisposed the political elite of Rwanda to target the Tutsi and

---

moderate Hutu populations for destruction. A number of studies that seek to explain the violence in Burundi offer a similar argument (see for example Harff 1998, and Davies et al. 1998).

What is unfortunate about these structural explanations is that they do not provide a sufficient connection between larger-scale phenomena and the decision of political actors to commit genocide or in the case of Burundi, to revert to lesser forms of violence. Instead, these studies frequently rely on the implicit assumption that political actors in one or both cases behaved in a manner that was more consistent with the assumptions of rational choice. From this point of view, structural factors induced the incumbent political elite of both countries to perpetrate genocide and/or other human rights atrocities purely for strategic reasons (e.g. to preserve scarce resources for the dominant group, to maintain political and economic control etc.).

The fact that none of these studies provides any evidence that demonstrates the incumbent elites of Rwanda and Burundi conducted a cost-benefit analysis of the policy options with which they were faced creates a problem of revealed preferences. In other words, policy preferences are derived from the policy choices made by actors which are a function of context. Consequently, it becomes extremely difficult for the reader to discern exactly how structural conditions led the leaders of both countries to behave in the particular manner they did. This latter issue is especially troublesome given that similar conditions of risk in Burundi produced an entirely different outcome. If it is indeed the case that economic downfall, a pluralized society, a history of group violence and resource scarcity induced political leaders to commit genocide in Rwanda, than nearly identical conditions in Burundi should have led the incumbent Tutsi elite to an identical policy choice.

All of the major studies written on the genocide in Rwanda contend that genocide was the more cost-effective policy option available to the conservative Hutu elite at the time. However, evidence presented in this dissertation demonstrates that genocide was objectively the costlier alternative relative to

---

4 Similar to theories that explain collective revolutionary behavior, this assumption is necessary in order to connect structure to individual action (for more on this point, see Berejikian 1992: 649).
participation in the Broad-Based Transitional Government.\textsuperscript{5} Furthermore, the benefits associated with a plan of genocide were by no means a foregone conclusion. It was highly likely that any attempt made by the Hutu to annihilate the Tutsi population would reignite the civil war with the Tutsi-led rebel group the Front Patriotique Rwandais ("RPF"), and the chances that the Rwandan military would be defeated in this war were substantial.\textsuperscript{6}

A second group of studies considered by this dissertation explore the causes of the genocide from a rational choice perspective. However, these studies experience a number of problems that are similar in many ways to those encountered by the aforementioned structural analyses. These individual-level studies contend that extreme forms of collective violence are a function of several different factors including the level of information members of one communal group have regarding the intentions of the other, the varying degrees of trust that exist between groups, the presence or absence of informal institutions to mediate inter-group conflict, and the existence of weak state leaders.\textsuperscript{7}

However, like the macro-level explanations of collective violence in Rwanda and Burundi, these rational choice studies are also unable to provide an adequate link between structure and agency. What is more often the case is that contextual elements are completely excluded from consideration. The state as an actor is rarely taken into account by these studies, and little emphasis is placed on the effect that past atrocities or current unfavorable conditions have on group identities and inter-group relations. As a result, the decision to commit genocide, or to engage in genocidal behavior, appears to occur as if in a vacuum.

\textsuperscript{5} The Broad-Based Transitional Government (or “BBTG”) was the transitional multiparty government mandated by the Arusha Accords. Like the joint-rule system of government in Burundi, the BBTG was to be a presidential-parliamentary system of government and was to include members of the former ruling party, the opposition parties and the RPF.

\textsuperscript{6} The RPF was a military group made up largely of members of the Tutsi Diaspora who had fled to Uganda from Rwanda following the 1959-1961 overthrow of the Tutsi monarchy. Among the leaders of the organization was Paul Kagame, current President of the Republic of Rwanda. From the start of the civil war in 1990 the RPF had proven its strength as a viable fighting force. By early 1993, the RPF had captured control of a large segment of territory in northern Rwanda and had been making substantial progress towards the capital city before being persuaded to return to the negotiating table.

\textsuperscript{7} Examples of the individual-level studies this dissertation examines are the studies by Fearon and Laitin (1996) and Bhavnani and Backer (2000).
Additionally, all of these rational choice studies rely on assumptions about group relations and human behavior that are somewhat unrealistic and less than applicable to the cases of Rwanda and Burundi. In some of these studies, it is assumed that contending groups lack information about the intentions of the other or that inter-group contact is infrequent. As this dissertation demonstrates, the Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda and Burundi have historically had close contact with one another through a variety of formal and informal institutional settings.

Furthermore, similar to the structural studies discussed previously, all of these individual-level studies assume that under similar conditions of risk actors will utilize the same type of decision rule. In both cases the costs associated with a plan to regain control of the government were very similar. In Rwanda, an attempt to reverse the democratization process meant civil war and a likely RPF victory. In Burundi, because the Hutu have always constituted the vast majority of the population, any organized attempt by the Tutsi to overthrow the Hutu-majority government that was elected into office in 1993 was highly likely to lead to a complete shift in the balance of power, with the Hutu assuming total control over the governing system.⁸ That the bulk of the Tutsi incumbent elite instead chose to deal with multiparty democratization in a cautious, risk-averse manner makes the commission of genocide in Rwanda appear quite irrational.

Studies that explore the relationship between democratization and communal violence in the African countries and elsewhere assume in one way or another that group violence is a function of the method of institutional change, its end result, and/or the lasting influence of pre-existing institutional arrangements. Whether these studies approach this topic from a qualitative or quantitative standpoint, and regardless of their focus of analysis, they all contend that communal violence is greater in countries in which the governing system is neither fully authoritarian nor fully democratic.⁹

---

⁸ Of course this is only conjecture. It should be noted, however, that there were insurgent Hutu groups operating in and around Burundi at the time of the October 1993 coup, some of whom were receiving assistance from Hutu extremists in Rwanda.

Although institutional arguments tend to provide more comprehensive explanations of collective behavior, most encounter structure-agency problems similar to the structural explanations of group violence. They generally fall short in establishing a connection between institutional factors and the behavior of individual decision-makers; instead institutions are depicted by these studies as a “black box.”

As this problem pertains to the cases of Rwanda and Burundi more specifically, without sufficient linkage between institutions and actors, it is possible to attribute the policy decisions made by the incumbent elite in both countries to any one of a number of other sources including population pressures, economic stagnation or political instability. This is a problem that is particularly evident in the quantitative democratization studies which more often portray institutions as another form of structure.

As the above discussion indicates, studies that offer meso-level explanations of collective violence tend to rely on many of the same assumptions and encounter many of the same pitfalls as macro- and individual-level studies. Actors are by and large assumed to behave rationally, and violence is portrayed as a strategic tool with which political opponents are controlled and, at the very worst, destroyed by dominant groups. Like the structural studies written on group violence in Rwanda and Burundi, none of the democratization studies includes a decision-making model. As a result, these studies cannot fully explain how institutional change or failure induces the leaders of developing countries to massacre segments of their population, and why this occurs in some places and not others.

The democratization literature also shares with structural studies a number of methodological problems, most of which are associated with the lack of cases used for comparison. For instance, none of the major studies written on the Rwandan genocide compare conditions in Rwanda to those that were simultaneously occurring in Burundi. Likewise, very few of the qualitative democratization studies examined by this dissertation compare and contrast the effects of institutional reform in more than a handful of countries. As a result, the conclusions these studies make regarding the relationship between

---

These studies would agree that the multiparty governments established in Rwanda and Burundi in the early 1990s were hybrid democracies. In both countries, authoritarian practices continued to prevail despite the expansion of civil liberties and in both cases the use of arbitrary force by government actors was quite common.

Furthermore, it can be stated that all of the major studies written on the Rwandan genocide, as well as
structural or institutional factors and communal violence are weak and can seldom be generalized to a larger set of cases.

The studies referenced above cannot adequately explain why total genocide was not also perpetrated by the incumbent ruling elite in Burundi following the introduction of multiparty democracy.\footnote{These macro-, meso-, and micro-level studies are discussed in greater detail in Chapters 2 and 3; the macro-level studies are also further analyzed in Chapter 5 of this dissertation in conjunction with a test of the structural alternative hypothesis.} Much of this is a consequence of the fact that few of these studies include a well-defined decision-making model that fully incorporates context and allows for the possibility that actors use multiple decision rules in their choice-making processes under conditions of risk. As the discussion below indicates, when the rationality of preferences is presented as a matter of individual perception, even the most illogical of choices can be explained.

The Argument

Before discussing the main argument of this dissertation, it is important to first briefly address what this study means by the term “genocide.” This dissertation defines “genocide” as a crime perpetrated by a government or its agents, which is intended to totally destroy a communal group within a country’s borders.\footnote{As indicated in greater detail in Chapter 4 of this study, the definition this study uses is the definition of “genocide” used by Harff (2003).} The type of genocide this study seeks to explain is \textit{total} as opposed to \textit{partial} genocide. While there is some dispute as to whether or not a partial genocide occurred following the collapse of multiparty democracy in Burundi in October 1993, there is no doubt as to the type of genocide that was perpetrated by the Hutu extremists in Rwanda in 1994.\footnote{However, with regard to Burundi, there is little contention among scholars over the fact that the country did enter a period of civil war after the murder of President Ndadaye (see Reyntjens 1995).}

Additionally, it is important to acknowledge that this study is no way attempting to explain the crime of genocide as a whole. Instead, what this study seeks to explain is the occurrence of total genocide.
during periods of institutional change. Seen in this light, total genocide is considered by this study to be an obvious indicator of a failed democratic transition.

This dissertation hypothesizes that what affected the success or failure of the democratic transitions that took place in Rwanda and Burundi in the early 1990s are institutional legacies. More specifically, this study argues that a history of authoritarian rule in conjunction with a tradition of informal institutions that reinforce social and economic disparities between groups create conditions in which multiparty democracy will be understood by an incumbent ruling group as a threat to its position of dominance. Conversely, when a country has an institutional history that exhibits a greater degree of tolerance and compromise, the likelihood that multiparty democracy will be perceived as *legitimate* by the incumbent ruling elite is increased. The relationship between informal and formal institutions is assumed by this dissertation to be recursive.

This study suggests that multiparty democracy was a “critical juncture” in the institutional development of Rwanda and Burundi. In both cases, democratization also influenced the formation of the types of reference points used by political leaders in their decision to either accept or reject these new multiparty systems. The goal of incumbents in both cases was to maintain control and power within the political system. The strategy (or strategies) actors in both countries selected to achieve this particular goal was a function of the ways in which democratization was framed vis-à-vis these reference points.

As the case of Rwanda demonstrates, the perception of multiparty democracy as a direct threat can induce members of an incumbent elite group to pursue risk-seeking strategies in order to maintain power; to reverse the status quo in other words. Under these conditions, multiparty democracy is doomed to failure. If, however, joint-rule is perceived by political leaders as a legitimate enterprise—or a “gain”—it stands a far better chance of success. In this latter situation, actors will choose instead to follow a risk-averse policy course. As the case of Burundi demonstrates, risk-seeking strategies of total genocide and other forms of mass violence and repression will not be perceived by the incumbent elite as acceptable solutions to the problems associated with joint-rule.
Additionally, as the cases of Rwanda and Burundi make clear, this hypothesized relationship between institutional legacies, institutional change and the choice-making behavior of incumbent political leaders holds even when the process of democratization is taking place under less-than-favorable circumstances.

The argument presented above involves a synthesis of two theories: historical institutionalism and prospect theory. Both theories present an image of social causation that takes context into account. Historical institutionalism differs from prospect theory in that it specifically emphasizes the variety of ways in which institutions impact collective behavior and generate distinctive outcomes. Furthermore, when institutional change occurs, the direction it takes is assumed to be a function of the legacies of institutions—both formal and informal. From this it follows that institutional transition affects different countries in different ways. Historical institutionalism also assumes that institutions influence human behavior by shaping and conditioning the identities and preferences of actors. In other words, the determination of the interests and objectives of political decision-makers are created in institutional contexts and are not separable from them. At the same time, one of the major theoretical deficiencies of historical institutionalism lies in its inability to fully connect institutions to human decision-making behavior. Similar to the democratization studies discussed above, institutions remain a “black box.”

It is in respect to this latter problem that prospect theory is especially useful to the present study. Prospect theory is a decision-making theory that specifically takes into account the impact of contextual factors on human decision-making behavior. Prospect theory assumes that how people choose between the options with which they are faced depends on their perception of these options as gains or losses relative to some neutral reference point.

Furthermore, because people tend to be more averse to losses than gains, if options are framed as a choice between “losses” vis-à-vis a reference point, actors will engage in risky behavior to avoid what they believe to be the least favorable outcome. Under these conditions, decision-makers become risk-

---

14 That historical institutionalism shares this particular problem with democratization studies is not a surprise. As discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3 of this study, most of the democratization studies rely on
acceptant *despite* the fact that the costs associated with the option selected clearly outweigh the costs of the foregone alternative. Conversely, if a choice between options is framed as a choice between *positive* outcomes, actors will avoid taking a gamble on the option with equal or greater expected value. In the current study, this translates into the suggestion that total genocide was perceived by the conservative Hutu elite of Rwanda as the “lesser of two evils” relative to joint-rule with the Tutsi and moderate Hutu. In Burundi the use of mass violence as a means to regain total control of the government was a gamble that the bulk of the Tutsi incumbent elite were *unwilling* to undertake.

Prospect theory too possesses its own set of flaws, however. Foremost among these is the theory’s inability to predict the reference points that actors use in their choice-making processes. It is in this respect that historical institutionalism—specifically the theoretical concept of the critical juncture—is especially relevant. Critical junctures are periods of institutional change that alter the trajectory of institutional development in a country. This study suggests that in cases in which countries are making the transition from authoritarian to democratic rule, institutions can serve as the reference point that guides the decision-making behavior of the incumbent elite. Under these particular conditions, if an incumbent elite group *cannot* adjust to the losses in power associated with the advent of multiparty rule, it will use the former governing system (e.g. the former status quo) as its reference point. The opposite is also true: if the ruling elite can successfully make the adjustment to multiparty rule, then the new system of government becomes the reference point around which the group assesses its options.

The combined use of prospect theory and historical institutionalism greatly improves on existing macro-, meso-, and individual-level theories that attempt to explain the relationship between regime change and group violence in Rwanda, Burundi and elsewhere in the developing world. On the one hand, a synthesis of both theories permits the formation of an explanation in which larger-scale causal factors

---

15 This assumption is demonstrated by the convex function of the utility-function of choice under risk. The fact that the difference between the sure loss and the worst outcome of the gamble is depicted in the flatter region of the s-curve indicates that the losses individuals may incur from a gamble mean *less* to them than incurring no losses at all (Kahneman and Tversky 1982: 162). In other words, people are less sensitive to larger losses. The same also applies to gains (see Tversky and Kahneman 1991: 1039-1040).
are more closely integrated with individual-level variables. At the same time, the use of a decision-model based on the assumptions of prospect theory overcomes many of the explanatory deficiencies frequently encountered by studies that rely in one way or another on the assumptions of rational choice.

The main hypothesis proposed by this dissertation is tested against two alternative hypotheses, the first of which suggests that a pluralized society in combination with economic stagnation, resource scarcity due to high population density, and communal violence, precipitated the total genocide that occurred in Rwanda in 1994. To disconfirm this structural hypothesis, this dissertation demonstrates that virtually identical conditions were simultaneously prevailing in Rwanda and Burundi in the years prior to, and during the transition to multiparty democracy, and total genocide resulted in only one of these two countries.

The second alternative hypothesis examined by this study suggests that the incumbent political elites in Rwanda and Burundi responded to the prospect of democratization in a manner consistent with the assumptions of rational choice. In other words, leaders weighed the costs and benefits of all options before them and chose that which carried with it the lowest cost relative to benefit. According to this argument, total genocide is a cost-effective means of maintaining power for a ruling elite group.

To disconfirm the rational choice hypothesis, this study demonstrates that the costs associated with risk-seeking strategies were quite high relative to the other options available to political leaders in both countries at the time and these costs were completely disregarded only in the case of Rwanda. Although it is true a segment of the Tutsi elite in Burundi also opted to pursue a risk-seeking strategy in response to the transfer of power, the vast majority did not. Faced with circumstances similar to those in Rwanda, the incumbent elite in Burundi reached an entirely different conclusion about multiparty rule. It is this variation in outcome which indicates that multiple decision rules were at play. In a certain way, the structural and rational choice alternative hypotheses examined by this study are interrelated. By disconfirming the first hypothesis, the ground is set for a refutation of the second.
Methodology

To test the main and alternative hypotheses, the current study utilizes a most similar systems design. All of the similarities between Rwanda and Burundi, including a period of economic downturn, and a history of ethnic discord are used as controls. The main independent variables examined are the various types of informal and formal institutions that pre-existed multiparty democracy. The intervening variable is multiparty democracy, and the dependent variable is the decision to commit total genocide.

A focus on the influence that indigenous institutions have on the process of institutional change reflects one of the major assumptions of historical institutionalism. The core assumption of path-dependency asserts that the development of institutions “cannot be understood in isolation from the political and social setting in which they are embedded” (Thelen 1999: 384). Given that different institutions rest on different foundations, the outcomes associated with institutional change are therefore likely to reflect these institutional differences.

The first of the two main independent variables is social structures. Social structures is defined by the types of social cleavages present within each of the two societies—either cross-cutting or reinforcing. Briefly, cross-cutting cleavages among social groups are said to exist when individuals identify with more than one communal group. Conversely, in a society that is marked by reinforcing cleavages, citizens identify primarily with the group with which they share certain characteristics (e.g. language, ethnicity, religion etc.).

This dissertation contends that the greater the presence of cross-cutting cleavages in a society, the greater the tendency towards political moderation and the better the foundations for democratic rule. Conversely, the presence of reinforcing cleavages in society is assumed to be a sign that more exclusive and inflexible social structures prevail. As the case of Yugoslavia perhaps best demonstrates, a predominance of reinforcing cleavages does not bode especially well for the prospect of democracy in multiethnic countries.

The variable, social structures, is measured both quantitatively and qualitatively. This dissertation examines two quantitative indices which tap into the levels of social distinction present
between groups in multiethnic countries—the Cultural Differentials Index and the Economic Differentials Index provided by the Minorities at Risk dataset compiled by the Center for International Development and Conflict Management, University of Maryland.

This study also measures social structures qualitatively by the type of civil society present within both countries. For both cases, this dissertation examines associational membership and the nature of the relationship between civil society associations and the state in order to determine whether civil society in both countries was more or less conducive to the formation of cross-cutting social cleavages. Additionally, the kinds of social structures that shaped group relations in Burundi and Rwanda are assessed by the traditional systems of social ranking, patron-client relations and group mediation in each country, as well as by the influence of regional identities. Data for these qualitative measures of social structures are obtained from historical analyses of both countries, including studies by Lemarchand (1970, 1992, 1994a), C. Newbury (1978, 1988) and Prunier (1995).

The second of the two main explanatory variables is traditional political institutions. “Traditional” in this sense refers to the formal political institutions that existed in Rwanda and Burundi prior to the institutional changes enacted in 1991 and 1992, respectively. The variable also encompasses the reforms made to the indigenous institutions in Rwanda and Burundi by the Belgian colonial authorities in the early to mid-20th century. Several qualitative studies of the two countries demonstrate that a full assessment of the colonial period is necessary in order to fully explain the relationship between institutions and group relations in both countries (see for example, Mamdami 2001, Lemarchand 1970, 1994a, 1994b, Newbury 1988, Prunier 1995).

Similar to social structures, traditional political institutions is measured by this dissertation using both quantitative and qualitative indicators. One of the first measures of traditional political institutions this study considers is the Political Differentials Index from the Minorities at Risk dataset. Additionally, traditional political institutions is measured by each country’s Polity2 score, degree of political centralization, method of executive recruitment, executive constraints, political competition, political participation and recruitment, and political paradigm. Data for all of these measures are partially obtained.
from the *Polity IV* dataset from the Center for International Development and Conflict Management, University of Maryland. In addition, data are acquired from qualitative historical studies of political development in both countries.

Four control variables examined by this study represent the various structural conditions that several scholars argue led to the genocide in Rwanda. These variables are *pluralized society, domestic conflict, demographic stress* and *economic health*. *Pluralized society* is measured by the population percentages of Hutu and Tutsi in both countries. *Domestic conflict* is measured with a number of indices from the *Minorities at Risk* dataset, including those that indicate the presence or absence of rebellion, political protest, and intra-group conflict. Additionally, data used to assess *domestic conflict* are obtained from qualitative studies of the history of intra- and inter-group relations in Rwanda and Burundi. The control variable *demographic stress* is measured by population density per square kilometer and square kilometer of arable land, annual food production and amount of food aid received. Lastly, *economic health* is measured with a variety of indicators commonly used to assess a country’s economic status and level of development, including GDP per capita, Human Development Index score, percentage of population living below the poverty line, and level of external debt. Excluding *domestic conflict*, data for all of these control variables are acquired from sources such as the World Bank, the Food and Agricultural Organization, and the United Nations Development Programme.

To fully assess the impact that institutional legacies and structural conditions had on the occurrence of institutional change and collective violence in both countries, the period for which the main explanatory and control variables are examined is the period broadly extending from the mid-19th century until the time at which the presidents of both countries were assassinated. Unfortunately data for the period *prior* to the 19th century are largely unavailable. In any event, this study contends that the time period considered is sufficiently long enough to allow this dissertation to reach a number of definitive conclusions regarding the relationships in question.

As indicated above, the intervening variable examined by this study is *multiparty democracy*. *Multiparty democracy* refers to the period of institutional reform that began in each country in the early
1990s. *Multiparty democracy* also represents the period of time for which this study assesses the views incumbent politicians and party members in both countries held regarding the shift from single party to multiparty rule. Stated differently, the perceptions of the incumbent political elite in each country are examined as they relate to the intervening variable.

To achieve this task, this dissertation performs a content analysis on statements made to the foreign and domestic media by the incumbent ruling elite in both countries. The specific purpose of this content analysis is to test a number of secondary hypotheses regarding the influence that context had on the decision-making processes of political actors. To demonstrate that multiple decision rules were utilized by political incumbents in Rwanda and Burundi, this study shows that most of the arguments made by speakers concerning the appropriate measures to be taken in response to institutional change were arguments in which a reference point was used. This dissertation also demonstrates that a correlation exists between the type of reference point utilized by speakers and the type of policy advocated. By confirming these relationships, this study is be able to negate the rational choice alternative hypothesis.

To provide a more comprehensive explanation of the nature of the opinions and views that were held by members of the Tutsi and Hutu incumbent elite during the period of democratic transition, the data obtained from the content analysis are supplemented with qualitative data obtained from reports and studies issued by organizations such as Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, ARTICLE 19, the United States Institute of Peace, and Médicins Sans Frontières, and by scholars such as Lemarchand (1994a), and Reyntjens (1995).¹⁶

**Plan of Dissertation**

In the chapters that follow, all of the concepts and relationships addressed in the current chapter are discussed in greater detail. Chapter 2 of this dissertation provides a thorough review and analysis of

---

¹⁶ Some of these studies are included with the structural studies discussed previously. Also, additional qualitative data is necessary to achieve correlative validity for the results obtained from the content analysis.
existing theories regarding the relationship between structural and/or institutional factors and the occurrence of collective violence in Rwanda, Burundi and elsewhere in the developing world. Also considered in Chapter 2 are studies that attempt to explain these episodes of communal violence with standard utility models. Close attention is given to the problems all three groups of explanations encounter with structure and agency, as well as the assumption that political actors behave rationally. The overarching purpose of Chapter 2 is to demonstrate the need for an integrative theory that combines institutions with a decision-making model that incorporates context as a factor in the process of individual choice.

Chapter 3 lays out the main argument of this dissertation. Following a brief review of the studies examined in the previous chapter, the concept of an integrative approach is introduced. Focus is placed on the value such an approach has for explaining the relationship between regime change and collective violence in Rwanda and Burundi. Chapter 3 then provides an analysis and discussion of the two theories that constitute the foundation of the integrative theory developed by this study. The core assumptions of historical institutionalism and prospect theory are addressed, as well as the primary obstacle each encounters in explaining variations in choice behavior.

The focus of Chapter 3 is then directed towards the ways in which a combination of both theories resolves these obstacles, as well as the theoretical difficulties mentioned previously in connection with structural, democratization and game-theory explanations of collective violence. Building on the combined insights of historical institutionalism and prospect theory, Chapter 3 next specifies a theory of collective violence centered on the connection between institutional legacies, the process of democratization, and the perceptions of political actors. Chapter 3 concludes with a discussion regarding the benefits a synthesis of both theories has for the study of regime change in the developing countries specifically, as well as for the discipline of political science more generally.

Chapter 4 lays out the research design used by this dissertation. The chapter begins with an in-depth discussion of the importance of a most similar systems design for studies that examine a smaller number of cases, the problems associated with the use of a most similar systems design, and the various
ways in which these difficulties are resolved by the present study. Next, Chapter 4 addresses each of the variables examined by this dissertation. Discussion is provided regarding the various ways in which the dependent, explanatory and control variables are measured, the theoretical basis for their inclusion in this study, and the sources of data used to assess each. This section of the chapter also introduces the first alternative hypothesis tested by this dissertation, which is a hypothesis that posits a relationship between structural conditions and the genocide in Rwanda.

The discussion in Chapter 4 then turns to the importance a within-systems analysis has for studies that rely on a fewer number of cases. A number of secondary hypotheses, which apply specifically to the relationship between the intervening variable—multiparty democracy—and the preferences of political decision-makers in both cases, is then introduced and discussed. Chapter 4 also introduces the second alternative hypothesis which posits that political decision-makers in both countries behaved as rational utility maximizers. Chapter 4 then addresses the particular method of within-case analysis with which all of these hypotheses are to be tested. The method of content analysis is discussed in extensive detail, along with its use and application to the present study.

Chapter 5 provides a test of the first alternative hypothesis. Each of the structural control variables—pluralized society, domestic conflict, demographic stress and economic health—is examined in extensive detail to demonstrate that similar conditions existed in both countries during similar periods of time. The analysis provided in Chapter 5 not only disconfirms the structural alternative hypothesis, it also demonstrates that institutional rather than structural factors are the most likely causes of the particular variation in outcome examined by this study.

Chapters 6 and 7 examine the effect social structures and traditional political institutions had on predisposing political leaders in both countries to either accept or reject the institutions of multiparty democracy. In both chapters, special emphasis is placed on the recursive relationship between these two explanatory variables.

The analysis provided in Chapter 6 demonstrates the extent to which traditional informal institutions varied between both countries. The data shows that traditionally informal institutions or
social structures in Rwanda have been premised on an ideal of social exclusion and closely tied to the political dominance of the ruling group. In Burundi the data demonstrates that the existence of a more complex and fluid social system, separate from the political system, contributed to a greater presence of cross-cutting cleavages in Burundian society, as well as a tradition of cooperation and consensus-building.

Although the types of political systems that emerged in each country in the post-independence era can easily be categorized as single party authoritarian regimes, the ruling systems that pre-existed independence differed quite substantially. Chapter 7 demonstrates that the traditional political institutions in Burundi lacked the high degree of centralization that characterized the institutions of Tutsi rule in Rwanda. Unlike Rwanda, the political systems in Burundi, both before and after independence, were not premised on a doctrine of group supremacy.

Chapter 7 concludes with a lengthy discussion regarding the ways in which the combined effects of social structures and traditional political institutions influenced the path of democratization in both countries. This segment of the chapter demonstrates that the institutional legacies of ethnic parity and cooperation in Burundi precipitated a greater inclusion of opposition groups in the democratization process, and permitted the initial stages of a peaceful transfer of power. Conversely, a greater presence of reinforcing cleavages in Rwanda, in combination with institutions of governance dominated exclusively by the Hutu, contributed to a perception that democratization was a zero-sum contest between the advocates and opponents of absolute Hutu rule. Members of the Hutu elite who held this particular view—including the president of the Republic, the former ruling party, and factions of extremists—largely responded to the prospect of joint-rule with a risk-seeking strategy of violence.

Chapter 8 of this dissertation examines this argument further with an individual-level analysis of the perceptions of multiparty democracy held by members of the political elite in both countries. In so doing, Chapter 8 provides a test of the second alternative hypothesis, as well as tests of the secondary hypotheses which pertain to the relationship between institutional change and individual perception. The results of the content analysis performed by this study largely substantiate all of the relationships posited.
by these secondary hypotheses. More specifically, Chapter 8 demonstrates that the arguments made by members of the incumbent political elite in Rwanda and Burundi—either for or against democratization—are consistent with the assumptions of prospect theory.

More specifically, the data presented in Chapter 8 show that most of the policy arguments made by speakers were those in which reference points were used. Speakers who used the former system of authoritarian rule as their reference point demonstrated a greater preference for risk-seeking policies that would stall or completely obstruct the democratization process (“high risk” policies). The data also show that speakers who framed multiparty democracy as a gain were more likely to advocate risk-averse policies, or policies meant to further the democratization process. The fact that most of these relationships are found by this study to be significant disconfirms the rational choice alternative hypothesis.

The concluding chapter of this dissertation, Chapter 9, provides a summation of this study’s findings. Chapter 9 first discusses the findings obtained from the qualitative between-systems analysis. Focus is placed on the ways in which institutional traditions influenced the perceptions political actors in both countries held regarding democratization. Next, Chapter 9 discusses the results of the content analysis performed by this study. Close attention is given to the various ways in which the behavior of actors in both cases is consistent with many of the core assumptions of prospect theory. Lastly, areas of future research are discussed, along with the implications this dissertation’s findings have for studies written on the Rwandan genocide, studies that examine regime change and violence in the developing world, as well as for the discipline of political science more generally.
CHAPTER 2
EXPLANATIONS OF COLLECTIVE VIOLENCE
IN RWANDA AND BURUNDI

As indicated in the previous chapter, there are a variety of theories commonly used to explain the origins of collective violence in Rwanda and Burundi. This dissertation focuses specifically on three groups of theories, some of which have in common basic assumptions regarding the causal relationship between contextual elements and the occurrence of violence between groups; all of which share the assumption that political leaders behave as rational utility maximizers.

The first group of studies this chapter considers explains the violence in Rwanda and Burundi as being an outcome of structural conditions, such as population density and socioeconomic status. The second group of studies this chapter reviews are quantitative and qualitative analyses that focus specifically on the causal impact that institutions and institutional change have on the frequency of inter- and intra-group violence in Rwanda, Burundi and in other African countries. This chapter places special emphasis on the problems both the structural and democratization studies experience with structure and agency, as well as the assumption that political leaders behave in a manner predicted by rational choice.

Next, this chapter turns to a group of studies which examine ethnic conflict strictly from a micro-level perspective. Consideration is given to two problems these studies share with the preceding groups of analyses: (1) an inability to adequately explain the source of the variation in the responses of political leaders to similar conditions; (2) a failure to establish a clear connection between context and individual behavior. This chapter concludes with a brief summation of the literature reviewed and a few brief remarks concerning the subject matter addressed in the next chapter.
Macro-level Explanations of Genocide and Collective Violence

Most of the structural studies considered by this dissertation specifically address the genocide in Rwanda. Others, including those by Krain (1997) and Harff (2003), examine collective violence in Rwanda and Burundi from a broader comparative perspective. All of these studies assume that certain combinations of structural factors or conditions are responsible for the numerous instances of group violence that have plagued both countries in recent decades.

On a more general note, the analysis of these macro-level explanations is kept brief given that many of these same studies are analyzed in greater detail in Chapter 5 of this dissertation in conjunction with a test of the first alternative hypothesis.

Although structural explanations of the violence in Rwanda and Burundi differ to the extent that they emphasize the causal significance of certain structural circumstances over others, they all rely on the general assumption that pluralized societies are especially prone to ethnic conflict given the right mix of circumstances. 17 Whereas some structural studies consider the size or the number of communal groups to be the significant causal factor in group violence in multiethnic societies, others attribute communal violence more specifically to group perceptions of “the other” (see for instance the studies by African Rights 1995, Des Forges 1999, Uvin 1998, 1999, and Prunier 1995). 18 In this context, it is assumed that

---

17 According to Kuper (1981: 57-58), pluralized societies are those in which inequalities are superimposed across all spheres of a society. Because a subordinate group or groups remain “outside the universe of obligation of the dominant group,” any crimes committed against them are subsequently perceived as acceptable by the dominant group (Fein 1979b: 9, 1993: 36-37). More generally, the causal role of a pluralized society in group conflict is an assumption that is shared by many of the studies that specifically address the causes of genocide and those which focus more exclusively on the factors that precipitate conflict between ethnic groups (see for example the studies by Fein 1979b, Melson 1992, Chalk and Jonassohn 1990, Gurr 1993, Horowitz 1985, Morrison and Stevenson 1972, Van den Berghe 1981 and Tilly 1978).

18 This is also an assumption that is made by studies that apply more of an institutionalist perspective to the conflict in Rwanda and Burundi (see for example Lemarchand 1970, 1994a, and Mamdani 2001). More generally, much of the disagreement concerning group identity in the cases of Rwanda and Burundi is a matter of the theoretical perspective adhered to by scholars (Lemarchand 1994a: chap. 1), (Mamdani 2001: chap. 2). Primordialist arguments assume that ethnic identity is ground in characteristics that are inherent or primordial, such as physical attributes, language, and place of origin. These arguments further assume that communal groups mobilize against one another in an effort to defend their identity and culture against encroachment from other groups (see Gurr and Harff 1994: 192, Geertz 1973, Van den Berghe 1981, Horowitz 1985; for a more complete explanation of the primordialist argument, see also Thompson 1989, Fearon and Laitan 2000). Studies that use a primordialist argument to explain the history of violence in Rwanda and/or Burundi include those by Horowitz (1985), Forster et al. (2000), and to some extent the study by Prunier (1995: 16-17). The problems associated with
the identities “Hutu” and “Tutsi” are not static, but have been shaped by historical circumstances and experiences.\textsuperscript{19}

Most structural studies consider a history of communal violence—including instances of violent government repression and abuse—to have been an especially significant factor in reifying group identities and social cleavages in Rwanda and Burundi.\textsuperscript{20} Many of these studies further contend that the effects of inter-group violence have not been confined solely to the country in which the violence occurred. Instead, it is believed that events such as the 1972 genocide of the Hutu intelligentsia in Burundi, the October 1993 assassination of Burundian President Melchoir Ndadaye and the massacres associated with the 1959 Hutu revolution in Rwanda, left an especially negative imprint on group relations in the neighboring country—both in a real and in an abstract sense (Uvin 1998), (Harff 1998), (Prunier 1995), (Des Forges 1999).\textsuperscript{21}

The primordialist argument is most often countered by the argument that communal groups use their identities as a means to attain, or defend, certain material benefits (see Tilly 1978, Bates 1983, Thompson 1989). In the context of Rwanda, instrumentalist arguments consider the Hutu and Tutsi to be rational actors who use their identities to pursue what is in the collective interests of group members (Bates 1983; see also Lemarchand 1994a). One of the problems associated with the use of instrumentalist arguments more generally is that they often tend to ignore the affective aspects associated with communal identity, one of which is a “shared sense of injustice or principle” (Carment 1993: 139; as this point applies to social identities in Burundi, see Lemarchand 1994a: 31).

\textsuperscript{19} Although there may be some objective basis for the origin of these particular identities, scholars such as Uvin (1998), Des Forges (1999), Lemarchand (1994a) and many others suggest that over time each has become a socially constructed, “imagined community.”

\textsuperscript{20} From a more general perspective, Fearon and Laitin suggest that the use of violence by elites impacts group identities in two ways: firstly, violence “alters the social content associated with being a member of each category,” which in turn precipitates further group violence out of vengeance. Secondly, the use of violence is a rational means to clearly establish group boundaries (2000: 865).

\textsuperscript{21} This interactive relationship between Rwanda and Burundi is generally believed by scholars who have written on one or both countries to be an outcome of their parallel patterns of political, social and economic development. According to Gurr, the impact that violence or protest by kindred groups has on increasing the opportunity for successful rebellion in another society is a function of a variety of factors. In some cases, rebellious activity serves as a source of symbolic support for kinsmen in neighboring countries. Additionally, kindred groups remain viable sources for financial, military and logistical aid (Gurr 1998: 19). In the cases of Burundi and Rwanda, studies indicate that both factors were present (see Prunier 1995, Uvin 1998, African Rights 1995, Des Forges 1999, Harff 1998, Davies et al. 1998). Although his study focuses more specifically on the impact of democratization on the occurrence of group conflict and genocide in Burundi and Rwanda, Mann also considers the influence of “escalating interactions” between the two countries (2005: 434-436; for additional discussion on this particular point, see also Chapter 3 of this study).
Adding further insult to injury in both cases has been the “culture of impunity” associated with these episodes of violence. As this pertains to Rwanda more specifically, a number of scholars partially attribute the commission of the genocide in 1994 to the lack of accountability the government and its agents experienced for the numerous human rights atrocities that were perpetrated during the civil war and as a result of the legalization of multiparty rule in 1991 (African Rights 1995), (Prunier 1995), (Kakwenzire and Kamukama 1999), (Verwimp 2000: 44), (Longman 1999: 348-350). These studies suggest that this culture of impunity created an atmosphere that only encouraged further violence and mayhem.22

In one way or another, all of the studies discussed above assume that violence in Rwanda and/or Burundi was a rational strategy enacted on the part of political leaders to retain or acquire political power.23 A number of other studies additionally assume that the violence that occurred in both countries in the early 1990s was a rational strategy intended by its perpetrators as a means of population control. The focus of analysis of this latter group of studies is more specifically the relationship between population density and the frequency of collective violence and bloodshed.

Uvin (1998) has made the useful distinction between arguments that take a “hard” and “soft” Malthusian approach to addressing the causal role of resource scarcity in Rwanda. Hard Malthusian arguments suggest that collective violence is the direct result of the disproportion between a country’s population growth and its natural resources. These arguments posit: “Under conditions of severe

---

22 Similar suggestions have been applied to Burundi (see for example the studies by Uvin 1998, Lemarchand 1994a, and Weinstein 1985). Many of the studies written on Rwanda and Burundi consider the lack of international condemnation of the abuses perpetrated by the governments of both countries to have been a major contributing factor to the creation of a culture of impunity. As Fein suggests with regard to the commission of genocide more generally, “insulation from foreign influence and the indifference of foreign states and international and regional organizations enables and reinforces the use of genocide by the perpetrators” (1993: 39; see also Harff 1987, Mazian 1990). As this applies to Rwanda, scholars have attributed this “internationalized form of impunity” to a variety of factors, including an absence of will on the part of western countries to intervene in the internal affairs of a small impoverished African country, as well as to the military and financial support given to the Habyarimana regime by countries such as France (see for example the studies by Des Forges 1999, Prunier 1995, African Rights 1995, Kakwenzire and Kamukama 1999, Longman 1999). Others, such as Uvin, attribute the culture of impunity in Rwanda to the actions of the international aid community (1998: 42-46, chap. 5, 1999).

23 Closely related to this suggestion is the “repeat offender hypothesis” in the genocide and ethnic conflict literature which suggests: “Perpetrators of genocide often are repeat offenders, because elites and security forces
population and land imbalance—when countries have exceeded their ‘carrying capacity’ (that is, the number of people that can be fed using their natural resources)—the only outcome possible is famine and/or conflict” (Uvin 1998: 180-181).

The theoretical perspective most commonly applied to the case of Rwanda is a soft Malthusian approach (Uvin 1998: 182-183). This argument contends that certain elements mediate the impact that environmental factors have on group relations. Although it is also assumed by these studies that environmental vulnerability is a fixed problem that societies face, how much of a threat it poses is assumed to be a function of the particular political and social institutions in place within a country.

Closely related to resource scarcity arguments are those which consider economic crises to have been a variable of particular importance in the violence that occurred in Rwanda. All of the qualitative structural studies written on the genocide, including those by Prunier (1995), Uvin (1998), African Rights (1995), and Des Forges (1999), posit that a severe bout of economic distress—brought on by the collapse of the international coffee market, the imposition of a structural adjustment program, and civil war—increased the likelihood that genocide would occur by exacerbating inter-group hostilities and by decreasing the security of the ruling elite. Under these circumstances, economic tensions and frustrations were subject to political manipulation by the incumbent Hutu elite.

The foremost problem encountered by all of the structural studies written specifically on the genocide in Rwanda is that they cannot explain why similar conditions in Burundi did not produce a similar outcome. The evidence presented in Chapter 5 of this dissertation demonstrates that circumstances in Burundi in the late 1980s and early 1990s were similar—if not worse in many ways—to the Rwandan context. "People may become habituated to mass killing as a strategic response to challenges to state security and, also, because targeted groups are rarely destroyed in their entirety” (Harff 2003: 62; see also Fein 1993, Uvin 1998: 221).

According to Uvin (1998) an example of a study that applies this particular perspective to the case of Rwanda is the study by King (1994). Among the studies which Uvin suggests apply a soft Malthusian approach to the cases of Rwanda and/or Burundi are the studies by Prunier (1995), Percival and Homer-Dixon (1995), Olson (1995), Ford (1995) and his own 1996a study.

This particular argument is firmly grounded in the literature on genocide and ethnic conflict which assumes that economic distress in fragmented societies aggravates tensions between dominant and subordinate groups (see for example the studies by Zenner 1987, Fein 1979b, Chalk and Jonassohn 1990, Mazian 1990, Harff 1987, Gurr and Harff 1994, Staub 1989 and Melson 1992).
those in Rwanda. If the “repeat offender” hypothesis holds any merit whatsoever, the likelihood that a second genocide would occur in Burundi was significant, particularly given the military’s past experiences with mass murder. Unfortunately, few of the above-mentioned studies offer any sort of systematic comparison between the two countries. As a result, the conclusions they reach concerning the relationship between macro-level factors and genocide are tenuous at best.27

The few scholars that do address the issue of variation in outcome attribute the difference in the scale of violence that occurred in both countries to the number of “accelerating events” which immediately preceded these conflicts. Discussed in further detail in the fifth chapter of this dissertation, the analyses by Harff (1998) and Davies et al. (1998) suggest that the occurrence of a greater number of accelerating events in Rwanda, in conjunction with various other pre-conditional circumstances—both background and intervening—resulted in total genocide. In Burundi, a lesser number of very similar events led to a completely different outcome: civil war. Unfortunately, neither can explain why a certain frequency of events prompted decision-makers to select a policy of genocide in one case but not the other.

The source of this explanatory deficiency is an attribute that is common to all of the structural studies discussed above, as well as to macro-level explanations more generally. It is the problem of structure and agency in which human behavior, preferences and interests are depicted as being pre-determined by larger-scale factors, such as a pluralized society.28

In his analysis of macro- and individual-level explanations of collective revolutionary behavior, Berejikian suggests that, in order to overcome the structure-agency dilemma, the former explanations indirectly rely on an assumption that actors “employ a decision rule akin to a microeconomic rational

---

27 On a separate note, it is somewhat ironic that no comparison between these two countries is provided given that all of these studies consider Burundi to be the “historical twin” of Rwanda.

28 Another structure-agency problem stems from the consideration of group identity as a social construct. In this regard, attributing the formation of group identities to factors such as discourse or macro-historical processes makes it appear that individuals have little, if any, control over their own identities. This is demonstrated in the study by Prunier (1995) who argues that the Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda operated according to “the logic of a script” created for them by their former colonial rulers (xiii; also 345-355; for further discussion on the agent-structure problem and the constructivist perception of group identity, see Fearon and Laitin 2000: 853-857, also Laitin 1986).
maximizer and are thus driven by the desire to secure maximum benefit” (1992: 648). Structural studies written on the occurrence of collective violence in Rwanda and/or Burundi depend on a similar assumption.

In these latter examples, the studies by Prunier (1995), Des Forges (1999), Harff (1998) and several others suggest that political leaders behave in a manner consistent with the assumptions of rational choice. As this applies to the case of Rwanda more specifically, these studies generally assume that the extremist Hutu opted to commit genocide because they considered multiparty rule with the Tutsi to be the more costly alternative. Unfortunately, none of these studies provide any evidence that demonstrates political leaders conducted any type of cost-benefit analysis in their decision-making processes. Because the focus of these particular analyses remains at the systems-level, the preferences of actors are instead derived from their policy choices. The reasons provided for these policy choices are then extracted from the context in which the decisions were made. As a result, it is difficult to fully discern how and why factors such as resource scarcity or economic crises affected the political elite of Rwanda and Burundi in the particular ways that they did.

Furthermore, as indicted above, the notion that state leaders employed a “single and mutual decision rule” (Berejikian 1992: 648) suggests that Hutu leaders in Rwanda and the Tutsi incumbent elite in Burundi should have responded to similar structural conditions in a very similar way. That this was not the case raises some doubts as to the applicability of rational choice explanations to both examples. Additionally, structural studies that rely indirectly on the assumption that the Hutu extremists in Rwanda were behaving as rational maximizers cannot explain why other more cost effective policy options were completely overlooked. Put another way, these studies cannot adequately explain why or how a segment of the Hutu political elite came to perceive genocide as the optimal strategy relative to all others.  

\footnote{In the case of revolutions, macro-level studies frequently assume that peasants weight the benefits of participation in a revolutionary endeavor against the costs (Berejikian 1992: 648-649).}

\footnote{Evidence presented in this study demonstrates that genocide was objectively the costlier alternative available to the Hutu incumbent elite. It was a risk-seeking strategy whose benefits were certainly not a foregone}
Meso-level Explanations: Democratization and Collective Violence

There is some degree of overlap between studies that attempt to explain the occurrence of genocide in Rwanda from a structural perspective and those which also take into account the role of democratization as a factor in explaining inter-group violence. Much of this overlap is due to shared assumptions regarding the causal role of structural and contextual elements on the occurrence of violence between groups, as well as the existence of rational state leaders.

Where the two groups of studies diverge is with respect to the role of institutions in communal violence. As indicated above, structural studies that address ethnic conflict and genocide in Rwanda, Burundi and elsewhere concentrate specifically on the conditions under which regimes are induced to commit mass murder. As this applies to the case of Rwanda, structural studies depict the process of democratization as a trigger event which unleashed group violence in a country that was already heavily burdened by a number of very serious problems. Democratization studies, on the other hand, consider institutions and the process of institutional change to be primary causal factors in the occurrence of ethnic violence and genocide in Africa, as well as in other parts of the developing world.

Much of the literature on democratization in Africa addresses the prevalence of what are termed “semi-democracies.” Also referred to as “virtual democracies,” or “façade democracies,” they are political systems which are neither fully democratic nor fully authoritarian and which possess several distinct features including:

- A formal basis in citizen rule, but with key [decision-making] (especially economic) insulated from popular involvement
- Manipulation of democratic transitions by political incumbents, including the use of violence and electoral fraud, to [re-legitimize] their power
- Wider popular participation, but narrow policy choices and outcomes
- External encouragement of multiparty elections on the premise that they will not threaten vested domestic and foreign interests if incumbents act adroitly. (Joseph 1997: 367-368)

31 According to Krain, an emphasis on context over regime-type is preferable in the study of genocide because regime-type alone is a poor indicator of when or if genocide will occur (1997: 332).
The democratization studies considered by this dissertation can be separated into two major groups: those which examine institutional change and collective violence with the use of quantitative methods and those which approach the topic from a more qualitative standpoint.

**Quantitative Studies**

The first set of democratization studies considered in the current chapter are those which quantitatively demonstrate that semi-democracies are more likely to experience conflict—including interstate wars and “life-integrity violations,”—than their democratic or authoritarian counterparts. The relationship between regime-type and group violence is generally considered by these studies to assume the shape of an inverted-U (Mansfield and Snyder 1995, 1997, 2002), (Ellingsen and Gleditsch 1997), (Ward and Gledistsch 1998), (Ellingsen 2000), (Mousseau 2001), (Hegre et al. 2001).

As Mousseau (2001: 550) suggests, this type of relationship is not a surprise given that at high levels of democracy, political violence is less likely because democratic systems are capable of accommodating the opposing demands [of groups] through legal and nonviolent forms of political mechanisms. However, on the other extreme, highly undemocratic or autocratic regimes might also be less likely to experience political violence, because at very low levels of democracy the political regime has the means to repress the society so severely that little room is left for individuals or groups to engage in dissident behavior.

Hybrid democracies are believed to be more prone to violence for the simple reason that they lack well-established procedures and mechanisms for resolving conflict between dissident groups and the state (Mousseau 2001: 551; see also Mansfield and Snyder 1995: 7). Where several of these quantitative scholars disagree is over the issue of whether group violence is a result of regime change itself, or

---

32 “Life-integrity violations” are defined by Fein as follows: “Gross violations of human rights which are criminalized in international law [and] which include genocide, extrajudicial executions, and torture” (1995: 170).

33 This particular argument is similar to Fein’s (1995) “More Murder in the Middle thesis.” Interestingly enough, others such as Saideman et al. (2002) have found that older democracies, especially those in multiethnic societies are more likely to experience ethnic violence (measured as protest and rebellion) than younger less established democracies. This finding has led the authors to the remarkable conclusion that “decision makers should not worry so much about increased ethnic conflict if they support democratization” (2002: 124).

34 The idea that autocratic systems experience less violence is contrary to the findings obtained by scholars such as Rummel. In his analysis, Rummel (1998) demonstrates that, the more totalitarian the regime, the greater the likelihood for violence, hence the dictum: “Power kills; absolute Power kills absolutely” (1998: 367).
whether it is the outcome of the quality of institutional change, its proximity, and/or the interaction between change and context.\textsuperscript{35}

Scholars such as Mansfield and Snyder (1995), (1997) suggest that democratizing states are more likely to experience war than states which undergo no regime change or those which are stable autocracies.\textsuperscript{36} Ward and Gleditsch (1998), on the other hand, demonstrate that whether or not violence occurs as a result of democratization is not merely a function of regime change, but the variance, magnitude and direction of the change.\textsuperscript{37} In their analysis, the authors find that a state which undergoes a “rocky transition” towards democracy is more likely to experience war than a state which undergoes a smoother transition.\textsuperscript{38} Others, including Hegre et al. have found that over the long-term, semi-

\textsuperscript{35} Another type of argument is offered by Braumoeller who suggests that the relationship between democratization and group conflict is less a matter of institutional or structural conditions and more the result of the particular type of normative liberalism to which a society adheres. The author associates the greater vulnerability of the Newly Independent States of the former Soviet Union to conflict with the prevalence of a brand of liberalism he refers to as “liberal nationalism.” Braumoeller defines “liberal nationalism” as a type of liberalism that places greater emphasis on autonomy rather than on the peaceful resolution of conflicts; it is a hybrid of liberalism and nationalism in which freedom is stressed as an important ideal, but it is interpreted by groups as a freedom from other groups, not from the state per se (Barumoeller 1997: 377).

\textsuperscript{36} According to the authors, states are considered to be democratizing if they evolve from either an autocracy or an anocracy (defined as a “political [system] in which democratic or autocratic features are mixed”) to a democracy, or if they change from an autocracy to an anocracy. Likewise, a state is considered to be autocratizing if it devolves from either a democracy or an anocracy to a democracy or an anocracy (Mansfield and Snyder 1995: 9, 1997: 458). It is important to call attention to the fact that a number of problems have been attributed to the Mansfield and Snyder studies. According to Thompson and Tucker (1997), the composite index of regime type used by Mansfield and Snyder (CONCEN x POLITY II score) erroneously codes states with higher concentrations of power as being more democratic than they actually are compared to states with lower concentrations of power. When Thompson and Tucker reformulate the regime-type index they obtain scores that are more empirically valid. A variety of other methodological difficulties associated with both Mansfield and Snyder studies referenced above—including omitted variable bias, problems of case selection and the periods of time examined—lead Thompson and Tucker to suggest that the findings obtained by Mansfield and Snyder should be accepted with a great deal of caution (for their full critique see 1997: 466-477; for additional critiques of Mansfield and Snyder’s 1995 analysis, see Wolf 1996: 176-180, Weede 1996: 180-183, and Enterline 1996: 183-196).

\textsuperscript{37} Although the authors initially obtain results that partially substantiate the argument made by Mansfield and Snyder (1995), when they more closely examine the cumulative effects of their independent variables (e.g. the variance, magnitude and direction of change) on war, they arrive at quite different results. They find instead that a continuous change toward greater democracy (especially in the area of executive constraints) actually reduces the likelihood of war (1998: 57-59).

\textsuperscript{38} By “rocky” it is meant transitions that include a reversal towards autocracy. In this respect, Ward and Gleditsch suggest that, “it is more dangerous to be at a given level of democracy if that represents an increase [italics added] in the level of authoritarianism than it is to be at the same level of democracy if that represents a decrease [italics added] in the authoritarian character of the regime. Stated differently, reversals are riskier than progress,” (1998: 58). On a related note, Joseph has referred to rocky transitions as “reconfigurations of power” in contrast to “political transitions,’ which imply a certain sense of direction” (1999: 76). Returning to the Ward and Gleditsch study, one reason why the authors obtain results that differ markedly from those obtained by Mansfield
democracies are more prone to civil war than other regime types because of a combination of lower levels of democracy and proximity of transition (2001: 38-40).  

To more fully explain the nexus between institutional change and collective violence, a number of other studies focus more directly on the character of the societies in which democratization occurs. Mousseau (2001), for example, demonstrates that countries with heterogeneous populations have a greater chance of experiencing political violence as a result of democratization and level of democracy than countries which are more socially homogenous.  

Other studies suggest that it is not the number of communal groups in a society that contributes to the greater propensity for conflict, but the size of the second largest group that matters. 

For instance, Ellingsen (2000) finds that the propensity for inter-group violence is greater in multiethnic societies in which the second largest group is medium-sized (e.g. between five and 20% of the population). Others, such as Jenkins and Kposowa, further contend that the balance of power that exists inside the government between the two largest ethnic groups is a significant causal factor in the occurrence of military intervention and successful coups d’état.

and Snyder (1995) stems from the fact that the variables they use for regime change do not measure change as a movement between categories, but as a continuum (Ward and Gleditsch 1998: 55).

This particular finding is consistent with the findings of several of the qualitative studies of democratization. For example, Söderberg and Ohlson (2003: 6) suggest that, “change alone [or direction of change for that matter] does not explain the higher frequency of conflicts in semi-democracies, as the conflict propensity…does not seem to change over time.”

The inverted-U curve representing the relationship between democracy and political violence in heterogeneous societies is more extreme in shape, taking the form of a wave. To the author, this indicates that, to some extent, democratization and democracy both exert less of a pacifying effect than they do in homogenous societies (Mousseau 2001: 561-562). Additionally, the author finds that—in the short term at least—an autocratic form of government actually reduces ethnic violence in heterogeneous societies (2001: 562).

In this respect, the assumption is that the closer the size of the two largest ethnic groups, the greater the chances conflict will occur. This suggestion is partially based on the additional assumption that given their size, the two largest groups rationally perceive victory as a possibility (Ellingsen 2000: 233). Generally, the former suggestion can be found in a number of qualitative conflict studies including those by Horowitz (1985) and Mann (2005: 431, 471). This assumption has also been echoed by Bates who suggests: “In the competition for benefits, it is obviously useful for groups to be ‘bigger’; in most forms of political competition groups do better if they are larger in size” (1983: 164; see also Korpi 1974: 1572).

The author demonstrates that the chances of conflict are less in societies with larger and smaller communal groups (e.g. greater than 20% and less than five percent of the population, respectively). Similar to the effect of regime-type on group violence, the author finds that the relationship between group size and the frequency of conflict also assumes the form of an inverted U-curve (Ellingsen 2000: 241-243).

They base the inclusion of their political competition variable on Korpi’s theory of power balance which suggests that a difference in power resources—defined as “the properties of an actor which provide the ability to reward or punish another actor”—partially contribute to the occurrence of conflict between groups along with
Similar to the macro-level studies discussed in the first segment of this chapter, all of the meso-level quantitative studies demonstrate problems of structure and agency. By and large institutions are depicted by these studies as another type of structure, along with economic status, population makeup etc.44

Additionally, most of these studies portray institutional change as a relatively self-contained event. Democratization is assumed to be a process that is disconnected from the society in which the institutions are rooted, that is, the structures of power, authority, interests, loyalties, traditions and legitimacy that make up the dense...socio-political life in that state. (Söderberg and Ohlson 2003: 17)45

According to Moore (1978), to understand revolution, or how actors transform what they perceive to be the inevitable (e.g. poverty, oppression etc.) into a sense of injustice worthy of more immediate action, a historical perspective is necessary. Such a perspective takes into account the relationship between actors and the economic and political institutions that exist within a society at varying points of time, as well as the impact of shared perceptions and norms on human behavior (1978: 460-462).

Because the quantitative democratization studies provide a largely superficial picture of the countries they examine—which downplays or ignores the various institutional constraints to democratization that many of these countries experience—they cannot fully explain why democratization has succeeded in some cases and not others, or more specifically why varying degrees of violence have most often accompanied institutional change in the developing countries.46

factors such as relative deprivation and time (Korpi 1974: 1571). In contrast to Gurr (1970), Korpi’s model suggests a bimodal relationship between power resources and conflict (Korpi 1974: 1574).

44 Whereas the majority of the above studies err on the side of structure, the Braumoeller (1997) study errs mostly on the side of agency, with little provided in the way of context to explain individual preferences. An additional problem many of these statistical analyses face stems from the fact that several of the measures used for regime characteristics, regime change etc. are likely to be highly correlated with one another. For example, it is difficult to separate the effect that democratization and democracy-level each have on conflict as both reflect institutional change over time.

45 Although the authors make this critique in reference to the strategies for democratization in Africa pursued by the western donor countries, it is also applicable to the quantitative democratization studies more generally.

46 An exception to this is provided by the Bratton and van de Walle (1997) study which includes both quantitative and qualitative analyses of the variety of factors that impact the success of institutional change in the African states—including the effects of past institutions.
However, a number of studies specifically written on the process of democratization in Africa pay greater heed to the relationship between context, history, and the success rate of democratic transition and consolidation. As with the quantitative democratization studies discussed above, these qualitative studies can also be grouped according to their focus of analysis.

**Qualitative Studies**

The first group of studies considered by the present chapter focus on the nexus between the types of democratic institutions implemented in the African countries and political stability. A number of analyses attribute the fate of democratic transitions (and by implication their impact on ethnic conflict) in large part to the presence or absence of a negotiated pact among political leaders (see Kirschke 2000, Lemarchand 1994b, Bratton and van de Walle 1997, Harbeson 1999: 43-44).

In places in which ethnic insecurity remains the order of the day, these studies suggest that pacts ensure a more balanced distribution of resources among contending groups and guarantee at least some degree of political participation for participants—often in a broad power-sharing arrangement (e.g. a consociational system) that includes all relevant parties. Agreements of this nature are believed to reduce the likelihood for conflict by setting the precedent for political negotiation and compromise between groups.

---

47 The democratization literature generally makes a distinction between democratic transition and democratic consolidation. Bratton and van de Walle define “transition” as “a shift from one set of political procedures to another” (1997: 10). “Democratic consolidation,’’ they define as a longer-term process that encompasses the institutionalization of democratic norms and procedures (235). Both are seen as separate, albeit linked, processes that are heavily influenced by a country’s pre-existing formal and informal institutional structures.

48 Pacts are generally defined as “[negotiated compromises] under which actors agree to forgo or underutilize their capacity to harm each other by extending guarantees not to threaten each others’…vital interests’” ([O’Donnell and Schmitter 1986: 38] Kirschke 2000: 389).

49 Rothchild refers to pacts as a “minimalist route” to the implementation of peace agreements. Quoting Sisk (1996: 81), Rothchild writes that pacts are minimalist in the sense that the elites of all participating parties agree to accept a lesser degree of power “‘in exchange for protection under agreed-upon rules of the political game’” (1999: 330).

50 As Bratton and van de Walle aptly state, pacts allow participants the opportunity to “nurture the democratic art of give-and-take” (1997: 257). According to Rothchild (1999: 330) power-sharing systems created by pacts “build on the logic of the iterated game to achieve a transition to stable societal relations.” Bratton and van de Walle consider negotiated pacts to be one of three features of the transition process that are essential for the institutionalization of democracy. Two of the other elements that can either hinder or help the consolidation process are the length of the transition and the role of “Big Men” in the process. As it pertains to the former, the authors suggest that shorter periods are preferable for transitions as they tend to reduce the levels of uncertainty inherent in
All of these studies posit that the absence of a negotiated pact in many of the sub-Saharan countries has contributed to the persistence of a zero-sum pattern of politics in which political competition is perceived as a “winner-take-all” contest for control of the state; it is a contest in which the losers are often harshly punished by the victors (Bratton and van de Walle 1997: 257).\(^{51}\)

However, others argue that the implementation of a majoritarian system of government may be the preferable strategy to ensure greater political stability, especially in those cases in which the achievement of national unity is the target (Snyder 2000), (Ottaway 1997: 11), (Rothchild 1999: 328-330).\(^{52}\) These scholars suggest that consociational systems of government often times engender further division between groups by reinforcing cultural divisions.\(^{53}\) As Snyder suggests, what may be more appropriate for multiethnic democratizing countries are efforts that are geared towards the creation of cross-cutting social cleavages through guarantees of individual rights and the construction of broader civic identities (2000: 40; see also 329-331). However, others such as Widner (1997), point to the fact that even in countries that have majoritarian electoral systems, ethnicity still remains a prominent feature of political life.\(^{54}\)

---

\(^{51}\) According to Kirschke (2000: 390-391) two additional factors that contribute to this trend of zero-sum politics are the material incentives for competition among incumbents and challengers, and the persistence of ethno-regional patronage systems.

\(^{52}\) This latter strategy is what Rothchild considers to be a “maximalist route” to the implementation of a peace agreement. It is an approach that encompasses a “sustained effort and frequent facilitation by external mediators backed by an international peacekeeping and monitoring force, to establish stable institutions leading to a general election” (1999: 328).

\(^{53}\) Additionally, because pacts require continuous negotiation among participants, Rothchild contends that they are by nature fragile agreements that often provide a less-than-stable basis for lasting regime change. This is especially the case when a pact is formed as a result of extensive pressures from external parties. As a result, when power-sharing arrangements fail, they often result in excessive violence and bloodshed (1999: 331-332). In the case of Rwanda, the author suggests that the imbalance in group size and power between the Hutu and Tutsi and the refusal of members of the incumbent elite to compromise on the redistribution of resources made the failure of the negotiated settlement reached by the parties at Arusha a near certainty (330-331). More generally, Rothchild suggests that the appropriateness of a pact depends upon the level of insecurity and uncertainty that exists among the political elite in a country, the existence of “antagonistic group memories,” the particular balance of power that prevails among groups and lastly, the desire of leaders to respond to the legitimate demands of various groups within their borders (335).

\(^{54}\) To illustrate her point, she uses the examples of Kenya and Zambia. Despite the fact that both installed majoritarian systems, ethnicity became a salient political issue in Kenya (Widner 1997: 75-76).
Additionally, some scholars contend that whether a presidential or a parliamentary system is the appropriate model of governance for a democratizing country is a function of that country’s particular institutional traditions. As this applies to the African countries more specifically, it is suggested that countries that have had at least some experience with legislative rule fare better in maintaining effective stable legislatures following transition; the opposite has been the case for those countries in which parliamentary traditions are absent (Bratton and van de Walle 1997: 246-248).\(^55\)

Although the importance of institutional legacies is a common theme throughout much of the democratization literature, the second group of qualitative studies examined by this chapter places special emphasis on the lasting influence that pre-existing institutional arrangements have on transition processes. Some of these studies focus on the impact that military rule has on the success (or failure) of institutional change (see for example Hutchful 1997, Söderberg and Ohlson 2003: 37-42 and Lemarchand 1994b). The general contention among these scholars is that a country in transition from a centralized military dictatorship to a system of government under civilian control is especially vulnerable to future conflict for the simple reason that democratization by its very nature diminishes the military’s power and prestige as a political actor (see also Jenkins and Kposowa 1992).\(^56\) What makes the role of military all the more troublesome in this context is the fact that its continued presence is needed during the transition process (and afterward) for the purposes of maintaining national security, as well as law and order.

Others argue that the prevalence of political violence and intra-state conflict in the African countries is an outcome of the weak and ineffective governing systems many of these countries have possessed since independence. A number of scholars suggest that, despite their attempts to democratize, the lack of widespread legitimacy and the inability to ensure for the well-being and security of their citizens has induced many political leaders to utilize policies and practices that are socially and politically

\(^{55}\) For additional discussion on the topic of parliamentary systems, presidential systems and stability in divided societies, see the studies by Linz (1990), Stepan and Skach (1993), and Lijphart (1991).

\(^{56}\) Of course the chances that the military will intervene to thwart the transition process are dependent on a variety of additional factors, specifically the role of the military in the previous system of government, the types of privileges it held under this system, the relationship between the military and the former ruler, and the extent to which “civilian strongmen” are able to control the military (Bratton and van de Walle 1997: 243-245).
divisive. The end result of this has been a further decrease in regime loyalty and an increase in the prospect of communal violence and political instability (see Söderberg and Ohlson 2003: 13-16 and Chabal and Daloz 2000).57

Still other scholars contend that, without the appropriate socioeconomic foundations necessary for democracy to thrive (e.g. a vibrant civil society, a democratic political culture, a liberalized economy etc.), the institutional changes made by the African countries will never become fully embedded (see Ottaway 1997, 2000, Clark 1997, Barkan 2000, Bratton and van de Walle 1997: 253-255, Mamdani 1996, Widner 1997: 76-78, Longman 1999, Chabal and Daloz 1999: chap. 2, and Söderberg and Ohlson 2003: 18-25).58

Closely associated with the above studies, as well as those which focus on the importance of negotiated pacts and national conferences, is a third group of analyses which address the various problems multiparty elections pose for the prospect of peace and stability in the African countries (see for example Harbeson 1999: 42-43, Young 1999, Snyder 2000: chap. 1, Carothers 1999, Ottaway 1999).59

Some scholars suggest that multiparty elections in countries formerly ruled by authoritarian regimes create the potential for conflict by disrupting pre-existing balances of power between groups; more specifically, elections bring to an end the various types of political arrangements that had previously

---

57 In many African counties, politicians have often had to depend on neo-patrimonial policies of redistribution in order to acquire greater loyalty from the public. However, because resources most often flow in the direction of select groups, neo-patrimonial regimes often encounter greater difficulty in acquiring widespread popular legitimacy, a necessary requirement for a strong democratic state (Söderberg and Ohlson 2003: 12-13). This argument is somewhat similar to Gurr’s argument regarding regime legitimacy and the potential for rebellion. According to Gurr (1970), political violence is partly a function of the ability of the state to effectively resolve the problems created by relative deprivation (e.g. the discrepancy between what members of a group believe they are entitled to and what they know they will actually receive). If a regime responds to relative deprivation by improving conditions for some, but not all of society, the legitimacy of the government is diminished in the eyes of those who receive the short end of the stick (1970: 327-328).

58 However other scholars, including Ihonvbere (1996), argue that the lack of democratic preconditions present in many African countries does not necessarily discourage democracy. Instead, these deficiencies “should serve as the reason for its occurrence. It is precisely the desire to create the foundations for the attainment of these goals—stability, predictability, industrialization, and development—and to establish viable institutions for conflict mediation and resolution that Africans have historically fought for democracy.”

59 Some scholars who adhere to the opposite view argue that multiparty elections permit the emergence of a new brand of political elite whose interests are different from those of the old guard and whose actions move the African countries closer to democratic consolidation (Barkan 2000: 235-238). However, Ihonvbere (1996) maintains that this new political elite still faces a host of problems that can retard its progress, notably the left-over
guaranteed at least some degree of internal stability (Ottaway 1999). 60 Still others attribute the problems of inter-group conflict in the African countries to the formation of political parties along ethnic or sectarian lines (Lemarchand 1992b, Longman 1999; see also Ottaway 1999, Decalo 1992: 30-31, Söderberg and Ohlson 2003: 28-30). Similar to many of the qualitative studies discussed previously, studies that address the nexus between multiparty elections and violence in the African countries suggest that the state is perceived by political actors as a prize; multiparty elections a “winner-take-all” competition that determines its control. 61

The fourth and final group of qualitative democratization studies this dissertation considers are those that question whether the implementation of multiparty democracy is compatible with the recommendations for economic liberalization made by foreign donor countries and international lending institutions (see Mkandawire 1999, Joseph 1999, Chabal and Daloz 1999, Decalo 1992). These scholars suggest that the imposition of structural adjustment programs (“SAPs”) by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank has made it especially difficult for the new African democracies to achieve legitimacy and stability. SAPs not only restrict the ability of governments to effectively distribute welfare benefits and other resources to their citizens, they interfere with government policy in areas such as national defense and employment. SAPs also hamper public debate on issues of national importance, such as taxation and public spending (Mkandawire 1999: 122-124, Hutchful 1997: 58-59). More

vestiges of neo-patrimonial policies and practices (on this point, see also Longman 1999: 345-346, Chabal and Daloz 1999).

60 Ottaway discusses three types of political arrangements: informal power-sharing agreements, formal alliances between contending groups and the government, and the use of outright repression by government authorities (1999: 304). In Burundi, the first and third types of arrangements have been the most prominent throughout much of the country’s post-independence history; in Rwanda, political stability under Hutu-rule was achieved primarily through the oppression of the Tutsi.

61 As Söderberg and Ohlson aptly state: “Because the stakes of power [in these countries] are high…any outcome that [stipulates] the loss of political or economic power for at least one party runs a high risk [of]…armed conflict as long as that party or parties believe that they will be able to strike a better deal through the option of conflict and violence rather than peace and democracy” (2003: 36).

On a separate issue, other scholars argue that the rush to conduct multiparty elections in many of the African countries (whether these countries are prepared or not) stems from an overemphasis on the importance of elections as a sign of a successful transition (Harbeson 1999). Scholars such as Herbst (1999: 269-270), Sklar (1999), Ottaway (1999: 10) and Olowu (1999) argue further that a strict focus on the significance of multiparty elections distracts attention away from the valuable impact that other types of institutions and institutional measures can have on the transition process.
generally, scholars who have written on this particular subject matter agree that SAPs have been implemented in these countries with a focus on macroeconomic stability, not democratic consolidation.62

Furthermore, Joseph (1999: 61-63, 1998: 7-12), Chabal and Daloz (1999) and others insist that western donors are at least partially responsible for the creation and persistence of the semi-democracies in Africa. These studies suggest that fears of increasing disorder and violence on the continent, as well as a desire to achieve viable market economies within the African countries, have led donor countries and institutions to overlook the prevalence of ruling systems that were and still are more authoritarian than democratic.63 For their part, the political elite in many of the recipient countries simply reconfigured their ruling institutions just enough to avoid criticism and to secure the continued flow of financial resources. According to Joseph (1999: 61), after 1989 “authoritarian regimes mastered the script of contemporary democratization while finding ways to neutralize and disable its transformative mechanisms.”64

Whether stated explicitly or not, the bulk of the qualitative studies discussed above rely heavily on many of the core assumptions of historical institutionalism, including the assumptions of path-dependency, critical junctures and unintended consequences. These studies posit that institutions act as intermediary structures that condition the preferences of actors. More specifically, qualitative

62 Much of this tendency is understandable given that many of the SAP agreements were originally reached between donor institutions and the previous authoritarian regimes. According to Mkandawire (1999), in the eyes of the donor community, this was a preferable practice as it made the implementation of their policy recommendations much easier to achieve (1999: 126; see also Kohli 1993).

On a related note, there are other scholars who do not question the fairness of SAPs, but instead place greater emphasis on the ability of the incipient African democracies to stabilize in the face of these policy recommendations. For example, accepting the SAPs as a given, van de Walle suggests that economic stabilization in the African countries is a function of their institutional capacities, as well as “the speed with which a reform program can be implemented [after political reforms are made], the degree of consensus within the political class about the need for reform, and the strength of the majority political party” (1997: 20). Graham (1997) suggests further that more rapid and extensive economic reforms (accompanied by extensive political reforms) are especially good for the poorer members of a society because they prevent entrenched interests from stalling or monopolizing the benefits of these reforms (as occurred in Senegal). What is especially relevant to the present discussion is that all of the factors outlined in the van de Walle study necessitate either a greater consolidation of democracy or at the very least the foundations necessary to achieve greater consolidation—all of which are conditions that other scholars suggest are absent or very weak in many of the African countries.

63 Other reasons why the commitment of western donors to the democratization project in Africa has waned over the years include competing foreign policy goals among the donor countries, a simple lack of interest and “aid fatigue” (see Gordon 1997: 157-159, Bratton and van de Walle 1997).

64 The same motivation has been associated with the formation of civil society associations in the African countries. As discussed in Chapter 6 of this study, many scholars suggest that civic organizations have been used by state leaders largely as a means to channel foreign aid (see Uvin 1998, Chabal and Daloz 1999: 22-24).
democratization scholars argue the ability of the African states to undergo a successful democratic transition, and the likelihood that democratic rule will survive at all, are heavily constrained by the pre-existing ruling structures and styles of governance within these countries. In particular, the twin legacies of neo-patrimonial rule and the institutions of authoritarian governance are believed to have hampered the ability of many African leaders to respond to democratization in a manner that is conducive to its survival in both the short and long term.65

Similar to structural studies written on the violence in Rwanda and Burundi (see above), both the qualitative and the quantitative democratization studies experience problems of structure and agency. In this respect, attributing actors’ preferences to institutions is highly problematic absent the establishment of a sufficient connection between institutions and individual behavior. Without this link, it is possible to attribute individual or group behavior to any one of a number of other causes including socioeconomic or cultural factors. Additionally, like the structural studies, the democratization studies also encounter problems stemming from the implicit assumption that political actors behave rationally in response to the circumstances with which they are faced. If this is indeed the case, it becomes difficult to understand why similar predisposing conditions in the African countries have resulted in such a wide variety of outcomes.

Lastly, it is worth mentioning that many of the explanatory problems the democratization studies encounter result from a number of basic methodological shortcomings. First, most of these studies fail to consider cases in which communal violence has not occurred.66 According to Fearon and Laitin (1996), in instances such as these, selection on the dependent variable leads to an over-prediction of ethnic violence.67 Additionally, many of the qualitative democratization studies experience a degrees of freedom

---

65 This is the thrust of the main argument put forth by Bratton and van de Walle. The present study agrees with their contention that socioeconomic factors (e.g. poverty, underdevelopment etc.), and international pressures played more of a secondary role in the ability of the new democracies to consolidate (1997: 237-255).
66 This is another quality that the qualitative democratization studies share with the structural studies discussed above. Some exceptions include the comparative studies by Mann (2005), Snyder (2000), Fein (1995) and Harff (2003).
67 To demonstrate their point, the authors highlight the fact that ethnic violence in Africa and in post-Soviet Russia has been a relatively rare phenomena; far less frequent than theories of ethnic conflict would suggest. Although their criticism is generally a valid one, their argument as it applies to Africa must be qualified by the fact that they only consider cases of group violence that occurred before 1979 (see Fearon and Laitin 1996: 716-717).
problem; in other words, they attempt to explain outcomes with too few cases for comparison. Consequently, parsimony and clarity are lost and almost any aspect in a society’s history or culture can be used to explain variation in the dependent variable. As C. Gibson argues (2002: 214-216), this is one of many problems that contribute to the descriptive story-telling attribute of the qualitative democratization studies.

**Micro-level Explanations of Collective Violence**

Many of the structural and democratization studies that examine the causes of ethnic violence in Rwanda, Burundi and elsewhere in Africa generally assume that groups behave as coherent units and have like preferences. The sources of group antagonisms are traced to a mixture of factors including colonialism, authoritarian rule, and a history of inter-group violence.

Because the focus of analysis of these studies remains primarily at the systems-level, they cannot fully explain how contextual and historical factors impact individual decision-making behavior. More specifically, these studies tend to overlook the presence of internal variation in the attitudes and behavior of group members and underestimate the impact this variation has on group violence. Studies that examine communal conflict from a micro-level perspective avoid the pitfalls associated with overgeneralizations about group behavior.

Using game-theory techniques, Fearon and Laitin (1996), Bhavnani and Backer (2000), and de Figueiredo and Weingast (1997) explore the association between a variety of causal factors and the occurrence of group conflict. In their study Fearon and Latin (1996) use a social-matching game theory model to demonstrate the effect that two types of informal institutions—the spiral regime and the in-house policing regime—have on mitigating the consequences of defection from inter-group cooperation.  

---

68 Discussed in greater detail in the fourth chapter of this dissertation, a degrees of freedom problem is one in which more independent variables exist than cases for analysis.

69 In a spiral regime, defection by one member of an ethnic group results in the indiscriminate punishment of all members of that group by the offended group. In an in-house policing regime, those who defect from cooperative behavior with the opposing group are punished by members of their own ethnic group. The authors
The authors find evidence which suggests that the in-house policing regime is the more effective of the two institutions in terms of limiting the scale of group violence.\textsuperscript{70}

Whereas Fearon and Laitin are concerned with explaining why groups cooperate with other groups, Bhavnani and Backer (2000) and de Figueiredo and Weingast (1997) seek to explain why individuals participate in group violence. In their analysis, Bhavnani and Backer use a computational model to demonstrate that the intensity of violence that occurred between opposing ethnic groups in Rwanda and Burundi was a function of the level of trust between groups, the level of extremism of group members, and the strength of a genocidal norm.\textsuperscript{71} More specifically, the authors find that high levels of inter-ethnic trust, a strong threat of sanctions for those who refuse to participate in the violence, and high levels of extremism within a group increase the intensity and/or the scope of group violence. They also find that a group member’s misinterpretation of the level of violence as national when it is local also increases the scale of inter-group violence up to a point.\textsuperscript{72}
For de Figueiredo and Weingast (1997) communal violence has less to do with inter-ethnic trust or noise and more to do with the ambiguity that surrounds the intentions of an opposing ethnic group. According to the authors, the occurrence of genocide in Rwanda was a result of the amount of public support political leaders were able to garner for their genocidal plan which, in turn, was a function of their ability to manipulate the fears of their constituents regarding the true intentions of the RPF. The authors further argue that Hutu extremists opted for genocide as a means to reduce the likelihood that a future government controlled by the RPF would succeed.

One of the more obvious problems with the de Figueiredo and Weingast study is that it rests on the assumption that the RPF had substantial support from Hutu moderates in the country. According to the authors, if left alone, the power-sharing government would likely have been a peaceful, stable regime (1997: 10). However, Chapter 7 of this dissertation demonstrates that RPF support within Rwanda had grown considerably weak in the several months prior to April 1994 due to events such as the assassination of Burundian President Melchoir Ndadaye in 1993 and the RPF invasion of February 1993. Whether the RPF could continue to count on the support of Hutu moderates is highly questionable. Once these facts are taken into consideration, it is very difficult to accept the authors’ suggestion that the Broad Based Transitional Government was an “RPF government.”

As the above example illustrates, some of the assumptions used by the individual-level studies are not empirically valid. A further example is provided by the Fearon and Laitin study which relies on the assumption that conflicts originate in the complete lack of information communal groups have of the others’ intentions. This absence of information is further believed to be the result of infrequent contact between groups (Fearon and Laitin 1996: 718-719). In the cases of Rwanda and Burundi, however, the Hutu and Tutsi lived side by side for generations and intermarriage was not infrequent.

---

73 The authors assume that state leaders who engage in this sort of behavior are leaders whose hold on power is tenuous. In situations such as these, political elites will pursue a strategy which the authors refer to as “gambling for resurrection.” They define “gambling for resurrection,” as “an attempt to maintain power by inducing massive change in the environment which has only a small chance of succeeding” (de Figueiredo and Weingast 1997: 2).

74 This is a point that Bhavnani and Backer also make about the Fearon and Laitin study (see 2000: 289).
All of the micro-level studies discussed in this chapter attempt to explain how obstacles to cooperation—whether in violent behavior or peaceful interaction—are overcome by group members. However, because none of these studies pays proper attention to context as a variable of importance in choice-making behavior, the decisions made by actors appear to occur in a void.

Looking again at the Fearon and Laitin study, the authors assume that cooperation is induced by certain informal institutions. However, without the inclusion of context it is impossible to discern why certain types of institutions arise in some cases but not in others. Similarly, Bhavnani and Backer fail to clearly explain why Hutu extremism was worse in Rwanda during the 1994 genocide than it was during the massacres of 1963-1964. From their analysis there is no way to tell what induced a genocidal norm to arise in the former period and not the latter. In both cases, socioeconomic factors could possibly explain this particular variation. Furthermore, it is somewhat problematic that few of the individual-level studies fully consider the state as an actor in group conflict. More generally, it can be said that studies such as these provide a poor representation of the reality of an extremely complex situation.

Similar to the structural and democratization studies listed above, the individual-level studies also assume that under conditions of risk actors utilize only one type of decision rule—given a set of options actors will select the option with the highest benefit relative to cost. And, when faced with similar circumstances, actors will behave in a similar manner. This assumption leaves little room for the influence of context on decision-making processes and on the ordering of individual preferences.

Furthermore, none of the above micro-level studies pays adequate attention to the costs associated with genocide. In the cases of Rwanda and Burundi, de Figueiredo and Weingast suggest that, for the

---

75 In all of these studies it is assumed that violence against one’s neighbors is a morally objectionable activity which creates a collective action problem. In order for individuals to participate in violence, some sort of sanctioning device is therefore necessary.

76 This is another criticism of the Fearon and Laitin analysis that is made by Bhavnani and Backer (2000: 290, 302); it is also a criticism that Fearon and Laitin make of their own study (see 1996: 731).

77 Bhavnani and Backer consider the genocidal norm to be a rough proxy for the state; more specifically the norm is a “proxy for the effectiveness of socialization processes that induce and enforce group solidarity” (2000: 292).

78 To be fair, Fearon and Laitin acknowledge that other causal factors may explain ethnic violence in addition to the type of informal regime in place. As they state: “our claim is not that the mechanisms we have
Hutu, the most cost-effective option was genocide. What is especially problematic about the authors’ argument is that it depicts genocide as a temporary solution to the problem of power-sharing; genocide was not committed to achieve a complete power reversal. However, assuming genocide was committed as part of a rational, long-term project to regain control of the government from the RPF severely underestimates the heavy costs associated with the crime and overestimates the willingness of its participants to endure the fallout. Given these circumstances, it is difficult to understand why a less violent, objectively less costly option—a political strategy—was not instead selected by the Hutu elite. Furthermore, the notion that genocide was preferable to all other options even though its benefits were not immediate or certain is unrealistic in that it presumes that actors do not discount the future (e.g. the problem of akrasia).

Lastly, in terms of individual participation in group violence, these studies cannot adequately explain at what point defection is perceived by actors as a risky proposition. Knowing the increase in the probability that an individual will engage in violence—or the strength of the genocidal norm according to Bhavnani and Backer—says nothing about when and why participation comes to be viewed by the actor as being less risky than defection.

79 The authors offer the unrealistic suggestion that the Hutu extremists in Rwanda intended to commit mass murder and then sit back and regroup while an RPF-controlled regime struggled to maintain stability in the country. This contention completely overlooks the fact that the extremists created an interim government during the period in which the genocide was occurring. This action is an indicator that regime-change was the more immediate goal. 79

80 Similar to the option of genocide as it is described by de Figueiredo and Weingast, a political strategy aimed at weakening the legitimacy of the Broad Based Transitional Government would have also returned the extremists to power eventually. As stated earlier, a large part of the problem with de Figueiredo and Weingast’s argument is that it rests on assumptions that are not empirically grounded in fact. Furthermore, their primary assumption concerning the genocidal intent of the perpetrators makes their argument a circular one. In effect, the authors argue that the Hutu lost the civil war with the RPF because they intended to lose the civil war with the RPF.

81 A similar argument is made by Berejikian with regards to participation in revolutionary activity. In this case, if sanction by villagers is assumed to be a deterrent to non-participation, a question arises as to how many villagers it takes to make defection appear the riskier alternative (or the less risky alternative) (1992: 650-651). From a more general perspective as it pertains to the use of sanctions as a means to deter group violence, Gurr (1970) makes the point that sanctions may not be an effective deterrent if the sanctioned group decides to act no matter the costs. Here, the author assumes that sanctions and the threat of sanctions can produce a shift in the value-hierarchy of the sanctioned group. This argument also extends to the behavior of agents of the state. In this respect,
Conclusions

Whether stated explicitly or not most of the studies analyzed in this chapter operate under the assumption that decisions made by political actors are essentially rational responses to environmental circumstances. Where these studies differ is with regard to which particular types of factors exert the greater influence on the decision-making processes of political leaders.

As this applies to the cases examined by the present study, several studies attribute the genocide in Rwanda and the bloodshed that began in Burundi in 1993 to various structural conditions; namely a pluralized society, extreme poverty, “accelerating events,” and/or high population density. Other studies suggest that the real culprit responsible for the episodes of inter-group violence in Rwanda, Burundi and elsewhere in Africa has been the process and pressures of democratization. These latter studies generally assume that the contest for political power in cases such as these is viewed by participants in zero-sum terms. Absent institutional safeguards, and the foundations necessary for democratic rule, conflict in one form or another is an inevitable outcome of institutional change.

Although structural and democratization studies share a variety of methodological problems—including selection bias and degrees of freedom issues—one of the foremost problems this dissertation is concerned with is the problem of structure and agency. Neither group of theories can clearly explain how certain contextual conditions affect actors in the various ways described. Instead, these studies rely on the auxiliary assumption that actors behave as rational utility maximizers. None of these studies, however, provides any sort of decision-making model to test this assumption; the preferences of political actors are instead derived from their policy choices.

The structure-agency problem also applies to studies that rely on formal decision-models to explain collective violence. The primary problem in this instance stems from a lack of sufficient attention to context. The choices made by actors are depicted by these individual-level studies as resulting from immediate circumstances and interactions with other actors. However, without an examination of the behavior of a dissident group can induce a shift in the value-hierarchy of the state, prompting its agents to pursue costlier strategies in attempt to restore order (1970: 259-260).
context in which this behavior occurs, it is impossible to discern why individuals choose to engage or refrain from participation in group conflict, or for that matter why leaders choose to pursue policies of repression, violence and genocide in the first place.

As stated frequently throughout this chapter, the assumption that political leaders behave in a manner consistent with rational choice encounters difficulty when it comes to explaining cases in which similar circumstances have led to different outcomes. None of the theories put forth by the studies examined above can adequately explain why total genocide did not also occur in Burundi, a country that was also undergoing democratization under conditions that were less than favorable. Furthermore, explanations that rely on some or all of the assumptions of rational choice cannot account for why a segment of the Hutu leadership in Rwanda would elect to pursue a policy that was costlier relative to participation in the power-sharing government, or even milder forms of repression. For this same reason, these studies cannot explain why the majority of the Tutsi elite in Burundi chose to pursue an entirely different policy course.82

The next chapter presents a theory that overcomes the explanatory deficiencies associated with the structural, democratization and game-theory models. The theory proposed and tested by this dissertation encompasses two distinct, but related theories: one from the sub-field of comparative politics, the other from the sub-field of international relations. Chapter 3 presents a full analysis of historical institutionalism and prospect theory. Close attention is given to the strengths and weaknesses of both theories and they ways in which each fills the “theoretical gaps” of the other. A discussion

---

82 It should be noted that the study by Mann (2005) does broach the topic of risk albeit indirectly. According to Mann, the perpetrators of ethnic cleansing act from a variety of motives, some of which are rational, others less so. Mann relies on Weber's classification of human action. In this context human behavior can be instrumentally rational, habitual, value-rational and/or affectual. How actors behave in a conflict situation is therefore contingent on the circumstances. Instances in which actors pursue objectives regardless of the cost are considered by Mann to be cases of value-rational behavior. Here, “people are willing to risk or inflict death in pursuit of their values, [with] instrumental reason...relegated to the back burner” (2005: 26). In his study Snyder also suggests that actors pursue risky policy choices as a result of ideology. In this respect, he argues that ideologies can produce “biased perceptions” in which “each side [sees]…the other as more threatening than it really is yet more easily defeated by united opposition than the true probabilities may warrant. Thus, aggression looks more necessary and more likely to succeed than it really is” (2000: 50; see also 66). What is interesting about these two arguments is that they appear to accord more with the assumptions of prospect theory than rational choice—yet both authors strongly suggest that actors behave as rational utility maximizers.

45
concerning their joint-application to the study collective violence and institutional change is then provided.
CHAPTER 3
HISTORICAL INSTITUTIONALISM, PROSPECT THEORY
AND THE EXPLANATION OF COLLECTIVE VIOLENCE

The analysis provided in the preceding chapter demonstrated that existing theories used to explain the causes of inter-group violence in Rwanda and/or Burundi fall short in a number of ways. The current chapter presents an alternative explanation that employs two distinct, but compatible, theories—prospect theory and historical institutionalism. Prospect theory and historical institutionalism are used by this dissertation to explicate the relationship between institutions, institutional transfer and collective violence.

The gist of the argument presented by this study is that the various ways in which an incumbent ruling elite responds to democratization are heavily impacted by the pre-existing formal and informal institutions within that country. Stated differently, institutional legacies influence the formation of the decision-frames that guide the policy-making processes in this particular context.

When a country’s institutional history demonstrates a lengthy pattern of authoritarian rule, combined with informal institutions that reinforce the social, political and economic dominance of one communal group over others, it is likely that the transition to a multiparty system of rule will be perceived by the incumbent elite as a threat. If multiparty democracy is framed as a “sure loss” relative to the previous system of government, policy makers will be more inclined to opt for a strategy that carries with it the possibility of reversing these unfavorable conditions if it succeeds, but which is highly likely to lead to even greater losses should it fail. If a country’s institutional legacy reflects a greater tradition of political tolerance and inclusion, the likelihood that members of the incumbent elite will perceive democratization as a loss is diminished. Instead, political leaders in this latter instance will select a strategy that more clearly reflects an acceptance of the new status quo.
The current chapter begins with a brief review and discussion of the studies examined in the previous chapter. The problems that the macro-, meso-, individual-level studies experience with structure and agency, as well as with the shared assumption that actors behave as rational utility maximizers are again highlighted to demonstrate the need for an integrative approach to explaining institutional change and collective violence.

Next, this chapter provides an analysis and discussion of the two theories that constitute the foundation of the integrative theory developed by this study. The core assumptions of historical institutionalism and prospect theory are provided, as well as the primary obstacle each encounters in explaining variations in choice behavior. Stated briefly, the difficulty with historical institutionalism rests with the theory’s inability to adequately link institutions to individual policy choices; with prospect theory, the dilemma concerns the issue of defining and predicting the reference points that guide decision-making behavior.

Next, the chapter turns to the ways in which the combination of the two theories resolves these aforementioned problems, along with the theoretical difficulties associated with the structural, democratization and game-theory explanations of collective violence discussed previously. Building on the combined insights of both theories, this chapter specifies a theory of collective violence centered on the connection between institutional legacies, the process of democratization, and individual perception.

The conclusion of this chapter revisits the topic of the integrative approach. Emphasis is placed on the benefits a synthesis of prospect theory and historical institutionalism has for the study of regime change, particularly as this applies to democratization in the developing countries. A discussion is also provided concerning the advantages an amalgamation of both theories has for the discipline of political science more generally. Lastly, the appropriateness of Rwanda and Burundi as test cases for the theory formulated by this study is addressed. Attention is given briefly to the structural similarities both countries share, which allow for a comparison to be made under semi-controlled conditions and which
have further implications for the external validity of prospect theory.\textsuperscript{83} This chapter closes with a few remarks concerning the subject matter addressed in the next chapter.

**The Need for an Integrative Theory**

The previous chapter provided a review of existing theories that explain the causes of group violence in Rwanda and/or Burundi. The analysis demonstrated that, for a variety of reasons, macro-, meso- and micro-level theories all possess an inability to adequately explain why similar conditions led to genocide in one case and civil war in the other. This explanatory deficiency was attributed primarily to problems of structure and agency, as well as to the commonly-held assumption that political leaders behave as rational utility maximizers.

As it pertains to the first issue—structure and agency—the discussion provided in the preceding chapter highlighted the fact that structural and democratization theories of collective violence generally assume that macro- and/or meso-level factors condition the preferences of actors over time. However, neither group offers a clear explanation as to how certain contextual factors translate into the specific policy choices made by political leaders. Instead, in all of these analyses, institutions assume the form of a “black box.”

Studies that apply an individual-level approach to the study of group conflict on the other hand do not fare much better. In this latter instance, individual choices are assumed to be strategic responses to more immediate factors including, but not limited to, the behavior of other actors.\textsuperscript{84} Because preferences are assumed to “pre-exist” structures, context is not considered to be a causal factor of any major importance in the decision-making process. As a result, the choices made by actors are devoid of any substantive meaning.

\textsuperscript{83} This particular aspect of the research design is discussed in more extensive detail in Chapter 4 of this dissertation.

\textsuperscript{84} As demonstrated by the game-theory studies discussed in the previous chapter, individual decision-making is also assumed to be influenced by factors such as norms, ideology, and trust. Of course these assumptions are somewhat problematic for the formal game-theory models in that these particular factors are themselves ground in structure (see Chapter 2).
It is in respect to these issues of structure and agency that the study by Mahoney and Snyder (1999) is especially instructive. The authors contend that structural and voluntarist theories of regime change each capture a vital part of the decision-making processes of political leaders. However, neither group of theories can explain the entire process. Instead, agency in the voluntarist theories remains “under-socialized,” with structure limited to the role of exerting an occasional constraint on individual behavior. With the structural studies, the influence of context on human action is over-determined and agency is “over-socialized.”

To overcome these theoretical deficiencies, the authors recommend that an integrative approach be used. An approach of this nature is defined by the use of both subjective evaluations of actors and objective conditions as primary causal variables; a focus on temporally proximate and remote factors; a methodological concern with case-specific and general causes of regime change; and an emphasis on multi-level explanations that span micro and macro levels of analysis. (1999: 11)

In an integrative approach, structures are conceived of as resources that both limit and empower actors. More specifically, the Mahoney and Snyder contend that an integrative strategy acknowledges that structures place certain limitations on the types of action actors can pursue at the same time it also recognizes that actors possess the ability to maneuver and modify their own behavior.

---

85 The present study suggests that each type of theory, on its own, attributes human behavior to causes that are necessary, but not sufficient.
86 By referring to agency in the voluntarist studies as “undersocialized,” Mahoney and Snyder mean to say that these studies generally do not consider human behavior to be an outcome of social structures. In other words, “human action is understood as a force external to and disengaged from ‘objective’ social relations,” (1999: 5).
87 When agency is “oversocialized,” actors’ interests and identities are strictly determined by context. The authors argue that this particular quality of the structural studies, “creates a strong bias for emphasizing long-term, impersonal processes and for overlooking the possibility that actors may have margins of maneuverability during periods of regime change,” (1999: 5; for their full discussion on the metatheoretical bases of structural and voluntarist theories, see Mahoney and Snyder 1999: 5-11).
88 As discussed in greater detail below, one type of integrative approach that the authors consider is the path-dependent explanation of institutional change, or what is essentially historical institutionalism. According to historical institutionalism, the link between macro-structures and human behavior is provided by institutions.

In terms of institutional change, this nexus is best represented by the critical juncture. As the authors describe it, the “closeness” of institutions to agency makes them a powerful optic for analyzing the role of human design both in creating institutional structures during critical junctures and in sustaining those structures after junctures,” (Mahoney and Snyder 1999: 17). However, as discussed in this chapter and as demonstrated in the preceding chapter, studies that rely on the assumption of path-dependency still face problems of structure and agency. For this reason, the type of integrative approach this study advocates is one which includes both institutions and a decision-making model that systematically tests the perceptions of actors.
As this applies directly to the present study, the use of an integrative approach facilitates the formation of an explanation that more fully accounts for the variation in the type of collective violence that occurred in Rwanda and Burundi as a response to the process of democratization. Furthermore, by including both institutional and individual-level variables it is possible to explain how temporally remote factors influenced the policy choices made by political leaders in later years.

This latter aspect is especially crucial if one is to try to understand and explain risk-seeking behavior. As demonstrated in the previous chapter, both the macro- and micro-level explanations of group violence in Rwanda and Burundi assume that the choices made by political actors are rational. Genocide and lesser forms of group repression are explained as rational choices made by state leaders as a means to retain or obtain power. Regardless of whether this assumption is included as a primary or an auxiliary assumption, it nevertheless creates a variety of explanatory difficulties. One of the foremost of these rests with the fact that similar conditions in both countries produced entirely different outcomes. These results raise the following question: What induced a powerful segment of the ruling elite in Rwanda to perceive that the most extreme form of government repression—total genocide—was the most suitable response to the prospect of multiparty democracy? The choice to commit total genocide is especially troublesome given that it was costlier than all of the other policy options available to the Hutu elite and its outcome was highly uncertain.

This study suggests that an integrative approach that includes a decision-making model that incorporates context as a causal variable may shed some light on what otherwise may appear to be irrational behavior by policymakers. The integrative approach developed by this study integrates two specific theories: historical institutionalism and prospect theory.

---

89 An integrative approach is especially beneficial to the present study as it allows for the inclusion of a greater number of observations. Considering individual-level data reduces the “small-n” problems otherwise associated with studies that rely on a smaller number of cases (for a fuller discussion on this particular point, see Chapter 4 of this study).

The author of the current study readily admits that this is an alternative interpretation of Mahoney and Snyder’s argument. In their analysis, the authors suggest that a voluntarist, individual-level approach is idiographic, instead of nomothetic. This particular assumption depends on the additional assumption that decision-making processes follow no particular sets of rules but are completely subjective. In this instance, cross-study comparison is
Briefly, historical institutionalism is a meso-level or mid-range theory which posits that past institutions influence the future policy choices of political leaders. When institutional change occurs, the direction it takes is assumed to be a function of relevant pre-existing institutions. From this perspective, institutional change can affect different countries in different ways. Like historical institutionalism, prospect theory also assumes that causality is a function of context. As an individual-level theory, prospect theory contends that decision-making behavior is a function of an actor’s perception of his or her current circumstances relative to a neutral reference point. The theory further suggests that the formation of reference points is influenced by current and historical factors, including formal and informal institutions. The theories thus have a great deal in common, much of which stems from their shared assumption that preferences are formed endogenously.

**Historical Institutionalism: Core Assumptions and Problems of Structure and Agency**

As a theory, historical institutionalism is concerned with demonstrating how political struggles are mediated by the institutional settings in which they occur. Contrary to rational choice institutionalism which assumes that the function of institutions is to create optimal outcomes where suboptimal would otherwise exist, historical institutionalism recognizes that asymmetries of power in societies often lead to the formation and maintenance of institutions that are highly inefficient.90

In this sense, the state is not assumed to behave as a neutral broker. Instead, historical institutionalist scholars such as Thelen (1999, 2004), Immergut (1998), Hall and Taylor (1996) and many others suggest that the state consists of a set of institutions that grants certain interests in society preferential access to the decision-making process and which unevenly distributes resources among groups.91

---

90 For a thorough analysis of the differences and “border crossings” between rational choice institutionalism and historical institutionalism, see Thelen (1999: 373-384), Immergut (1998) and Hall and Taylor (1996: 950-955).

91 The idea that institutions serve a collective benefit is refuted by some rational-choice institutionalists such as Knight. According to Knight, the creation and maintenance of institutions reflects a conflict over resources difficult to achieve. If, on the other hand, actors are assumed to behave as rational utility maximizers, or in a manner consistent with the assumptions of prospect theory, then a cross-case comparison is entirely feasible.
Historical institutionalism generally defines institutions as “the formal or informal procedures, routines, norms and conventions embedded in the organizational structure of the polity or political economy” (Hall and Taylor 1996: 938). Informal institutions, which include norms, are considered to be “another set of rules that create incentives or constraints on behavior” (Thelen 1999: 377). Cortell and Peterson (2001), argue further that norms also limit the effectiveness of institutional change. In this instance, if alterations made to existing institutions do not accord with contemporary norms and beliefs, then the likelihood these changes will be accepted by a society is decreased.

One type of informal institution emphasized by this study places is social capital. “Social capital” has been defined as the “features of social organization, such as trust, norms, and networks that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions” (Putnam 1993b: 167). It has been further suggested that social capital, or civic engagement, is “an attribute of the social structure in which a person is embedded” (Coleman 1990: 315).

In the context of the present study, the type of social capital that prevailed in Rwanda and Burundi prior to and during democratization is included as one of several different measures of the first independent variable, social structures. Incorporating the concept of social capital—as a sub-theory of historical institutionalism—into the current study is useful not only as a means of explaining the between groups. As he states: “The main goal of those who develop institutional rules is to gain strategic advantage vis-à-vis other actors” (1992: 40). In other words, with the help of institutions, actors can limit the alternatives of other actors to their advantage. What is problematic about this particular study is that the author sees the creation of institutions as being the result of the strategic, short-term considerations of actors. Very little consideration is given to the influence that past institutions have on institutional creation or on individual behavior.

92 For a similar definition, see also Thelen and Steinmo (1992: 2-4). The idea that institutions “cannot be understood in isolation from the political and social setting in which they are embedded” is what Thelen considers to be the primary characteristic that distinguishes historical institutionalism from rational choice institutionalism (1999: 384; for variations on the definition of institutions, see also Peters 1999: 65-67 and Kraner 1988: 72-73).

93 According to Putnam, norms lower transaction costs and make cooperation easier to achieve. They are “inculcated and sustained by modeling and socialization (including civic education) and by sanctions,” (1993b: 171; see also 172-176).

94 The authors further suggest that informal institutions are more difficult to change than their formal counterpart for the obvious reason that informal institutions are more deeply embedded in society (Cortell and Peterson 2000: 775).

95 Because a number of studies have raised questions regarding the appropriateness of the application of western conceptions of civil society to the African countries, this study also includes several additional measures of social structures that represent the informal institutions indigenous to the societies of Rwanda and Burundi (for a critical view regarding the applicability of western-style notions of social capital to the African countries, see...
relationship between informal institutions and formal institutional change, but also as a means of illustrating the association between informal institutions and group conflict (see below).

As a model within historical institutionalism, theories of social capital assume that institutional development is a path-dependent process. Rueschemeyer (1998), Putnam (1993b) and other scholars suggest that patterns of civic engagement tend to demonstrate “historical persistence.” This persistence has been attributed to factors including the embeddedness of patterns of civic engagement, the constitutive nature of civic society, as well as the benefits derived from past instances of social cooperation. 96

One of the most important benefits attributed to social capital is the positive effect it is believed to have on the health of governing institutions, specifically democratic forms of government. 97 However, scholars also acknowledge that social capital’s impact on institutions and institutional development depends on the type of social capital in place. Putnam and Goss (2002) distinguish between various categories of social capital according to the benefits provided by each. The distinction the authors make between “bonding” and “bridging” social capital is especially relevant to the present study as it pertains

---

96 With respect to the first and second factors, Rueschemeyer writes that the notion of historical persistence is based in large part on the contention that civic associations are embedded in the larger civil society and political community, each of which has tremendous staying power. The notion of historical persistence is also premised on the assumption that the institutions of civil society shape and condition the interests and preferences of individuals and collectives (Rueschemeyer 1998: 20-21). As it applies to the benefits associated with coordinated action, Putnam suggests the following: “Faced with new problems requiring collective resolution, men and women everywhere look to their past for solutions. Citizens of civic communities find examples of successful horizontal relationships in their history, whereas those in less civic regions find, at best, examples of vertical supplication” (1993b: 174).

97 For example, Putnam (1993b: 89) suggests that “civil associations contribute to the effectiveness and stability of democratic government...because of their ‘internal’ effects on individual members and because of their ‘external’ effects on the wider polity.” Internally, civic organizations are assumed to create feelings of trust, solidarity and cooperation; externally they are assumed to provide a basis for the effective aggregation and articulation of group interests.

According to Rueschemeyer, civil society increases the prospects for democracy in a number of more specific ways. First, civic associations empower groups within society. They serve as “the most important power resource of those who lack disproportionate influence and power based on coercion, economic resources, cultural hegemony, and/or individual or collective prestige” (1998: 9). Secondly, past participation in civic associations establishes a precedent of cooperation and organization that helps to overcome future collective action problems. Participation in civic organizations provides members with useful skills and the associations of civil society also serve to shape and clarify group and individual interests in ways that would not otherwise be possible. Lastly, civil society acts as a counterbalance against the state and it gives “social reality and coherence to the political construct

---

Comaroff and Comaroff 1999: chap. 1; for examples of studies that advocate the opposite position, see Bratton 1994 and Azarya 1994).
directly to the preceding assumption that institutions reflect existing asymmetries in power within
societies. 98

Bridging social capital is generally defined as social capital that exists among members of
different communal groups. In this context, the creation of social capital between groups is analogous to
the creation of cross-cutting cleavages. Bonding social capital, on the other hand, is assumed to be a type
of social capital that binds together individuals who already alike in some way. Because it is based on
social exclusion, bonding social capital is generally assumed to lead to the creation of reinforcing
cleavages within societies.

Studies by scholars such as Narayan (1999), and Colletta and Cullen (2000) suggest that the type
of social capital and the type of political institutions in place within a society have different economic and
social outcomes. In societies in which bonding social capital and a weak dysfunctional government
prevails, conflict between groups is more likely to occur. The reason for this particular outcome is that

[t]he non-overlapping nature of social networks of different social groups results in unequal
opportunity to participate. Hence those who belong to social networks which already have access
to the resource allocation decisions of the state or the private sector…are much more likely to
continue to be included in societal processes than those who do not have such access. (Narayan
1999: 5)

Studies that examine the relationship between social capital and communal violence raise an
additional issue concerning causation. Many social capital scholars assume that the causal path between
social capital and government is unidirectional (Putnam 1993b: 89-90), (Putnam and Goss 2002),
(Coleman 1990), (Fukuyama 1995). However, a number of other scholars suggest that the type of social
capital found in a society is a function of the type of formal institutions in place. 99 Instead of positing a

98 In his past work Putnam (1993a) has acknowledged that, “social inequalities may be embedded in social
capital. Norms and networks that serve some groups may obstruct others, particularly if the norms are
discriminatory or the networks socially segregated…Life does not exempt us from the need to worry about how [a]
community is defined—who is inside and thus benefits from social capital, and who is outside and does not.” Levi
uses the example of neighborhoods to demonstrate this point further. She suggests that “neighborhoods (and certain
other forms of civic engagement) are a source of trust and neighborhoods are a source of distrust [in the sense that]…they promote trust of those you know and distrust of those you do not” (1996: 51).

99 A more extreme version of this suggestion has been made by Levi (1996) who states: “There is
considerable evidence that state institutions can, under certain circumstances, lay the basis for generalized trust [e.g.
social capital]. The absence of an effective state leads us to the Hobbesian world of nature, of the ‘war of all against
one-way process of causation (e.g. from social capital to institutions), these authors contend that the relationship is reciprocal with institutions playing a major role (see for example della Porta 2000, Rothenstein and Stolle 2002, Bratton 1989, Rueschemeyer 1998, Berman 1997 and Narayan 1999).100

Whether the institutions considered are informal or formal, social capital theories and theories of historical institutionalism assume that institutions serve as intermediate structures. One of the core assumptions of historical institutionalism is that institutions influence human behavior by shaping and conditioning the interests, identities and preferences of actors. As Immergut (1998: 20) states:

Institutions—be they the formal rules of political arenas, channels of communication, language codes, or the logics of strategic situations—act as filters that selectively favor particular interpretations either of the goals toward which political actors strive or of the best means to achieve these ends.101

Furthermore, it is through these “selective interpretations” that the disparities of power between groups within a society are maintained and reinforced. In this respect, the distribution of power within a governing institution is seen as influencing the degree to which the political or economic demands made by groups are considered “legitimate” by the ruling elite.102

100 The assumption that a two-way path of causation exists between social capital and government is also evident in many of the democratization studies discussed in the previous chapter (see Rothchild and Lawson 1994, Snyder 2000, Bratton 1994, Azarya 1994, Gyimah-Boahi 1994, Chabal and Daloz 1999 and Ottaway 2000). Where many of these democratization scholars differ is over whether state and society are completely distinct from one another. Whereas some, such as Bratton (1994), strongly suggest that the state and civil society are two separate, autonomous entities, other scholars such as Chabal and Daloz (1999) and Lemarchand (1992a) contend that the state in African countries is generally “unemancipated from society.”

On a separate note, the assumption made by many social capital scholars that formal institutions within a society directly reflect the type of social capital in place is a characteristic that distinguishes social capital theories from historical institutionalism more generally. As indicated previously, historical institutionalism posits that institutional development in a country is not just a matter of informal institutions, but also pre-existing formal institutions, as well as critical junctures.

101 On the difference between “calculus” and “cultural” interpretations of this particular function of institutions, see Hall and Taylor (1996: 939). As implied in the above discussion on social capital, the relationship between institutions and individual actors is assumed by historical institutionalism to be mutually constitutive. Here it is suggested that actors reinforce (or weaken) the very institutions that structure their behavior. According to Hall and Taylor, “[w]hen they act as a social convention specifies, individuals simultaneously constitute themselves as social actors, in the sense of engaging in socially meaningful acts, and reinforce the convention to which they are adhering” (1996: 948).

102 On this point, Immergut (1998: 20) states: “government actions may encourage (or discourage) the mobilization of interests by recognizing the legitimacy of particular claims or even by providing these persons with the opportunity to voice their complaints.”
The above suggestion is derived from an additional assumption made by historical institutionalists that the development of institutions is “a structured process” impacted by the history and culture of a society. As stated above, historical institutionalism emphasizes the importance of context as a causal factor in explaining human behavior. Institutions—including political institutions—are generally considered to be one type of context. However, the ability of institutions to condition actors’ preferences and behavior, as well as their influence on other institutions, is not limited to the present. Instead, institutional influence and development is assumed to be a path-dependent process.

A “path” is formed when institutions encourage “societal forces to organize along some lines rather than others, to adopt particular identities, or to develop interests in policies that are costly to shift” (Hall and Taylor 1996: 941). The ability of institutions to endure over time is further assumed to be a function of the particular feedback mechanism in place.

Thelen (1999) highlights two primary feedback mechanisms frequently referenced in the historical institutionalist literature: functional and distributional mechanisms. Because this study concerns the relationship between institutions and group conflict, the distributional mechanism is the more applicable. A distributional feedback mechanism is defined by Thelen (1999: 394) as one in which institutions encourage “societal forces to organize along some lines rather than others, to adopt particular identities, or to develop interests in policies that are costly to shift” (Hall and Taylor 1996: 941). The ability of institutions to endure over time is further assumed to be a function of the particular feedback mechanism in place.

103 For a full discussion on the various perspectives from which the concept of path dependency is derived, see Thelen (1999: 384-387). The concept of path-dependency is perhaps best described by Krasner with the statement: “The natural path for institutions is to act in the future as they have acted in the past” (1984; 235).

104 According to Krasner (1988: 81), an analysis of institutions must not only take into account institutional origin, but also how institutions persist over time, particularly in light of changing environmental circumstances. In this respect, feedback is suggested as being one of a number of different mechanisms by which institutions endure. Others include the ability of institutions to mitigate the problems associated with incomplete information, their ability to alter their environments and their ability to resist change. Lastly, institutions persist because of horizontal links with other institutions. (Krasner 1988: 85) All of these are mechanisms that in one way or another impact the vertical depth and horizontal linkages that encourage institutionalization. For a full discussion of the persistence of institutions, see Krasner (1988: 81-85; in regards the concept of institutionalization more specifically, see 1988: 74-77).

105 At this point, it is important to make a distinction between path-dependency as a core assumption of historical institutionalism and path-dependency as a theoretical subset of historical institutionalism. The latter pertains to a body of literature that focuses specifically on the mechanisms of institutional persistence with less emphasis given to the types of factors that induce institutional change. Many of the studies Thelen references in her discussion of distributional and functional feedback mechanisms are from the path-dependency literature. For a more specific discussion on this point, see Thelen (1999: 392-396).

106 The first mechanism—the functional mechanism—is a type of mechanism that prompts actors to “adapt their strategies in ways that reflect but also reinforce the ‘logic’ of the system once the system is in place” (Thelen 1999: 392). One of the many examples Thelen uses to demonstrate this type of mechanism is the study by Esping-Anderson (1990) who examines the relationship between different types of welfare systems (e.g. universal, means-
which “political arrangements and policy feedbacks actively facilitate the organization and empowerment of certain groups while actively disarticulating and marginalizing others.”

From the preceding discussion, it would appear to be the case that institutional change is quite difficult to achieve. Krasner argues that the more institutionalized the institution—the more actors identify with the institution (vertical depth) and the more links an institution has with other institutions (horizontal linkages)—the more difficult it is for the institution to evolve and modify (1988: 74-77). The concept of “vertical depth” is especially relevant to the present study as it takes into consideration the various cognitive aspects associated with institutions: their ideational foundations and the degree to which individuals self-identify with these foundations (Krasner 1988: 74-75).

Rothstein considers “collective memory” to be a type of distributional feedback mechanism that is a historical construction, the content of which is influenced by political leaders to achieve particular goals. According to the author, in an attempt to create generalized trust, a collective memory is used in the following way:

At time $t_1$, a specific notion of ‘who are the others’ is successfully established by political leaders (these ‘others’ could very well be a political institution). This creates a certain type of behavior among the masses, which at $t_2$ serves to reinforce the political strength of their political leaders so that they can, with even more resources, work to strengthen that particular collective memory at $t_3$ (2000: 496)

Collective memory is a part of political discourse. Hall (1993) attributes policymaking—and by implication institutional persistence—to the political discourse in place. One aspect of this discourse is the policy paradigm. According to Hall, policy paradigms consist of “[a] framework of ideas and standards that specifies not only the goals of policy and the kind of instruments that can be used to attain

---

107 Some of the studies in the historical institutionalist literature that demonstrate the role of distributional feedback mechanisms include the studies by Skocpol (1992), Esping-Anderson (1990), and Karl (1997) (see Thelen 1999: 394-395).

108 This is a problem Thelen (1999: 396) associates with the literature on both types of feedback mechanisms. At the same time, Krasner (1988: 73) states: “If patterns of behavior, roles, collectivities, or formal organizations change rapidly and frequently, then there is little use in invoking an institutional argument.”

109 Examples of studies that focus on the role of ideas in institutional persistence and change include those by Locke and Thelen (1995), and Hall (1993).
them, but also the very nature of the problems they are meant to be addressing” (1993: 279). From this it follows that those who exert the most influence over the political discourse also control policy and/or group identity.111

Hall further suggests that policy paradigms are distinct from formal institutional structures in that change in the former often induces change in the latter. Historical institutionalists have suggested that the ability of a state to defy pressures for change is dependent on the coherence of the particular policy paradigm in place. When a paradigm—for whatever reason—no longer provides a sufficient template for the creation and maintenance of effective policies that accord with the interests and demands of political entrepreneurs and/or society as a whole, a space is created for new alternative paradigms (Hall 1993: 280-281, 290-291).112

At the same time, paradigm shifts are frequently met with resistance from those who derive benefit from the existing set of entrenched programmatic beliefs—not only in the material sense, but also in terms of the group’s identity.113

The more deeply embedded a policy paradigm is in a country’s institutions—the more policymakers associate their interests and preferences with the paradigm—the greater the likelihood that

110 Goldstein and Keohane (1993: 10) offer a similar definition as it pertains to causal beliefs. On a more general note, the historical institutionalist perspective on policy paradigms has a great deal in common with the conception of ideas and beliefs in the international relations literature—in particular the relationship between ideas and institutions (see Goldstein and Keohane 1993 and Goldstein 1993).

111 In this way, actors are influenced by and also exert an influence on, policymaking and institutions (Hall 1993: 289-290). The concept of collective memory used by Rothstein also incorporates issues of power in a similar way. Because collective memory legitimates a group’s claims to power it becomes a “contested ideological terrain, where different actors try to establish their particular interpretation of the past as the [italics in original] collective memory for a particular group” (2000: 494; see also 497). The relationship between power and the political agenda hypothesized here is not a new one. For example, Schattsneider (1961: 68) has stated: “Political conflict is not like an intercollegiate debate in which the opponents agree in advance on a definition of the issues. As a matter of fact, the definition of the alternatives is the supreme instrument of power [italics in original]; the antagonists can rarely agree on what the issues are because power is involved in the definition. He who determines what politics is about runs the country, because the definition of alternatives is the choice of conflicts, and the choice of conflicts allocates power.”

112 A good example of an international relations take on the policy paradigm shift is provided by the studies by Jackson (1993: 111-138), Sikkink (1993: 139-170) and Goldstein (1993).

113 With respect to this latter issue, Ringmar (1993: 3) offers the suggestion that groups go to war with other groups “not only in order to win things, but also in order to defend a certain conception of who they are.”
institutional change will encounter opposition. In this way, ideas constrain the policy choices actors make in their responses to changing environmental circumstances. As Berman (1998: 207) notes:

Actors [strive] to make decisions consistent with preexisting beliefs; ‘appropriateness’ [is]…the most important criterion actors use when evaluating the worth of different policy options. Since actors’ ideas (and hence their definition of ‘appropriateness’) tends to change slowly at best, moreover, we should find that a particular actor makes similar choices over time, even as the external environment changes.

In a similar vein, international relations scholars Goldstein and Keohane (1993: 12) state:

Insofar as ideas put blinders on people, reducing the number of conceivable alternatives, they serve as invisible switchmen, not only by turning action onto a certain track rather than others…but also by obscuring the other tracks from the agent’s view.114

Although historical institutionalists assume that movement off a certain institutional trajectory is difficult, it is not impossible. In addition to social learning, change is possible through the occurrence of a critical juncture.115 “Critical junctures” are defined as “moments when substantial institutional change [creates]…a ‘branching point’ from which historical development moves onto a new path” (Hall and Taylor 1996: 942).116

114 The concept of ideas as “switchmen” is derived from Weber (see Gerth and Mills 1958: 280).
115 “Social learning” is defined by Hall as “a deliberate attempt to adjust the goals or techniques of policy in response to past experience and new information. Learning is indicated when policy emerges as the result of such a process” (1993: 278). According to Hall, social learning occurs in stages. Each stage is a function of the particular goals of the policymaker, the techniques used to attain these goals and the policy targets, all of which are attributable to the particular policy paradigm in place (1993: 278-279).
116 For a similar definition, see Thelen (1999: 387). According to historical institutionalism more generally, critical junctures are similar to punctuated equilibrium arguments in evolution. In contrast to a Darwinian synthesis, which sees change as a slow, gradual and adaptive process, Krasner suggests that punctuated equilibrium arguments depict change as a difficult process that is constrained by past structures and which often occurs with suboptimal consequences (1988: 77-80, 1984: 240-244). In this regard, institutional change is assumed to occur rapidly as a result of circumstances or events that are brief and often fortuitous.

One point that is worth making in regards to institutional change is that it is not always a result of a “sudden exogenous shock.” Streeck and Thelen argue that the focus of institutionalist literature on the punctuated equilibrium model has led scholars to misinterpret incremental institutional change as being less significant than it actually is. Instead, the authors advocate the position that even gradual institutional change—or change constrained and influenced by existing institutional structures—can and does exert a significant impact on societies. To clarify their argument, the authors distinguish among types of institutional changes (incremental and abrupt) by their results. The authors contend that the outcome of incremental change can be either institutional adaptation or institutional transformation over time. In terms of the latter outcome, the end result often entails a drastic long-term shift in previous institutional arrangements (2005: chap. 1; for an empirical demonstration of this argument, see also the studies included in the authors’ edited volume. The above argument is also present in Thelen 2004).
Regardless of whether a critical juncture is the result of a crisis or non-crisis event, historical institutionalism suggests that similar critical junctures impact countries differently depending on their interaction with various internal political processes (Locke and Thelen 1995: 328, Berman 1998). To be more specific, Thelen argues that the ways in which critical junctures effect existing institutions depends upon on how these institutions were initially formed, as well as on their mechanisms for reproduction (1999: 397).

Another variable that impacts the course of institutional development is the unintended consequences that arise from institutional reforms. Unintended consequences are defined by Cortell and Peterson as “those policy, procedural, and/or institutional consequences that diverge from the goals sought by the agents who originally established or altered the institution” (2001: 771). As mentioned above, Cortell and Peterson suggest that the chances that unwanted outcomes will arise in response to institutional change increase in instances in which the reforms in question do not accord with the existing beliefs (paradigms) and practices of the society in which they occur. Unintended consequences can also surface from the favorable or unfavorable interaction between new and the pre-existing institutions (2001: 772-774).

A “crisis” has been defined as “a sporadic, disruptive event that suddenly challenges a state’s capacity to maintain control and alters the boundaries defining the legitimate use of coercion. Crisis situations tend to become the watershed in a state’s institutional development’, (Skowronek 1982: 5, quoted in Krasner 1984: 234). Krasner (1984: 234) points to two types of crisis: those that are generated internally, and those that stem from external sources (e.g. international pressures and threats). Regardless of origin, crises induce institutional changes that are abrupt and extensive. At the same time, other scholars suggest that gradual change in institutions is possible. Peters argues that “incremental adjustment…[is]…a means of institutional adjustment to changing demands and to inadequacies in the initial [institutional] design” (1999: 70; for further discussion on incremental change, see also Cortell and Peterson 1999 and Streeck and Thelen 2005).

Expressed as an equation, this relationship would read as follows: \( I_t = I_{t-x} + [I_{t-x} \times M_{t-x}] + [I_{t-x} \times C_{t-y}] \) where \( I \) represents the institution in question at time \( t \), \( M \) the relevant mechanisms for reproduction, and \( C \) the critical juncture. \( X \) in the above equation stands for the period of time at which the institution was originally formed; \( y \) is the period of time at which the critical juncture occurred.

The third way in which unintended consequences come about is a failure on the part of the agents of reform to sanction defection and monitor compliance with the changes made. Cortell and Peterson associate the first two explanations of unintended consequences discussed above with theories of sociological and historical institutionalism respectively. The last explanation the authors associate with rational choice institutionalism. More generally, Hall and Taylor state that the concept of unintended consequences creates serious problems for rational choice institutionalism, which defines institutions by the particular function they serve. Because unintended
As demonstrated in the preceding chapter, most of the qualitative studies of democratization in Africa rely, either explicitly or implicitly, on the core assumptions of historical institutionalism. As a result, these studies fall prey to a number of the theoretical pitfalls associated with historical explanations. The foremost among these is the problem of structure and agency.\textsuperscript{120}

The problem of structure and agency primarily centers on the assumption of path-dependency. If actors’ preferences are created in institutional contexts, and institutions and institutional development are constrained by past trajectories, then history pre-determines individual choice and behavior to a large extent.\textsuperscript{121} In the theory of historical institutionalism, agency is largely limited to critical junctures, or moments of institutional change.\textsuperscript{122} Mahoney and Snyder (1999: 18) point out that this assumption is problematic in that it “obscures the dynamic interaction of agency and institutional structures across time and encourages a reliance on structural explanations for the origins of junctures.”

Historical institutionalist scholars face difficulty in explaining how and why critical junctures produce particular policy outcomes. While the current study accepts the contention that past institutions influence future institutional development by way of their impact on individual actors, merely relying on a country’s “institutional legacy” to explain the direction of regime change is not enough. Historical institutionalism assumes that actors exercise a certain degree of decision-making autonomy. In order to

\textsuperscript{120} In an effort to devote more of this chapter to the structure-agency problem, only a very brief synopsis of the other theoretical difficulties faced by historical institutionalism is provided here. In addition to problems of structure and agency, historical institutionalism also encounters difficulties in explaining institutional change. The notion that change occurs as a result of punctuated equilibria or critical junctures oftentimes results in explanations that are essentially ad hoc (this is a point made by Peters 1999: 69 and Hall and Taylor 1996: 942). Furthermore, as Streeck and Thelen (2005) point out, the focus on change as an abrupt process had led many historical institutionalist scholars to overlook the importance of more gradual types of institutional change, the end results of which are often times extremely significant. Historical institutionalists are also frequently accused of engaging in “story telling,” or creating explanations of institutions and individual behavior that are largely descriptive (Thelen 1999: 372-374). Using history to explain institutional phenomena further runs the risk of creating explanations that cannot be falsified (Immergut 1998: 19, 26-27). The ways in which these various problems are dealt with by the current study are explained in greater detail in Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{121} Peters (1999: 71) describes the problem as being the result of a “certain sense of \textit{dues ex machina} [italics in original]” in which “decisions taken at one time [appear] to endure on auto-pilot, with individual behavior being shaped by the decisions made by members of an institution some years earlier.”

\textsuperscript{122} Mahoney and Snyder (1999: 17) suggest that critical junctures represent a causal mechanism that links past institutions with future institutions, which in turn “embody the choices and decisions [of] actors.”
demonstrate this, it is necessary to systematically examine the ways in which political leaders perceive their policy options prior to and during periods of institutional reform.\textsuperscript{123}

The inclusion of a decision-making model is especially critical for those studies that examine the causes and outcomes of democratization in the developing world. As most of the studies in the previous chapter indicate, excessive violence has been the “unintended consequence” of democratization in Rwanda, Burundi, and in several other countries on the continent of Africa. However, absent a thorough analysis of leaders’ thoughts and perceptions regarding multiparty democracy, we have no way of knowing why these unintended consequences varied to the extent they did.

\textbf{Prospect Theory: Core Assumptions and the Problem of Predicting Reference Points}

As a type of bounded rationality, prospect theory assumes that the type of decision rule utilized by actors under conditions of risk is a function of context.\textsuperscript{124} This assumption is offered as corrective to the principle of invariance used by expected utility models. Quattrone and Tversky state the assumption as follows:

\begin{quote}
[Invariance] requires that the preference order among prospects should not depend on how their outcomes and probabilities are described and thus that two alternative formulations of the same problem should yield the same result. (1988: 727)
\end{quote}

Stated another way, a variation in the way in which options are presented to the decision-maker—which has no influence on the outcomes of these options—should exert no impact on the choice between them. How options are weighted by the decision-maker should remain consistent.\textsuperscript{125}

\textsuperscript{123} One of the ways in which historical institutionalists have tried to remedy this particular problem is with the use of methods such as process-tracing. Process-tracing is used to examine “the decision process by which various initial conditions are translated into outcomes,” (George and McKeown 1985: 35). The interests and preferences of actors, their attention and memories, are assumed to be impacted by contextual factors, including previous institutional arrangements.

\textsuperscript{124} McDermott (1998: 4) describes the theory as providing, “a profoundly situationalist analysis [in which it is assumed that] risk-taking behavior is based not on the individual predispositions of a particular leaders, but evolves out of a cognitive response to a situation that constrains the way options are interpreted and choice is made.”

\textsuperscript{125} Berejikian (1992: 652) attributes this belief to two additional assumptions of rational choice: the assumption that decisions between options are made on the basis of the utilities of these options, and the notion that the same decision rule applies to choices between gains and choices between losses.
However, Kahneman and Tversky (1979), Tversky and Kahneman (1986), Quattrone and Tversky (1988) and several other scholars have empirically demonstrated that invariance and many of the other normative foundations of rational choice theory are frequently violated in practice and that these violations are not the result of random error, but are systematic.\(^\text{126}\)

Prospect theory assumes that how people choose between options depends on their perception of these options as a loss or a gain relative to a neutral reference point. The theory further distinguishes between two phases of the decision-making process: the editing phase and the evaluation phase.

The editing phase—also referred to as “framing”—focuses on the impact that certain cognitive processes have on the categorization of options in terms of their consequences. According to prospect theory, the framing process concerns not only the manner in which choices are presented, but also the means by which individuals distinguish between these choices. Operations frequently used for the purpose of simplifying the decision process during this phase are coding, combination, cancellation, segregation, detection of dominance and simplification.\(^\text{127}\)

The evaluation phase of the decision-making process is the phase in which the actual choice between options is made. The two essential components of the evaluation phase are the value function and the weighting function (Kahneman and Tversky 1979: 277-284). The former attributes a subjective

---

\(^\text{126}\) In addition to the assumption of invariance, three of the other core assumptions of rational choice that are regularly violated in decision-making under risk are the assumptions of cancellation, transitivity and dominance. The former assumes that the choice between options is a function of the condition(s) under which options yield different outcomes. In other words, if option A is preferred to option B given condition X, then absent X, neither option is preferable as they both yield the same outcome, zero. Transitivity assumes that the consequences of options are not evaluated relative to the consequences of other options. If the utility of A is higher than that of B, A will be preferred to B. The utility of A is evaluated separately from the utility of B. The assumption of dominance suggests that an option which is preferred in one state, and is at least as good in all other states, is the dominant option and should therefore be selected. Tversky and Kahneman (1986: S253) state that, because of its simplicity, the assumption of dominance “serves as the cornerstone of the normative theory of choice.” For the authors’ full discussion regarding each of these assumptions and the difficulties they encounter when applied to actual choice behavior, see Tversky and Kahneman (1986: S251-S278).

\(^\text{127}\) To be more specific, Kahneman and Tversky suggest that the use of these cognitive editing mechanisms is to “transform the outcomes and probabilities associated with…offered prospects” (1979: 274). The editing mechanisms listed above are nicely summarized by McDermott (1998: 23-24). The mechanism of coding is the “tendency to categorize outcomes in terms of gains and losses, rather than in terms of final absolute states of wealth or welfare”; combination is “the tendency of people to add together the likelihood of choices that present identical outcomes”; segregation is the tendency “to focus on the factors at hand that seem most relevant to the immediate problem” and simplification is the “mathematical rounding of probabilities…[and the] discarding…[of] very
value to objective outcomes in the form of a gain or a loss. The latter function concerns the particular manner in which probabilities are attributed to outcomes.

The value function in prospect theory is unlike the value function in expected utility theory in that the assessment of the values of choices assumes the form of an s-shaped curve that is concave above a neutral reference point, and convex below the reference point.\textsuperscript{128}

\textit{Figure 3.1. Value Function of Choice under Risk}

unlikely alternatives.” For further discussion of the operations associated with the editing process, see Kahneman and Tversky (1979: 274-275) and Tversky and Kahneman (1986: S257).\textsuperscript{128} In rational choice theory it is assumed that the shape of the utility function is concave to represent the phenomenon of diminishing marginal returns in risk-seeking behavior. In prospect theory both segments of the s-shaped value curve reflect diminishing returns.

Another crucial distinction between prospect theory and expected utility theory is that in the latter the value of options is defined in terms of final asset accumulation, not in terms of changes in welfare or status. Quattrone and Tversky demonstrate the assumption of coherence in expected utility theory with the following example: “a person with wealth $W$ accepts an even chance to win $\$1,000$ or lose $\$500$ if the difference between the utility of $W + \$1,000$ and the utility of $W$ (the upside) exceeds the difference between the utility of $W$ and the utility of $W - \$500$ (the downside)” (1988: 720). In this particular instance, the decision to accept the risky proposition depends on whether the difference between current wealth and amount gained is more than the difference between current wealth and what the gambler stands to lose from the gamble. Prospect theory assumes instead that individuals are more “attuned to the evaluation of changes or differences...than to the evaluation of absolute magnitudes” (Kahneman and Tversky 1979: 277). The authors write: “value should be treated as a function in two arguments: the asset position that serves as the reference point, and the magnitude of the change (positive or negative) from that reference point” (1979: 277; for further information on value-function according to prospect theory, see Kahneman and Tversky 1979: 277-280, 1982: 162-164, Tversky and Kahneman 1986: S258-S260, and Quattrone and Tversky
That the convex segment of the s-curve is steeper than the concave is believed by prospect theory scholars to be an indication that losses loom larger than gains in the logic of choice under risk. Kahneman and Tversky (1986: S258), Quattrone and Tverky (1988: 724) and others refer to this characteristic of the value function as “loss aversion.” A manifestation of loss aversion is the endowment effect. As Gross-Stein explains (1992: 15), the endowment effect suggests that people frequently demand much more to give up an object than they would be willing to pay to acquire the same object. The principal effect of endowment is to enhance not the attractiveness of what one owns but the pain of giving it up; forgone gains are less painful than perceived losses.

Scholars who have focused specifically on the impact of the endowment effect on choice suggest that it frequently results in a bias towards whatever is perceived by the individual to be the status quo (see for example the studies by Kahneman, Knetsch and Thaler 1991, Knetsch and Sinden 1984, and Knetsch 1989). Movement away from the status quo can be conceived of in terms of its costs or its benefits. The tendency for individuals to attribute a greater significance to the costs associated with change means that, under certain conditions, when movement from the status quo is perceived as a choice between negative outcomes it is likely to induce risk-seeking behavior.

However, risky behavior under these circumstances occurs when the reference point and the status quo are congruent. Scholars such as Levy (1997) and Levy and Whyte (1997) also argue that in instances in which an actor’s point of view is not the current status quo but some aspiration level—such

---

129 The concept of loss aversion violates the rational choice assumption of indifference. To explain the concept of indifference Kahneman, Knetsch and Thaler (1991: 196) use the following example: “if an individual owns \( x \) and is indifferent between keeping it and trading it for \( y \), then when owning \( y \) the individual should be indifferent about trading it for \( x \).” In this context it is assumed that indifference curves are reversible. However, the studies by Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler (1991: 196-197) and Knetsch (1990) empirically demonstrate that when loss aversion is present, the assumption of reversibility no longer holds. Other scholars, such as Wicker and Hammans (1995), have found that, under conditions in which the goals of the actor exhibit greater necessity, the loss aversion effect is even stronger in magnitude.

130 This assumption hinges on the further assumption that actors adjust faster to gains than to losses (Kahneman et al. 1990: 1342). If, for example, an individual cannot adjust to the losses associated with a shift in the status quo, prospect theory predicts that that same individual will be more inclined to behave in a risk-seeking manner (Gross-Stein 1992: 15-16), (Jervis 1992, 2004), (Kahneman, Knetsch and Thaler 1991).

131 Levy makes it clear that loss aversion and risk acceptance are two totally distinct concepts. Whereas “loss aversion is reflected in the steepness of the value function on the loss side…risk orientation is reflected in the curvature of the value function” (1997: 90n).
as the former status quo, for example—then the current status quo itself can be perceived as the loss. In
cases such as this, risk-seeking behavior becomes the means by which the decision-maker attempts to
recoup the losses associated with movement away from the previous status quo.\footnote{More generally, Levy (1997: 91) makes the point that status quo bias is actually “reference point bias.” He defines “reference point bias” as “a greater tendency to move toward the reference point than expected-utility theory predicts.” This suggestion accords with the general assertion made by Kahneman and Tversky (1982: 167) that “the reference point is the state to which one has become adapted.” On this point, see also Kahneman and Tversky (1979: 286-288; for further discussion on this issue, see also Levy 1992a: 177, 1992b: 285-289, and Jervis 1992: 196-197, 199-200, 2004: 171-174).}

Either way, risk-seeking or risk-averse behavior is a function of the domain in which the
decision-maker finds himself or herself which, in turn, depends on his or her particular reference point.\footnote{Furthermore, prospect theory scholars suggest that once a reference point has been chosen and a choice problem framed as a gain or a loss relative to this reference point, actors are less likely to alter their original perspective of the issue as a gain or a loss. In other words, they become less sensitive to new information and evidence especially if this information and evidence contradicts their current perceptions and beliefs. What ends up occurring is a “truncated search in which options inconsistent with prevailing beliefs and ideological constructs [are] eliminated a priori,” (Gross-Stein 1992: 34; for further discussion, see Kahneman and Tversky 1992).}

In a losses frame actors display a tendency to engage in risky behavior in order to avoid the “sure loss”
associated with movement away from the status quo, or from a shift in the status quo. Conversely, in a

In a gains frame actors face a choice between two or more prospects which they perceive to have positive

Given the diminishing marginal returns associated with increases in gains it assumed that in a
gains frame actors will engage in risk-averse behavior.\footnote{In other words, the actor chooses what is believed to be the sure gain over a gamble of equal or greater expected value. Kahneman and Tversky use the monetary expectation of a gamble to demonstrate risk-averse and risk-seeking behavior. In this case, “[a] choice is risk-averse if a certain outcome is preferred to a gamble with an equal or greater monetary expectation. A choice is risk-seeking, on the other hand, if a certain outcome is rejected in favor of a gamble with an equal or lower monetary expectation” (1982: 160). Regardless, in both cases, people are behaving \textit{irrationally} in that they are choosing the option that has the lower expected monetary value.}
Prospect theory distinguishes between two features of the weighting function. The first of these concerns the manner in which extreme outcomes are weighted. Here it is assumed that under conditions of risk, greater weight is attached to outcomes that are considered to be certain or impossible regardless of their actual probabilities. The second characteristic of the weighting process follows from the first. In this case, events with moderate to high probabilities are underweighted and events with low probabilities are severely over-weighted. As a result, outcomes that are less likely to occur tend to exert a greater influence on the decision-making process than those which have a greater likelihood of occurring.

Furthermore, a number of studies have demonstrated with the use of real-world examples that when actors choose to gamble on a prospect that is probable, though unlikely (a “long shot”), they tend to downplay or ignore the costs associated with the gamble even when these costs outweigh the costs of the foregone alternative(s). This particular aspect of risk-seeking behavior is reflected in the flatter, convex segment of the s-curve (see above), which indicates a lesser sensitivity to additional losses as one moves farther away from a reference point. Under these conditions, actors will continue to risk the larger losses associated with the gamble rather than accept the sure loss (Gross-Stein 1992: 19).

Prospect theory has been used to explain many different aspects of international relations behavior—including cases of cooperation between groups, matters of military deterrence, as well as inter-

---

135 The weighted values are demonstrated by the equation: \( v = \sum w(p_i) \cdot v(x_i) \). In this equation \( x \) is the outcome, \( p \) its perceived probability, \( w(p) \) the probability-weighting function, and \( v(x) \) the value (Levy 1992a: 181).

136 This phenomenon is what is known in prospect theory scholarship as the “certainty effect.” As McDermott describes it, the certainty effect prompts actors to “treat highly likely but uncertain events as certain [and]...highly unlikely events as impossible” (1998: 30). The example commonly used to demonstrate the certainty effect is the game of Russian roulette (see Kahneman and Tversky 1979: 283, Quattrone and Tversky 1988: 730). Kahneman and Tversky further demonstrate that when the character of an outcome is reduced from being a sure thing to being only probable, its attractiveness subsequently diminishes (1979: 265-266).

137 The tendency for actors to overestimate events with low probabilities reduces the attractiveness of possible gains relative to sure gains and increases the threat of sure losses relative to probable ones. These are considered to be examples in which risk-seeking behavior can occur in a gains frame and risk-averse behavior in a losses frame. Kahneman and Tversky limit this behavior to events with small probabilities only (1982: 163, 166, 1979: 285-286), (see also Quattrone and Tversky 1988: 730-731). Both the certainty effect and overestimation violate the rational choice assumption of substitution. This assumption asserts that probabilities are assessed independently of utility such that “if \( B \) is preferred to \( A \), then any (probability) mixture of \( (B, p) \) must be preferred to the mixture \( (A, p) \),” (Kahneman and Tversky 1979: 266), (McDermott 1998: 29-33).
of state conflict and war. Of specific relevance to the present study are analyses which use prospect theory as a means to explain cases of genocide and mass violence.

A good example of this latter type of study is Midlarsky’s (2005) analysis which uses prospect theory in conjunction with the concept of realpolitik to explain the occurrence of genocide in three cases: Ottoman Turkey, Nazi-occupied Europe and Rwanda. The author specifically attributes the commission of genocide in Rwanda to the vulnerability of the Tutsi and to the presence of a losses frame among Hutu political leaders. He argues that the inability of the Hutu extremists to adjust to the losses associated with multiparty democracy, RPF victories on the battlefield, the violence in Burundi, an expansion in the refugee population in Rwanda and a history of inter-group tensions, led them to abrogate the Arusha Peace Treaty in April 1994 (the risk-seeking option). According to the author’s model, genocide was not the risky act, but was instead perpetrated in order to compensate the Hutu for all of their previous losses, and to minimize the costs associated with the riskier option selected.

While potentially important for its use of prospect theory in the explanation of genocide, several fundamental problems render Midlarsky’s work not only flawed, but troubling. What is especially troubling about the Midlarsky study is his assumption that a losses frame engenders two types of behavior: risk-acceptant and risk reducing. If leaders, acting in a domain of losses, simultaneously attempt to minimize the risks associated with a riskier policy choice, this implies the use of a single decision rule. Under these circumstances, leaders are behaving in a manner that is more consistent with a subjective expected utility model rather than as prospect theory suggests.

---

138 Examples of studies that apply the theory to specific foreign policy decisions, including those associated with the Gulf War (1991) and the Cuban missile crisis, are the studies by Farnham (1992), McDermott (1992), McDermott and Kugler (2001), Haas (2001), Richardson (1992), and Welch (1992). An example of a study that examines military deterrence from a prospect theory perspective is the study by Berejikian (2002). On a more general note, the studies included in the volume edited by Gross-Stein and Pauly (1992)—many of which are mentioned immediately above—apply prospect theory to case studies of international cooperation.

139 More specifically, genocide is categorized in Midlarsky’s model as an “imprudent” form of realpolitik. “Brute force-imprudent realpolitik” is evident in cases in which the use of mass violence by political leaders exceeds a state’s normal security interests (Midlarsky 2005: 92-97; see also chap. 5).

140 The idea that the Hutu desired to reduce the risks associated with their defiance of the peace accords implies that some sort of cost-benefit analysis was conducted by leaders. Furthermore, if leaders were indeed behaving rationally, Midlarsky’s explanation of the Rwandan genocide encounters a problem similar to the explanation offered by de Figuierido and Weingast (1997). In both analyses, genocide is presumed to have been an
Furthermore, it is very difficult from the author’s model to detect the origin of the reference points leaders use to guide their decision-making behavior. In the case of Rwanda, for example, the author argues that a number of factors contributed to the losses frame of the extremist Hutu politicians, including the particular history of “status relations between Hutu and Tutsi” (Midlarsky 2005: 162). In this particular instance, it is possible to attribute the causes of the genocide to structural circumstances and not to the way in which the prospect of power-sharing was framed by political leaders.141

The Midlarsky study highlights one of the major difficulties that prospect theory encounters. The theory has been dubbed by scholars as a “reference-dependent theory without a theory of the reference point,” (Levy 1997: 100). Reference points are a function of context and are entirely subjective. Their formation is influenced by current conditions, past experiences, norms, beliefs, as well as by imaginary events and/or those that have not yet transpired. Without a clear explanation of the circumstantial or cognitive factors that induce certain types of reference points it is difficult to reach any conclusions about choice behavior that encompass the entire decision-making process and which are generalizable across cases.142

Levy (1992b: 294, 1997: 99) argues that, to clearly demonstrate the causal impact of framing on the decision-making process, the reference point must be distinguishable from the context at issue. In other words, “if the same underlying conditions influence both the framing of a choice problem and the action whose benefits were understood by the perpetrators to be gradual, long-term benefits. Explanations of this nature face the problem of akrasia.

141 In the above example, the reference point cannot be identified independently of the behavior in question. The result is an explanation that is tautological (e.g. group violence causes more group violence). On a more general note, the author’s analysis faces additional problems when it comes to explaining instances in which genocide did not occur. As this applies to Rwanda specifically, many of the factors that contributed to the creation of the losses frame among Hutu leaders in Rwanda were also present in Burundi. As a result, the author’s conclusions as to the causes of the genocide in Rwanda should be accepted with a great degree of hesitation.

142 A similar problem arises with respect to determining which aspect of the decision-making process—the reference point, decision weights, loss aversion etc.—exerts the most influence on the choices made in a particular setting (Levy 1997: 99). Again, using the Midlarsky study as an example, it is very difficult to distinguish which element exerted the greatest impact on the occurrence of genocide in Rwanda: the cumulative effect of the losses experienced by the Hutu or the isolated effect of one particular loss; the weight attached to the prospect of multiparty rule, the prevalence of state insecurity, or the desire to minimize risk.

The problems associated with defining the reference point, and in determining the differential causal significance associated with the editing and evaluation phases of the choice process are what Levy considers to be problems of external validity (1997: 98-100).
behavior we want to explain, an inference that framing and loss aversion casually determine choice might be spurious” (1992b: 294). This particular problem points once again to the need for a theory to explain which types of factors lead to the creation of specific types of reference points under given sets of conditions.

Generally speaking, prospect theory has better luck in explaining the decision-making process once a decision frame has been determined. Because the various aspects associated with the editing phase are taken as a given, prospect theory is limited in its ability to fully attribute outcomes to cognitive processes. Instead, outcomes are more often explained as being a function of the decision-maker’s goals and the constraints with which he or she is faced.\textsuperscript{143}

**Historical Institutionalism and Prospect Theory: An Integrative Theory of Collective Violence**

When it comes to explaining the relationship between collective violence and institutional change, historical institutionalism and prospect theory each offer valuable insights into the ways in which contextual elements influence the policy choices of political leaders. Whereas the former theory focuses more on explaining behavior by explaining the meso-level factors which produce this behavior; the latter places greater emphasis on the ways in which policy options are assessed relative to particular contextual factors.

Unfortunately, each theory has an inherent flaw that reduces its explanatory power. Prospect theory cannot systematically explain the formation of reference points while historical institutionalism encounters difficulties in overcoming the obstacle of institutions as a “black box.” The present study suggests that a synthesis of these theories not only resolves their individual limitations but, when applied to the study of democratization and group violence, greatly improves on existing theories.

\textsuperscript{143} According to Levy, it is this particular characteristic of the theory that makes it a type of “substantive rationality” along with expected utility theory. In both cases, less emphasis is placed on the explaining the reasoning processes associated with decision-making (e.g. how preferences are formed, how reference points are chosen etc.). Instead, these latter processes are more often included as auxiliary assumptions (1997: 101-102).
There has been little, if any, attempt made by scholars to integrate prospect theory and historical institutionalism. The approach used by this dissertation therefore permits the formation of an original theory that offers a fresh perspective on the relationship between institutions, institutional change, and the choice-making behavior of political leaders.

Prospect theory is particularly valuable in this regard as it integrates institutions (as context) with individual decision-making behavior. The current study has frequently noted that neither the structural theories of group violence, nor those which explain collective violence as an outcome of democratization, offer a complete explanation as to how larger scale factors translate into specific policy outcomes. As this structure-agency problem applies to the theory of historical institutionalism more specifically, it is necessary to establish a link between institutions and individual behavior. Otherwise the explanatory power of concepts such as the critical juncture is substantially weakened. Absent a decision-making model, historical institutionalism is reduced to deriving the preferences and interests of actors from their policy choices.

Additionally, the use of prospect theory in conjunction with the theory of historical institutionalism is valuable as a means of explaining why political leaders opt to respond to democratization with a strategy of excessive violence in some cases, but not others. As indicated previously, prospect theory assumes that under conditions of risk actors do not adhere to a single utility function. In the context of the present study, this translates into the suggestion that the choice to commit total genocide may have less to do with its actual utility and more to do with an actor’s perception of his or her own status relative to a particular reference point.\(^{144}\) This would explain why in cases such as

\(^{144}\) As indicated in the previous chapter, many of structural and democratization studies assume that in multiethnic societies the transfer from an authoritarian system to a system of multiparty rule is most often perceived by incumbent elites as a direct threat to their interests. Consequently, the contest for political power in these countries becomes a winner-take-all competition. This assumption is based on the additional belief that a single utility function is applicable across cases. Under adverse conditions, actors are expected to choose the option that will maximize their highest expected utility. However, to assume that violence is rational under these circumstances suggests that in similar contexts—across cases—actors will opt for similar strategies. That this does not always occur poses serious difficulties for explanations that rely on the assumptions of expected utility theory or rational choice theory more generally.
Rwanda and the Sudan, for instance, leaders embarked on policies that were extremely costly, not only in terms of human life, but also in terms of infrastructure, economic stability and foreign status.145

When the topic of study is institutional change, the concept of the critical juncture, derived from the theory of historical institutionalism, provides prospect theory with a means to more clearly define the reference points used by political leaders. How leaders respond to institutional change therefore becomes a matter of how change is perceived—as a gain or a loss.

As the above relationship applies to democratization in multiethnic developing countries, this dissertation argues that the critical juncture of institutional change influences the types of reference points that guide the decision-making processes of incumbent elite groups. Under these conditions, the strategy (or strategies) political leaders develop and select in response to either the implementation of multiparty rule—or its prospect—is a function of the ways in which democratization is framed vis-à-vis these reference points.

Several of the studies discussed in the previous chapter indicate that political competition in developing countries is frequently perceived by incumbents and opposition alike as a zero-sum contest. This study further accepts the contention made by democratization scholars that, during periods of institutional change, the primary goal of political incumbents is to retain power within the governing system. This goal is consistent across cases and is assumed by this study to be the driving force behind the behavior of political incumbents in Rwanda and Burundi. What differs, of course, is the manner in which actors go about achieving this particular goal.

This study contends that political leaders who are unable to adjust to the losses associated with the transfer from a single party authoritarian system to a power-sharing system of government will frame their policy options relative to the former ruling system (the status quo ante). The result is a perception of the decision-making process as a choice between two negative outcomes: the “sure loss” of the current status

145 Levy states that, when a state perceives itself to be in a zero-sum relationship with an adversary, the tendency for leaders to engage in risky behavior to “avoid or recoup even small losses” increases (1992b: 287).
quo of multiparty democracy, and the larger probable losses associated with a strategy intended to reverse the status quo.

Consistent with the assumptions of prospect theory, this study argues that when political incumbents are operating from the domain of losses, they will select the “risk-seeking” option. McDermott (1998: 39) defines an option as “risk-seeking” if the difference between the best and worst outcomes of the option is greater than the difference between the best and worst outcomes of the second option. In other words, the risk-seeking option is the “all or nothing” strategy (for more information, see Chapter 4).

In the present study “all or nothing” strategies are those which are intended to reverse the democratization process. By and large these strategies are assumed to be those that in some way target the political opposition and all others who challenge the incumbent group’s right to retain power. Included among these strategies are various forms of ethnic cleansing and “life-integrity violations,” ranging from milder forms of repression to the most extreme form of government-perpetrated violence, total genocide (Fein 1995), (Mann 2005).

However, when political incumbents can successfully adjust to the losses of power and privilege that are associated with institutional change, the result is a preference for the new system of government, or in other words, the current status quo. If the reference point is congruent with the status quo, prospect theory suggests that neither gains nor losses are incurred, although this may change at some point in the future with a change in conditions (Kahneman and Tversky 1982: 162), (Berejikian 1992: 652). Under these particular circumstances, power-sharing agreements that are especially fragile will push leaders towards risk-averse behavior in an effort to remain at the status quo.

As indicated in greater detail in Chapter 4, this study argues that political incumbents operating under a domain of gains will rank their policy options differently from those who perceive democratization from a losses frame. In a gains frame actors will demonstrate a greater preference for the option with less variation in outcome relative to the riskier strategy. In the case of the present study, the risk-averse policy option is the strategy of approaching multiparty democracy through regular channels of
normal, non-violent political competition. Under these circumstances, the best and worst outcomes associated with multiparty rule are considered preferable to the best and worst outcomes associated with strategies intended to reverse or obstruct the democratization process.

This study argues that the assessment of multiparty democracy from a losses or a gains domain is a matter of a country’s institutional history. In terms of formal institutions, the literature on the topic of democratization in the developing world suggests that countries that have little experience with the power sharing and/or institutional practices associated with democracy experience greater difficulty in sustaining a successful transition to democratic rule. Whether institutional reforms are the result of popular pressures, external pressures or a mixture of both, their occurrence drastically alters the balance of power in multiethnic societies which have traditionally been dominated by members of one communal group. Under these conditions, these studies suggest that the likelihood that the process of democratization will end in violence is increased.

Scholars who have studied the appropriate foundations for democratic rule argue that informal institutions also play a very important role. Putnam and Goss (2000), Narayan (1999) and others suggest that informal civic organizations create conditions conducive to democracy when they lead to the formation of cross-cutting as opposed to reinforcing social cleavages. Whether the social cleavages that form in multiethnic societies stem from group membership in civic associations or in other types of indigenous social groupings is not as important as is their influence on the willingness of incumbent leaders to consider the prospect of power-sharing as legitimate.

The current study accepts the argument that the relationship between formal and informal institutions is reciprocal. In accordance with the studies by Narayan (1999), Colletta and Cullen (2000) and others, this study also suggests that the potential for group conflict is greater in multiethnic societies that have weak authoritarian systems of government and a greater prevalence of bonding social capital. It is assumed in this example that an asymmetrical distribution of political power reinforces and is reinforced by a society’s patterns of social and economic organization.
During periods of institutional change, this study argues that a country’s informal and formal institutions—its institutional legacy—directly impact the formation of the particular decision frame(s) in which multiparty democracy is placed by political leaders. Political leaders of multiethnic societies that have traditionally had more complex social structures and a more equitable distribution of political power and resources among groups are better able to adjust to the losses associated with the shift to a multiparty system of government. On the other hand, incumbent leaders that have little or no frame of reference for the concept of power-sharing or group equality will perceive multiparty democracy as nothing more than a total defeat. In both examples, formal and informal institutions can either mitigate or exacerbate the outcomes associated with multiparty rule.

The argument presented by this study is represented by the following diagram:

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 3.2. Institutions, Institutional Change and Total Genocide*

This study does not assume that political leaders are monolithic. However, this study argues that under certain conditions it is possible to consider the policy choices made by an elite group to be the result of a collective decision frame. For instance, in cases in which a dominant worldview or ideology prevails and is the primary justification for a regime’s right to rule, a focus on the collective is not unreasonable, especially when the regime in question is an authoritarian single party state controlled by a dominant communal group.
Generally speaking, scholars have noted that prospect theory encounters certain difficulties when applied to group settings. Similar to expected-utility theory, the problem centers on the issue of explaining how an aggregation of individual preferences (or in this case risk orientations) translates into specific policy choices. It follows that the larger the size of the group, the greater the problem.

The explanatory difficulties associated with group decision-making under conditions of risk have been dealt with by prospect theory scholars in a variety of ways. Some studies have looked to cultural factors to explain risky policy choices made by groups. Other studies have attributed counter-productive policies to the combined effects of the initial predispositions of group members towards risk, pressures towards uniformity, and the process of group polarization. Arguments such as these, hinge on the notion that the prevalence of a risk-seeking bias among at least some group members prior to the decision-making process influences the likelihood that a riskier option will be selected.

An additional variable worth considering is the concept of the policy paradigm drawn from the historical institutionalism literature. Embedded within the institutional legacy of a country, a policy paradigm influences the course of policy-making by establishing the appropriate rules and standards by which policy options are debated, discussed, judged and implemented by political decision-makers (Hall 1993: 279). As a type of distributional feedback mechanism, policy paradigms reflect existing power structures within societies. They embody the nature and history of group identities in relation to each other and in relation to the ruling system in place. At the same time, paradigms are not simply historical

146 A good example is provided by the study by Levy and Whyte (1997). The authors suggest that the choice of Japanese political leaders to bomb Pearl Harbor was in large part the result of a particular decision-making style embedded in Japanese culture that stresses conformity and collective responsibility.

147 To explain certain policy fiascoes, Whyte (1989) uses a combination of prospect theory and the theory of group polarization as an alternative to the theory of group-think. According to the author, the major difficulty that the theory of group-think encounters in explaining decision-making under risk is that it provides no explanation of initial group preferences. Whyte instead suggests that, in decision-making under risk, when a majority of a group members are predisposed towards perceiving policy options as a choice between negative outcomes, pressures for uniformity will move the group closer towards opting for the riskier strategy. The end result is a policy choice that is far riskier than that which the average group member would have preferred.

148 The fact that these studies consider group decision-making in settings in which the size of the group is quite small poses no particular problem for the present study. As stated above, the type of governing systems in place in Rwanda and in Burundi in the early 1990s were ones in which policy decisions were made by a small group of ruling elite closely associated with the president.

149 It is worth noting that some prospect theory scholars do address the relationship between ideology
constructs. They can be manipulated by political actors to achieve certain ends (Rothstein 2000), (Berman 1998).

This dissertation argues that the formation of a collective decision frame in policy-making is influenced and reinforced by the dominant policy paradigm in place. In multiethnic societies with authoritarian regimes, policy paradigms reflect what a ruling group perceives to be the most acceptable distribution of power; paradigms also represent the ruling groups’ perception of its identity and that of other groups.

The transfer from an authoritarian governing system to a system of multiparty rule constitutes a paradigm shift. As stated previously, paradigm shifts derive from the weakness or dysfunction of an existing policy paradigm in the face of changing international and/or domestic circumstances. Paradigm shifts understandably create conditions of uncertainty and risk for incumbent ruling groups.

This study suggests that when members of a ruling elite perceive their continued ideational and material hegemony to be directly threatened by an alternative policy paradigm that emphasizes greater social and political equality, they will be more likely to engage in risk-seeking behavior in order to defend (or reclaim) the dominant paradigm. Subsequently, policy-makers who are in opposition to the prevailing paradigm will face increased pressures to alter their preferences in favor of the preferences of the dominant group.150

Alternatively, when the dominant policy paradigm within a multiethnic society stresses the importance of multiethnic cooperation and consensus—even if the government in place is more authoritarian than democratic—this study argues that the collective decision frame that forms vis-à-vis the prospect of multiparty democracy will demonstrate a greater affinity for the new system of government to be established. The character of past policy paradigms impacts the ability of policy-makers to adapt to future paradigm shifts.

150 This particular suggestion is grounded in the scholarly literature on group decision-making, in particular studies which focus on the impact of normative and informational influences on the preference shifts of individual group members, as well as studies the address the power of groupthink. For a good overview of studies that address

Conclusion

One of the major themes of this chapter has been the value that an integrative approach has for the study of institutional change and collective violence. This study contends that the combined application of prospect theory and historical institutionalism to the study of regime change—in the developing countries generally and in Rwanda and Burundi specifically—greatly improves on existing explanations that attempt to tackle the issue from either a macro-, meso-, or a micro-level approach.

This improvement is two-fold. Firstly, the synthesis of the theories permits the formation of an explanation in which larger-scale causal factors are more closely integrated with individual-level variables. In this respect, historical institutionalism provides the institutional context against which political elites frame their policy choices, while prospect theory establishes the link between institutions and individual behavior.

Secondly, the use of prospect theory overcomes many of the explanatory deficiencies associated with a reliance on the assumptions of the standard expected-utility model. As indicated above, the notion that actors employ a single decision rule across cases creates certain obstacles when it comes to explaining variation in the responses of actors to similar circumstances—or in this example, the responses of political leaders to regime change. With prospect theory, these anomalies in decision-making behavior can be more fully explained.

The combination of an international relations theory and a theory from the field of comparative politics also benefits the discipline of political science more generally. Prospect theory and historical institutionalism have a great deal in common: both assume that causality is a function of context (including ideas) and both assume that actors’ preferences are formed endogenously. Their synthesis represents a “border crossing” that builds on the existing strengths of international relations theories as a means to explain conflict and cooperation among political actors, and the strengths of comparative theories as a means to explain the impact of larger phenomena on the behavior of collectives.

the pressures to conform in group decision-making contexts, see Whyte (1989: 44-46).
To date there has been little attempt made by either international relations or comparative scholars to synthesize these theories. This is somewhat surprising given the natural compatibility of the two theories, as well as the fact that other theories of decision-making behavior, such as rational choice, are commonly used in both fields. This study’s use of prospect theory in conjunction with historical institutionalism therefore constitutes a significant contribution to both fields of study and to the study of democratization and group violence more specifically.

In terms of historical institutionalism more specifically, this dissertation provides additional support for the argument that institutions and institutional development exhibit a path dependent quality, much of which is a function of existing distributional feedback mechanisms. This study demonstrates both qualitatively and quantitatively the effects a variation in these particular feedback mechanisms has on the willingness of political leaders to accept or reject the prospect of sharing power with communal opposition groups. Consistent with the arguments made by Thelen, Hall, and a number of other institutionalist scholars, this dissertation shows that the outcomes of institutional change do not occur in a vacuum, but are heavily constrained by preexisting institutional arrangements. In moments of crisis, it is institutions—not poverty, conflict, or population density—that more clearly explain the variation in outcome across both cases.

In the next chapter, this study demonstrates that Rwanda and Burundi provide ideal test cases for the theory developed by this dissertation. It has been suggested by scholars such as Eller (1999: 197) that

Rwanda and Burundi...[offer] a kind of natural laboratory of ethnicity, an opportunity to observe similar traditional, cultural, and demographic preconditions refracting through varying circumstances and producing varying ethnic 'effects'.

The fact that both countries have experienced similar patterns of inter-group violence and are strikingly similar in terms of their demographics, economic status, and population density permits a comparison to be made under semi-controlled conditions. Being able to control for these structural conditions makes it possible to isolate the effects that formal and informal institutions had on the responses of political actors in both countries to institutional change.
The use of two highly comparable cases is also extremely effective as a means to test the impact of framing on decision-making. Because the critical juncture of institutional change in both countries was virtually identical, it is possible to clearly distinguish the reference points leaders used to guide their decision-making in each case. This dissertation suggests that the variation in the responses of incumbent elites in Rwanda and Burundi to the same stimulus effectively establishes that more than one type of decision rule was in use. A demonstration of this nature helps to ensure a greater degree of external validity for prospect theory—albeit under certain conditions.

The next chapter outlines the research design and methodology used by this dissertation. Special focus is placed on the importance of a most-similar systems design and its applicability to the research question this study is addressing. Additionally, attention is placed once again to the significance of combining a meso-level approach with an individual-level approach. Whereas the present chapter approached this particular issue from a theoretical standpoint, the following chapter addresses this issue from a methodological standpoint.
CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

To test the primary hypothesis of this study two cases are considered, Rwanda and Burundi.\textsuperscript{151} This study also provides an analysis of the perceptions members of the incumbent elite in both countries had regarding multiparty democracy. This secondary analysis, described in greater detail below, requires the use of alternative measurements and analytical techniques. All of the analyses conducted by this dissertation test different elements of the general hypothesis:

\textit{Hypothesis 1}: The indigenous social structures and political institutions of Rwanda and Burundi impacted the occurrence of total genocide by way of their impact on the ability of multiparty institutions of government to acquire legitimacy among members of the incumbent political elite in both countries. Where multiparty democracy was perceived by political actors to be illegitimate, or a “sure loss,” these governing institutions failed and total genocide was chosen as a means to reverse the status quo (e.g. to reinstitute the previous system of single-party rule). Where multiparty democracy was perceived by political leaders to be legitimate, the multiparty institutions of government were accepted and total genocide did not occur, despite the occurrence of a very similar set of unfavorable circumstances.

This study suggests that multiparty democracy represented a critical juncture in the institutional development of both countries and heavily influenced the formation of the reference points used by the incumbent political elite of Rwanda and Burundi in their decision to either accept or reject the new multiparty institutions of government.

\textsuperscript{151} Hall (2003: 396) makes note of the distinction between a “case,” defined as a unit whose impact on the dependent variable is assessed at a systems-level, and an “observation,” defined as a unit of analysis drawn from an original larger unit. A similar distinction between “case” and “observation” is also made by King et al. (1994: 52-53) and Lijphart (1975: 160). As this applies to the current study, Rwanda and Burundi are cases for analysis ($n = 2$); the policy arguments made by incumbent political leaders within both countries are the observations ($n = 239$).
This study encompasses both qualitative and quantitative features.\textsuperscript{152} Given the nature of the data one is examining it is often preferable to combine elements of both in an analysis. According to King et al. (1994: 51) this is often the case because

[i]n the same research project, some data may be collected that is amenable to statistical analysis, while other equally significant information is not. Patterns and trends in social, political, or economic behavior are more readily subjected to quantitative analysis than is the flow of ideas among people or the difference made by exceptional individual leadership. If we are to understand the rapidly changing social world, we will need to include information that cannot be easily quantified as well as that which can.

For these reasons, the authors suggest that the best research is most often both qualitative \textit{and} quantitative.\textsuperscript{153}

The qualitative aspect of this study addresses the impact the two primary explanatory variables—\textit{social structures} and \textit{traditional political institutions}—had on the occurrence of total genocide by way of their impact on the ability of multiparty democracy to be perceived as legitimate in the eyes of political actors in Rwanda and Burundi.

The variable, \textit{social structures}, is defined by the types of cleavages present within each of the two societies in question, and is measured in a variety of different ways. The second independent variable, \textit{traditional political institutions}, is measured by the nature of the formal ruling structures in place, as well as by the degree of political inequality that existed between groups within each country.\textsuperscript{154}

Additionally, this study provides a quantitative analysis of the relationship between the attitudes political actors held concerning these institutional changes and the policies they chose in response, including total genocide. Actors’ perceptions are assessed from their statements made to the domestic

\textsuperscript{152} King et al. maintain that neither the qualitative nor the quantitative approach is superior to the other; each has to adhere to the same basic rules of scientific inquiry. Whatever differences exist between both approaches are suggested by the authors as being “stylistic and…methodologically and substantively unimportant” (see 1994: 4).

\textsuperscript{153} As examples of studies that successfully combine elements of both qualitative and quantitative approaches, King et al. (1994: 5) refer to Putnam’s \textit{Making Democracy Work} (1993), and Martin’s \textit{Coercive Cooperation} (1992). Additionally the value attached to studies that combine both qualitative and quantitative elements is shared by those who advocate the use of the “analytical narrative” as a means to overcome many of the difficulties frequently associated with the use of rational choice as an analytical tool (for more on this point, see Levi 1997: 29-31).

\textsuperscript{154} Although much of the data for these two variables are assessed qualitatively, this study also relies on quantitative data derived from sources that include the Minorities at Risk (“MAR”) dataset, as well as the \textit{Polity IV}
and foreign news media. One of the primary reasons this study chooses to focus on the perceptions of political actors is to provide a fuller account of how institutions and institutional change impact the behavior of individual decision-makers.

Conducting an individual-level analysis such as this is also beneficial because it increases the number of observations for analysis which potentially increases the significance of this study’s findings. According to King et al. (1994), increasing the number of observations for analysis is crucial as a means of “maximizing leverage” over the variety of different research problems that arise with the use of a smaller number of cases. With the inclusion of additional cases, multiple tests of the main hypothesis become possible.

This chapter proceeds as follows. Firstly, a discussion addressing the use of a two case-study approach is provided. Specifically, this discussion focuses on the use of a most-similar systems design, and its appropriateness for the type of research question addressed by the current study. Next, this chapter provides an analysis of the dependent variable and each of the independent variables—explanatory and control—with special focus paid to the ways in which each of these variables is measured. A discussion then follows that addresses the particular type of within-case analysis performed by this study. Close attention is given to the intervening variable used in this analysis, multiparty democracy. The chapter next addresses content analysis and its application to the present study. This chapter concludes with a brief summation and some remarks pertaining to the chapter that follows.

---

155 As discussed in greater detail below, these statements consist of arguments in support of a particular policy course to be followed in response to democratization.

156 As discussed in the previous chapter one of the major difficulties the theory of historical institutionalism encounters stems from its inability to adequately establish a connection between institutions and individual behavior. By also using individual-level analysis, this dissertation suggests that this structure-agency problem can be resolved.

157 Maximizing leverage requires the researcher to explain “as much possible with as little as possible” in order to increase the significance of what is being explained (see King et al. 1994: 29). Generally speaking, the authors consider qualitative studies to have considerably less leverage than quantitative due to the fact that the former require more in-depth analysis of a subject area or areas, and are far more comprehensive in scope than the latter (1994: 4; on this point, see also Lijphart 1971).
Variation between Cases: The Use of a Two-Case Study

One of the difficulties most frequently associated with the use of a smaller number of observations for comparative and/or qualitative analyses is the “small-n problem.” This is one of the “[t]he principle problems facing the comparative method [which] can be succinctly stated as such: many variables, small number of cases” (Lijphart 1971: 685; on this point, see also King et al. 1994, Lijphart 1975, Collier 1991, Mahoney 2003 and Rueschemeyer 2003). The use of a few cases most often creates a degrees of freedom problem in which it becomes extremely difficult for the researcher to determine which explanatory variable is responsible for the variation (or lack of variation) in the dependent variable. In this instance, more inferences exist than observations and, as a result, a research model is created that is largely indeterminate (King et al. 1994: 119-122).

A variety of different techniques have been suggested to combat the small-n problem. For instance, to decrease the number of explanatory variables, the researcher can combine variables that are similar, use comparable cases (e.g. a most similar systems analysis), and/or employ a “stronger theory that focuses the analyst on a more parsimonious set of explanatory factors” (Collier 1991: 18; see also Lijphart 1971: 690, 1975: 159). The standard way of improving a research design is to increase the

---

158 Lijphart defines the comparative method as one of four methods of scientific inquiry, the other three being the experimental, the statistical and the case study methods. The comparative method is not considered by Lijphart to be a method of measurement, but is instead a “broad-gauge, general method” for “discovering empirical relationships among variables [italics in original].” (1971: 683). Some, such as Meckstroth, have found this definition to be inadequate because of the fact that its terms are ambiguous and it defines the method by its results; not by how it achieves these results (1975: 132; also Lijphart 1975). However, it is worth noting that Meckstroth also suggests that many of the problems associated with Lijphart’s definition of the comparative method are resolved in his discussion of most similar systems designs (see 1975: 132-133).

159 Of course, this is not to say that the use of a fewer number of cases, or even a single case for analysis, is a waste of time. On the contrary, it has been suggested that studies that rely on one, or a small number of cases, can be extremely useful. Single-case studies can be used to generate new hypotheses and insights, as well as provide a means of testing existing hypotheses. Furthermore, it has been suggested that the use of smaller number of cases helps to avoid problems of “conceptual stretching,” and can provide the researcher with a greater amount of material with which to assess more complex hypotheses. The use of fewer cases also permits a greater understanding of human behavior by allowing for a better understanding of context (on this particular point, see Collier 1991: 13-15; for further discussion on the value of small-n studies, see Rueschemeyer 2003: 305-336, Collier 1991: 13-15, 23-24, and Hall 2003: 395-398).

160 This latter aspect is what Lijphart (1971: 690) refers to as a “general commitment to theoretical parsimony.”
number of observations for analysis. Various recommended techniques for increasing the number of cases include expanding the number of cases geographically and cross-historically, as well as conducting an analysis of sub-national units (e.g. a within-case analysis) (Lijphart 1971: 686-687), (King et al. 1994: 217-228), (Collier 1991: 15-16, 23), (George and McKeown 1985:29-41). Given the particular research question that this study addresses two of these techniques—increasing the number of observations, and using comparable cases for comparison—are especially relevant.

Using comparable cases applies directly to the particular research question this study addresses. This technique requires a comparison be made between two cases that are strikingly similar in a number of specific ways. In order to explain the variation on the dependent variable—total genocide—the current study uses a most similar systems design. According to Lijphart (1971: 687), this type of design is particularly useful in instances in which

the total number of variables cannot be reduced...[B]y using comparable cases in which many variables are constant, one can reduce considerably the number of operative [italics in original] variables and study their relationships under controlled conditions without the problem of running out of cases.

A reduction in the number of operative variables used limits the problems associated with degrees of freedom.

The use of a most similar systems design is not without its own share of inherent difficulties, however. One of these is the problem of over determination. Between similar cases there can exist an infinite number of explanatory and control variables that could possibly explain the variation on the dependent variable. In the absence of some theoretical basis for comparison between cases, the choice of which variables to include or exclude can be somewhat problematic. Here, Meckstroth (1975: 134) states that

---

161 This is a point that is stressed repeatedly by King et al. (1994), also Lijphart (1971), (1975), and Collier (1991).
162 These two techniques are considered by Lijphart (1975: 163) to be the two primary solutions to the small-n problem.
163 A most similar systems design is what John Stuart Mill ([1970] 1974) refers to as the, “method of difference” (on this point, see also Lijphart 1975: 164, George and Mckeown 1985: 26-28, and Mahoney 2003: 341). To Mill, “difference” indicates the difference in outcome between two otherwise similar cases (for further
all possibilities are equally relevant, as far as the [comparative] method is concerned, and as long as an endless variety of possibilities must be considered, the method cannot justify conclusive statements about explanatory relationships.

As a result, the causal impact of the variables that are chosen for analysis can be over-determined.\textsuperscript{164} With a strong theoretical basis for the inclusion of certain explanatory and control variables, however, the problem of over-determination is lessened. In choosing cases for comparison, Collier (1991: 17), among others, suggests that “cases should be selected in response to the specific analytical requirements of particular research projects.” The fact that two cases are similar to one another in terms of their geography, or that the data for comparison are readily available to the researcher, are both insufficient reasons for comparison.\textsuperscript{165} Instead, what is necessary for comparison is a “criteria of relevance” established by the various theories and propositions to be tested in a research model (Meckstroth 1975: 134).\textsuperscript{166}

In the present study, the control variables selected for inclusion in the model all represent contextual/structural factors that are widely considered by genocide and ethnic conflict studies to be causes of genocide in general, and the Rwandan genocide in particular. The use of an explicit typology as a basis for controlled comparison between cases is one technique that has been suggested by Diesing (1971: 189-190) among others. Referring to Diesing’s work, George and McKeown (1985: 28) state:

discussion of most similar systems designs, see Przeworski and Teune 1970 and Meckstroth 1975).\textsuperscript{164} The difficulty here lies with the fact that a most similar systems design does not itself establish criteria for distinguishing which variables to include for analysis and which variables to exclude (Meckstroth 1975: 134), (Przeworski and Teune 1970: 84).

\textsuperscript{165} This is a problem that has also been noted by Lijphart (1975:173), who suggests that “the danger that ones’ preferences for methods or for the fortuitous availability of similar cases may dictate one’s research aims is a real and serious one.” He also notes that this problem is not confined to the use of comparative method, but is also shared by those who use the statistical method as well. As it pertains specifically to comparisons based on geographical proximity and/or historical likeness, George and McKeown (1985: 26) write that “[t]he geographic method is vulnerable to the fact that contiguous cases are not necessarily similar at all; [in the case of comparisons based on history] historical controls are rarely possible—partly because the imputation of a common history often requires a level of knowledge of the past that the researcher cannot possess.” These are problems that were noted first by Diesing (1971: 188-189).

\textsuperscript{166} In his discussion of most similar and most different systems, Meckstroth demonstrates that the criteria of relevance apply to most different systems as well (for a discussion on the value of a focused structured comparison between cases, see especially Lijphart 1975 and George and McKeown 1985). To George and McKeown (1985: 42) this criterion of relevance concerns the ability of the researcher to ask “standardized, general questions [italics in original] of each case” being considered. In other words, the questions should “reflect the research objectives and theoretical focus of the study,” and be general enough to apply to all cases under consideration in the model, not
If a typology is used to guide case selection [as with the present study] so that at least one case is present in each cell of the typology, then two cases in adjacent cells will differ on only one endogenous dimension. If exogenous (i.e. contextual) differences between cases can be ruled out as a source of variations in outcome, then differences in outcomes in the two cases could be attributed to differences on one dimension of the typology.

In the present study, the difference in outcome is not attributed to any of the dimensions of the particular typology (listed below), but to institutional factors that have been largely ignored by the above-referenced studies. In effect, using these particular dimensions of the genocide typology as control factors allows for a test of the alternative structural hypothesis.

The other side of the “small-n” problem concerns the number of cases used for analysis. King et al. (1994: 213-217) cite a number of factors that impact the number of cases a qualitative researcher needs to consider in order to arrive at a causal inference that is valid. Two are of particular interest to the current study, the degree of unexplained variation on the dependent variable and the degree of variation in the primary explanatory variables.\(^{167}\) It is worth reiterating that many of the concerns raised by King et al. (1994) and others regarding the number of cases appropriate for analysis are resolved to a large extent through the use of a most similar systems design.

The authors suggest that the larger the amount of unexplained variability remaining on the dependent variable, the greater the number of cases needed for analysis (King et al. 1994: 214). Much of

\(^{167}\) The other two factors to which King et al. (1994) cite are the amount of uncertainty in the study’s findings and the amount of multicollinearity that exists between explanatory and control variables. As it pertains to the former, it is suggested by the authors that the greater the amount of uncertainty that is acceptable to the researcher in terms of his or her findings, the fewer the cases, or observations needed for analysis. This is especially the case, “[i]n areas where any new knowledge gained is very important” (1994: 214-215). Undoubtedly, the subject matter that this dissertation addresses is one of great importance and relevance to the study of genocide. While this dissertation fully recognizes that a certain amount of uncertainty is an unavoidable outcome of any study, uncertainty is limited in the present study by the use of a most similar systems design.

In regards to the issue of multicollinearity, it is suggested by the authors that the higher the degree of multicollinearity that exists between primary explanatory variable(s) and control variables, the less likely the researcher is able to determine, with any degree of certainty, which variable is impacting the dependent variable (1994: 215). In this case, the inclusion of more cases, or observations, is preferable in order to achieve greater certainty in a study’s findings. How much of a problem multicollinearity poses for the present study, however, is limited by the fact that each of the controls is eliminated as a rival causal explanation for the variation in the dependent variable. However, multicollinearity likely exists between the two primary explanatory variables. At the same time, this study in no way suggests that the two main explanatory variables exerted an impact on the dependent variable independently of each other. Instead, it is assumed that social structures and traditional political institutions acted in conjunction to impact the occurrence of total genocide.
the ability to reduce the amount of unexplained variation on the dependent variable in a research model is a function of the level of knowledge the researcher has of the subject matter he or she is examining; the greater the knowledge, the better the researcher’s ability to account for variation in outcome. The chance than an alternative—albeit unknown—explanation exists somewhere for the outcome in question is reduced substantially with the use of a most similar systems design. In this instance

a single deviation from a hypothesized pattern of necessary or sufficient causation is enough to eliminate a given factor as a potential cause. As a result, the [most different and most similar systems] methods provide a powerful basis for systematically eliminating rival causal hypotheses, even when only a small number of cases are selected. (Mahoney 2003: 342)

Both the most similar and most different systems methods are considered “deterministic” methods of comparative analysis. The most similar systems design is deterministic in the sense that variation on the dependent variable is accounted for by only one, or a few, explanatory variables which are considered to be necessary or sufficient causes for a particular outcome to occur within a limited set of cases (Mahoney 2003: 340-341).168 Whatever variation cannot be explained is attributed to what cannot be known.

In contrast to a most different systems design, the explanatory variables examined in a most similar systems design are those which are largely considered to be sufficient causes of the outcome being explained.169 As Mahoney (2003: 342) writes:

With the method of difference [most similar systems method], the outcome is present in some cases and not present in others. Hence, any hypothesized cause that is shared by all the cases cannot by itself be sufficient for the outcome, since not all cases with the hypothesized cause experience the outcome of interest.

---

168 “Determinism” in this context does not refer to problems of agency and structure (see Mahoney 2003: 339-340). Instead “deterministic” and “probabilistic” refer to the amount of random variation that is acceptable to the researcher. In a probabilistic study, perfect prediction is not possible, random variation always exists. As a result, explanatory variables are treated as being “almost always [italics in original] necessary or almost always sufficient conditions” for the outcome in question (2003: 341).

It is worth noting that, in his discussion of deterministic and probabilistic studies, Mahoney suggests that the researcher is not committed to using either a fully deterministic, or a fully probabilistic model (2003: 341; for a further discussion of the difference between deterministic and probabilistic perspectives, see also King et al. 1994: 59-60).

169 By “sufficient” it is meant that the occurrence of the explanatory variable in question is always associated with the occurrence of a particular outcome (Mahoney 2003: 341). In the case of a most different systems design, the explanatory variables considered are those believed to be necessary causes of a particular outcome. By “necessary” it is meant that “the absence of this cause is always associated with the absence of the outcome in question, at least within the relevant population of cases” (2003: 341).

89
As discussed in greater detail in this dissertation, in the field of genocide studies more generally all of the control variables listed below are considered (in one form or another) to be necessary and/or sufficient causes of genocide.

One obvious criticism of the design used by this dissertation is that it involves a selection on the dependent variable, which can bias a study’s results. With the use of a most similar, or most different, systems design, problems of selection bias are largely applicable to the extent that there is any attempt made by the researcher to generalize his or her findings to a larger group of cases. In this respect, studies that use only a few cases that are selected on the basis of a similarity, or a difference, in the outcome in question may not necessarily be representative of the larger population of cases. However, given the particular research question that this study addresses—which focuses on certain factors that contributed to a divergence in outcome in two specific cases—the problems of selection bias are minimal. At the same time, selection bias is an issue that will have to be addressed in the course of future research if any of the conclusions reached by this study are to be made more generalizable.

A second factor that King et al. (1994) suggest impacts the preferred number of cases is the degree of variation in the values of the primary causal variables. The authors assert that the greater the range in variance in the values of the main explanatory variables between cases, the fewer the cases needed for analysis. It is assumed that a greater variance in the values of the primary explanatory variables provides the researcher with a greater ability to assess the full impact these variables have on the dependent variable (1994: 215-216).

---

170 This is particularly the case when there is no variation on the dependent variable (King et al. 1994: 129-130).

171 In this respect, it could be the case that the relationship between the primary explanatory and dependent variables examined by the current study is not as strong as it otherwise appears (see King et al. 1994: 130). This is an issue of external validity. For a complete discussion of the problems associated with selection bias, see King et al. (1994: 129-132; as these problems pertain specifically to cases that examine necessary and sufficient causes, see Mahoney 2003: 351-352).

172 According to Lijphart (1975: 172), although the use of the comparative method (e.g. most similar systems method) makes it difficult to arrive at generalizations that are universal in scope, “partial generalizations may be useful as a first step, and may be followed up by replications in different settings. It can also happen that a characteristic only occurs in a single cultural setting.”
Because the present study utilizes a most similar systems design, it is also important that the difference in variation in the main operative variable(s) be sufficiently larger than any variation that may exist in the control variables. As it pertains to the latter, the variation between cases on each of the similarities held constant should be as minimal as possible (Lijphart 1975: 163-164).

The present study demonstrates that the degree of variation on the two primary explanatory variables—social structures and traditional political institutions—between Rwanda and Burundi is indeed more than sufficient. At the same time, this study readily fact that there is some degree of variation between these cases on each of the control variables examined. In many respects, this variation works to the advantage of the present study in that it provides evidence which further weakens the alternative structural hypothesis.

**Dependent Variable: Total Genocide**

The dependent variable in this study is total genocide. The definition of total genocide that is used by this study is a modified version of the definition of “genocide” used by Harff (2003: 58). Harff defines total genocide as

> the promotion, execution, and/or implied consent of sustained policies by governing elites or their agents—or, in the case of civil war, either of the contending authorities—that are intended to destroy, in whole...a communal, political, or politicized ethnic group. [italics in original].

The variable total genocide measures the presence or absence of total genocide in each of the two cases.

Total genocide is a crime that is perpetrated by members of an incumbent elite group. “Incumbent elite” is defined as a group comprised of members of the dominant ruling communal group. In other words the communal group that has to cede power, or a substantial portion of power, to a contending group or groups. Members of the incumbent elite include current as well as former members of government. The incumbent elite also include leaders and members of the various political parties in each state. In Rwanda the incumbent elite are the Hutu; in Burundi the Tutsi.

---

173 Given that this dissertation is concerned solely with explaining a variation in the occurrence of total genocide, not partial genocide, the portion of Harff’s definition that pertains to partial genocide has been removed.
Explanatory Variables: Social Structures and Traditional Political Institutions

The two primary explanatory variables examined by in this dissertation are *social structures* and *traditional political institutions*. The present study suggests that differences in the nature and structure of these indigenous institutions—one set informal, the other formal—created conditions that were conducive to the success or failure of multiparty democracy.\(^{174}\)

For each of the explanatory variables and control variables, the current study considers qualitative data for a time period that begins in the mid- to late 19\(^{th}\) century and ends with the assassination of each country’s president in the early 1990s.\(^{175}\) This broader time frame is used to more fully assess the impact that institutional legacies had on group relations in both cases.

Quantitative data for all independent variables are also considered. The time period for which quantitative data are assessed is a period of time similar to the time period discussed above, but ending the year *prior* to the collapse of multiparty democracy in each country.\(^{176}\)

---

\(^{174}\) *Social structures* are informal institutions. Informal institutions comprise elements such as norms and culture that, while not formally established, nevertheless serve as constraints on behavior (Thelen 1999), (North 1990). *Traditional political institutions*, on the other hand, are considered to be formal institutions. “Formal institutions” have been defined by Hall (1996: 19) as “the formal rules, compliance procedures, and standard operating procedures that structure the relationship between individuals in various units of the polity.”

On a separate note, the decision to focus on the relationship between indigenous institutions, institutional change and group violence in Rwanda and Burundi was influenced heavily by the work of René Lemarchand (1970). Lemarchand has attributed the particular patterns of political development in Rwanda and Burundi, as well as the occurrence of ethnic conflict in each to what are some essential differences in the makeup of their formal and informal institutions. In recent years, Lemarchand (1994a) has come to modify the conclusions that he originally reached in his 1970 study; specifically his suggestion that the lack of serious ethnic discord in Burundi was due largely to its decentralized institutions of government and less rigid social structures. He has stated that his early work suffered from “a comparative impulse that led [him] to overemphasize that structural contrasts between Rwanda and Burundi and thus minimize the potential for conflict inherent in Burundi society” (see 1994a, xiii). This acknowledgment is understandable to the extent that his original comparative study was published two years before the partial genocide of the Hutu in Burundi. He now suggests that ethnic violence in Burundi (and by implication Rwanda) can be understood as the result of the collective self-images of “Hutu” and “Tutsi” that exist in both countries. However, at the same time, the present study suggests that the formation of these group identities *cannot* be understood apart from the institutional context in which they arose. In this respect, Lemarchand’s 1970 study still holds merit as a key to understanding the development of political institutions in both countries, as well as the potential for group conflict.

\(^{175}\) As a reminder the presidents of Burundi and Rwanda were assassinated on 21 October 1993 and 6 April 1994, respectively. On a separate but related note, although the kingdoms of Rwanda and Burundi were consolidated in the 15\(^{th}\) and mid-17\(^{th}\) centuries respectively, data for the period *prior* to the 19\(^{th}\) century are either unavailable or are incomplete.

\(^{176}\) The reason for this is simple. Quantitative data obtained from sources such as the World Bank, the United Nations and databases such as *Polity IV* and *MAR* are data for an entire year. This dissertation is only concerned with a specific segment of the year in which the two multiparty democracies collapsed.
Social Structures

The first of the two explanatory variables—social structures—is defined by the type of group cleavages present within each of the two societies. Following the work of Lipset (1960), Lijphart (1969) and others, this study assumes that two types of cleavages exist within a society: cross-cutting and reinforcing. A greater presence of cross-cutting cleavages is indicative of a more fluid and flexible social structure. Conversely, a greater presence of reinforcing cleavages in society indicates a more exclusive and inflexible social structure.

One of the ways in which social structures is measured is with quantitative data derived from the Minorities at Risk (“MAR”) dataset compiled by the University of Maryland’s Center for International Development and Conflict Management. The portion of the data set that deals specifically with cultural differentials is considered first. The Cultural Differentials Index (“CDI”) is a composite index of six separate measures of cultural differences between groups. The CDI ranks countries from “0” to “+4,” with lower scores indicating less difference between groups and higher scores indicating greater degrees of difference.

177 Cross-cutting cleavages exist when individual membership in social groups is not mutually exclusive. Instead, the groups that exist tend to be more heterogeneous in makeup. Similar in effect to the notion of “overlapping memberships,” advanced by David Truman (1951) and Arthur Bentley (1949), it is assumed that cross-cutting cleavages produce “psychological cross-pressures [as a result of] membership in different groups with diverse interests and outlooks [which in turn, leads] to moderate attitudes” on the part of group members and leaders (Lijphart 1969: 208). Political stability in this sense is created by political moderation.

By way of contrast, in a society marked by reinforcing cleavages, individuals tend to identify primarily with one group. Groups are differentiated from one another by a particular characteristic, or set of coinciding characteristics, such as ethnicity, language and religion. In this case, it suggested that, “when the political culture is deeply fragmented-the pressures toward moderate middle-of-the-road attitudes are absent” (Lijphart 1969: 209). This concept of reinforcing cleavages also fits to a large extent with the concept of the “pluralized society” in the structural genocide and ethnic conflict literature (Kuper 1981), (Fein 1979b), (Horowitz 1985), (Tilly 1978), (Gurr 1993), (Gurr and Harff 1994b). A “pluralized society” is defined as “a system of domination by one group over others in a society based on coexistence with separate (but not equal) cultures” (Fein 1993: 49).

The use of MAR data to measure social cleavages is in accordance with the work of Saideman et al. (2002). Similar to their study, the present study also looks at the Cultural, Political and Economic Differentials Indices from the dataset.

179 Specifically, these six measures of cultural difference are ethnicity/nationality, language, historical origin, religion, social customs and place of residence (urban vs. rural) (MAR Dataset Users’ Manual 2005: 27-28; see also Gurr 1993: 38-39). It is assumed that greater degrees of difference indicate a greater presence of reinforcing cleavages. However, the CDI and the EDI by themselves do not provide an especially clear picture of the type of society that exists in Rwanda and Burundi. A fuller assessment is provided by the qualitative studies written on both countries.

93
Studies have indicated that group differences in Rwanda and Burundi are also heavily associated with economic status. To measure these differences this study uses the *MAR Economic Differentials Index* (“EDI”). The EDI is a composite index of six measures of economic difference, and is ranked on a scale from “-2” to “+4.” Higher scores on the EDI indicate greater degrees of economic inequality between minority and majority groups. Data for both the EDI and the CDI are available from 1965 to present.

Another way in which this study measures group cleavages is by the type of civil society that existed in each country for the period in question. Two indicators of civil society are considered by this study: associational membership and the relationship between civil society and the state. In terms of the character of group membership, this study examines the level of homogeneity in civic association membership. Close attention is also paid to how the institutions of civil society were used by the political elite in each country. Data on the nature of civil society in Rwanda and Burundi, as well as data for group membership in civic associations, are obtained from qualitative studies that address the topic of civil society in both countries.

The variable, *social structures*, is also measured by the different ways in which groups are ranked socially in Rwanda and Burundi. This study considers familial groupings as one indicator of social ranking, as well as various other forms of intra- and inter-group social distinction. Data on the system

---

180 The six indicators of economic difference included in the EDI are differences in income, ownership of property, access to higher education, presence in commerce, presence in the professions and presence in official positions (*MAR Dataset Users’ Manual* 2005: 30-32; see also Gurr 1993: 41).

181 From 1965 until 1984 data for both indices are available for five-year increments. From 1985 onward, data are provided annually.

182 As indicated in Chapter 3 of this study, and in keeping with the literature on social capital more generally, a greater presence of civic associations with heterogeneous memberships is assumed to be indicative of a greater presence of cross-cutting cleavages (or “bridging social capital”). The converse is also the case: a greater presence of civic associations with homogeneous memberships is assumed by this study to be an indicator of a greater presence of reinforcing cleavages (or “bonding social capital”).

183 Here it is assumed that the state can use civic associations to either enhance or weaken social cleavages. In other words, civil society can be used to build consensus between groups, or it can be utilized as a means to further enhance the divisions that already exist within a society.

184 Some examples of these studies include the studies by Uvin (1998), Lemarchand (1992a), Laely (1997), Barrett et al. (2001), ARD (2001), and the United States Department of State *Human Rights Reports* for Rwanda and Burundi.

185 This study assumes that the more variegated the society, the greater the presence of cross-cutting
of social ranking in place within Rwanda and Burundi are obtained from qualitative studies of each
country.\textsuperscript{186}

Another measure of social structures that is considered by this study is regional identification.
Studies of group relations in Rwanda and/or Burundi indicate that regional identities have been the source
of a great deal of the intra-group friction in both countries. Lastly, social structures is measured by the
types of patron-client systems that traditionally existed in both countries, as well as the informal
institutions of mediation that were present.\textsuperscript{187} Data on regional identities, patron-client systems and
informal institutions of mediation are all derived from the qualitative studies mentioned above.

\textit{Traditional Political Institutions}

The second primary explanatory variable—\textit{traditional political institutions}—accounts for all of the
formal political institutions that existed prior to the legalization of multiparty democracy in Rwanda and
Burundi.\textsuperscript{188} The definition of “political institutions” this study accepts is the definition of “polity” used
by the Polity IV Project. A “polity” is considered to be a formal, institutionalized type of “authority
pattern,” the latter of which is defined as

\begin{quote}
a set of asymmetric relations among hierarchically ordered members of a social unit that involves
the direction of the unit...The direction of a social unit involves the definition of its goals, the
regulation of conduct of its members, and the allocation and coordination of roles within it.
(Eckstein and Gurr 1975: 26, quoted in Marshall and Jaggers 2002: 1)\textsuperscript{189}
\end{quote}

cleavages. Conversely, it is assumed that the fewer the social divisions, the greater the presence of reinforcing
cleavages.\textsuperscript{186} Some examples of these studies include the studies by Lemarchand (1970, 1974, 1994a), Louis (1963),

\textsuperscript{187} As stated in the previous chapter, with respect to the informal institutions embodied within the patron-
client systems in Rwanda and Burundi, it is assumed that the more flexible the system, the greater the likelihood that
cross-cutting cleavages were and are present within society.

In terms of the institutions of mediation in each—the bashingantahe in Burundi and the batware w’intebe
in Rwanda—it is assumed that membership in these particular organizations is also a reflection of the type of
cleavages present within society; the greater the diversity of membership, the greater the likelihood that cross-
cutting cleavages exist within society.\textsuperscript{188} The variable, traditional political institutions, includes the institutions introduced by the Belgians during
their period of colonial rule (1919-1962). As has been made clear by a number of studies, including those by
Lemarchand (1970), Prunier (1995) and Mamdani (2001), Belgian rule exerted a lasting impact on the political and
social development of both countries.

\textsuperscript{189} Marshall and Jaggers are clear to point out that Eckstein and Gurr’s definition of “authority patterns” is
broad and can be applied to other types of social organizations besides governments. However, for purposes of the
To distinguish “polity,” or “government,” from other types of authority patterns, *Polity IV* considers polities to be “the recognized central authority for a…social unit that is delimited spatially through the identification of formal, territorial borders” (Marshall and Jaggers 2002: 1).

The greater the degree of political inclusiveness within these institutions, the greater the likelihood that institutional change—specifically democratization—will be accepted by the incumbent political elite.

*Traditional political institutions* is measured in several ways. *Traditional political institutions* is measured by degree of political centralization, executive recruitment and competition, executive constraints, political participation and recruitment, and political paradigm. Data for each of these measures are obtained from qualitative studies of the history of political development in both countries. Data on regime characteristics are also obtained for the *Polity IV* database (see below).

*Traditional political institutions* is also measured by the *MAR Political Differentials Index* ("PDI") for each county. The PDI, which is a composite of six separate measures of political differentials between groups, ranks groups on a scale from “-2” to “+4,” with higher numbers indicating the presence of greater political inequalities. Data for the PDI are available for the period 1965 to the present.

A final way in which *traditional political institutions* is measured is by the *Polity2* score for each country. *Polity2* scores are obtained from the *Polity IV* database from the Center for International Development and Conflict Management. *Polity IV* provides data on regime characteristics for all data collected by *Polity IV*, only formal ruling structures are considered (Marshall and Jaggers 2002: 1).

---

190 These studies include many of those previously mentioned (see Prunier 1995, Lemarchand 1970, 1994a, and C. Newbury 1978, 1988). The use of qualitative studies in this instance is essential as these studies provide a more complete picture of the type of governing institutions that existed in both countries. The purpose of this study, however, is not to demonstrate the value of qualitative data over quantitative data. At the same time, the formal and informal institutions that existed in Rwanda and Burundi were far more complex than they are otherwise portrayed by databases such as *Polity IV* or *MAR*.

191 The measures of political difference included in the PDI are access to power, access to the civil service, political recruitment, voting rights, the right to organize and equality of legal protection (*MAR Dataset Users’ Manual* 2005: 29-30), (Gurr 1993: 40).

192 Similar to the CDI and EDI indices, data are available for the PDI for five-year intervals from 1965 until 1984. From 1985 onward, data are provided annually.
independent states for the period 1800 to 2003. In addition to the combined Polity2 score for both countries, this study also looks specifically at a number of different regime and authority characteristics included in the dataset, including level of executive constraints and degree of political competition.

As stated previously in Chapter 3 of this study, the relationship between social structures and traditional political institutions is an interactive one. It is assumed that the particular type of informal social structures which existed in Rwanda and Burundi influenced and reinforced the traditional political institutions in place and vice versa. For example, this study qualitatively demonstrates that the patron-client system that existed within each country reinforced the level of inclusiveness (and exclusiveness) present within the formal ruling structures in both countries.

Control Variables
When the explanatory variables used in a model are considered to be necessary and/or sufficient causes of a particular outcome to be explained, the relationship between these variables and the dependent variable is assumed to be a nonlinear one. As a result, the variables included for analysis are most often measured at a nominal, instead of an ordinal-level.

Because all of the control variables examined by the present dissertation are those which constitute a typology of structural factors which are considered by many studies to be necessary and/or sufficient causes of the crime of genocide in general, and in Rwanda in particular, they are all included for analysis in this study as nominal-level variables. These control variables are as follows:

---

193 For countries that have gained independence more recently, data are available from the year in which the first government was formed. However, often times, data can start a few years prior to independence (Marshall and Jaggers 2002: 4). In the case of Rwanda, for example, data are available the year before the country gained formal independence from Belgium; in the case of Burundi, data are available starting in 1962.

194 A country’s Polity2 score takes into account the combination of that country’s score on the DEMOC and AUTOC indices. In other words, to calculate a Polity2 score, a country’s AUTOC score is subtracted from its DEMOC score. Additionally, unlike the original Polity scores, the Polity2 score converts scores for foreign interruption (“66”), interregnum (“77”), and transition (“88”) to conventional Polity scores (for a fuller discussion on Polity2 scoring, see Marshall and Jaggers 2002: 15-18).

195 As Mahoney (2003: 338-339) states: “A nominal strategy implicitly or explicitly assumes a nonlinear understanding of causation built around the ideas of necessary and sufficient conditions…By contrast, an ordinal strategy is more compatible with linear and correlational assumptions that guide much large-N research.”

196 For examples of studies that consider the above control factors to have contributed to the occurrence of
1. Pluralized society  
2. Domestic conflict  
3. Demographic stress and  
4. Economic health

Inclusion of these variables allows for a test of the alternative structural hypothesis. This hypothesis is as follows:

Alternative Hypothesis 1: The occurrence of total genocide in Rwanda was a result of the onset of certain crises. These crises, which included economic downfall, resource scarcity, and communal violence, served to exacerbate group tensions in an already heavily pluralized society.\(^{197}\)

**Pluralized Society**

The first control variable examined by this study is **pluralized society**. Given the level of controversy that surrounds the exact nature of the identities “Hutu” and “Tutsi,” this study adheres to the perspective adopted by scholars such as Mamdani (2001), Uvin (1998), Lemarchand (1994a) and others. These scholars suggest that, in the cases of Rwanda and Burundi, the identities of Hutu and Tutsi are complex and cannot be accurately characterized on the basis of factors such as physical features, historical origin, or socioeconomic status. Instead, it is more appropriate to think of these particular communal identities as social constructs, or “imagined communities,” that have been shaped and reinforced by history and social experience.\(^{198}\) Whatever the original source of the distinction between the two groups, their perception of each other as separate and distinct was made possible by institutional factors.

---

\(^{197}\) As this study makes clear in subsequent chapters, the fact that both countries endured similar circumstances, yet experienced vastly different outcomes, effectively eliminates the structural hypothesis as an explanation for the genocide in Rwanda.

\(^{198}\) In his consideration of the group identities “Hutu” and “Tutsi,” Uvin (1998) refers to Anderson’s concept of the “imagined community.” Here, national identity is “imagined” in the sense that “members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (Anderson 1983: 19). It follows that whatever inequities exist within the imagined community are disregarded.

Uvin is clear to point out the similarity between Anderson’s definition and Gurr’s (1993) definition of
Pluralized society is included in this study as a control to test the suggestion that fragmented, multiethnic societies of the type which prevail in Rwanda and Burundi are more likely candidates for serious conflict and genocide. More specifically, this study tests a hypothesis made by a number of studies which suggests that the size of the two largest ethnic groups impacts the chances that serious ethnic conflict—including genocide—will occur (see for example Horowitz 1985, Ellingsen 2000, and Jenkins and Kposowa 1992).

To disconfirm this hypothesis, the current study needs to demonstrate that the relative size of the Hutu and Tutsi populations in both countries has been roughly the same for the entire period under examination. To do this reliable demographic data for Rwanda and Burundi are examined. The data are compiled from sources which include the World Almanac, the Encyclopedia Britannica Book of the Year, the New International Yearbook, and Africa Contemporary Record.

Domestic Conflict

The second control variable examined by this dissertation is domestic conflict. Domestic conflict measures the history of group conflict between Hutu and Tutsi in both countries and is defined as the “overt, coercive interactions of contending collectivities” (Gurr 1980: 1). The definition of conflict used by this dissertation is a broad one which comprises four additional characteristics. Specifically, “conflict” as it is defined by Gurr (1980: 2) is an event in which:

1. two or more parties are involved
2. they engage in mutually opposing actions
3. they use coercive behaviors, ‘designed to destroy, injure, thwart, or otherwise control’ their opponent(s)

“communal groups.” Gurr considers communal identity to be a matter of “shared perception” of the set of particular characteristics that distinguish one group from another. Furthermore, the salience of communal identity “varies over time. The psychological bases of group identification are reinforced by cultural, economic and political differentials between the group and others” (Gurr 1993: 3; see also Gurr and Harff’s definition of the “psychological community” at 1994b: 5).

199 A number of studies have been written which consider a pluralized society to be, at least partially, a cause of the conflict in Rwanda and Burundi (see for example the studies written by Prunier 1995, Kuper 1981 and Gurr 1993).
4. these contentious interactions are overt, hence their occurrence can easily be detected and agreed upon by independent observers.\textsuperscript{200}

*Domestic conflict* encompasses events ranging from threats of violence, to instances of lower-level political violence (e.g., riots, political purges and assassinations of rival-group politicians), to instances of mass violence that stem from, among other things, political insurrection and civil war.\textsuperscript{201}

The particular type of conflict to which this definition applies is political conflict. “Political conflict” is defined by Gurr (1980: 2) as conflict that “involve[s] the state, either as a party…or as the object of peoples’ demands and perceptions.” In the post-independence history of both countries, political conflict has been the type most frequent between the Hutu and the Tutsi.\textsuperscript{202}

This study expands the above definition of conflict to encompass instances of government abuse directed towards subordinate groups in each of the two cases under examination. The inclusion of these events stems from a general assumption made in the genocide and conflict literature that government massacres, extrajudicial killings, imprisonment and the torture of civilians often occurs in response to group conflict (see for example the studies by Gurr and Harff 1994b, Fein 1979b, Melson 1992, and Mazian 1990).\textsuperscript{203}

The present study includes *domestic conflict* as a control variable to test two hypotheses that have been made by a number of studies of the Rwandan genocide. The first of these is that group conflict, including civil war, was a precursor to the genocide that occurred in Rwanda between April and July 1994 (African Rights 1995, Des Forges 1999, Harff 1998, Prunier 1995, Longman 1999 and Davies et al. 1998). In this context, *domestic conflict* is assumed to be a prelude to more serious forms of communal

---

\textsuperscript{200} The first three of the four characteristics outlined by Gurr are adapted from the definition of conflict given by Mack and Snyder (1957).

\textsuperscript{201} Gurr’s definition excludes the specific motive of the conflict, which tends to vary depending on the circumstances (see 1980: 3-4). The definition of *domestic conflict* used by this study also accords with the definition used by Ellingsen (2000). In her analysis, Ellingsen combined elements of Small and Singer’s (1982) definition of “civil war” with Wallensteen and Sollenberg’s (1999) definition of “armed conflict,” considering both types to be forms of domestic conflict (2000: 229).

\textsuperscript{202} In fact, *MAR* categorizes the Hutu and Tutsi as “communal contenders.” “Communal contenders” are defined by Gurr (1993: 18) as “culturally distinct peoples, tribes, or clans in heterogeneous societies who hold or seek a share in state power.”

\textsuperscript{203} In the case of Rwanda, for example, the civil war between the RPF and the government of Rwanda led to numerous instances of violence perpetrated by the government and members of the extremist political parties
violence. To disconfirm this hypothesis, this study needs to demonstrate that both countries had extensive experience with group violence.

The second hypothesis is that violent events that occurred in Burundi in the early 1990s negatively impacted relations between Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda (see for example Harff 1998, Davies et al. 1998, Prunier 1995). This second hypothesis stems from a more general argument made by scholars of the Great Lakes area that tensions between “kindred groups” in one of these two countries have historically impacted inter-group relations in the other.

On its face, the above suggestion appears to create a problem for the current study; namely what is known as “Galton’s problem.” Galton’s problem exists under conditions in which events in one country affect the life of another…[This] is referred to as diffusion [italics in original], and testing for its effects on cross-national research is referred to as Galton’s problem…It suggests that we may see a strong causal connection between two variables—such as a country’s reaching a certain stage of development and its experiencing shifts in policies—where none really exists, all because several countries in our sample are jointly influenced by another country. (Bahry 1995: 255)\textsuperscript{204}

In instances such as these, a spurious relationship can result between the explanatory and dependent variables due to a lack of independence among observations.\textsuperscript{205}

However, the fact that inter-group violence was occurring in both countries in the early 1990s and a divergence in outcome ensued nonetheless indicates that the “ethnic affinity” hypothesis can be eliminated as a potential explanation for the total genocide that occurred in Rwanda.

Alternatively, the fact that instances of conflict and abuse tended to impact relations between Hutu and Tutsi in the neighboring country actually serves to bolster one of the primary arguments of this study—that the variation in the occurrence of total genocide was a function of the perceptions political leaders in each country had of multiparty democracy. This study demonstrates that whether multiparty democracy was perceived as a loss or a gain by the leaders of Rwanda and Burundi was partially due to

\textsuperscript{204} For a good explanation of Galton’s problem, see also Lijphart (1975: 171-172).
\textsuperscript{205} In cases such as these, the recommended strategy has been to either eliminate the influential observation altogether, or to use a most different systems design (Bahry 1995: 255).
events in the neighboring country. These events reinforced certain reference points used by the leaders in their decision to either accept or reject multiparty rule.

To more accurately depict the history of group violence in each country, *domestic conflict* includes data on both *inter-* and *intra-*group disputes. To test both of the above hypotheses, this study depends largely on data gathered from qualitative studies written on the history of group relations within both countries. These studies include reports written by Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International and other similar non-governmental organizations, and historical analyses by scholars such as Lemarchand (1970, 1974, 1977, 1994a, 1994b) and Pruner (1995).

This study also considers quantitative data from the *MAR* dataset. The Hutu and Tutsi of Burundi and Rwanda are categorized by the *MAR* project as “minorities at risk.” For a group to be considered a minority at risk, it must be an ethno-political (communal) group that

- collectively suffers, or benefits from, systematic discriminatory treatment vis-à-vis other groups in a society; and/or [a group that] collectively mobilizes in defense or promotion of its self-defined interests. (*MAR Dataset Users’ Manual* 2005: 5)

*MAR* includes data that measures the presence of inter- and intra-group conflict. Data for intra-communal conflicts are available for the period 1965 onward. Intra-communal conflicts are measured by *MAR* according to the nature of the dispute between factions, the identity of the factions in conflict, and the severity of the conflict itself.

With respect to *MAR* data on inter-group conflict, this study first considers the *MAR* index “NOCOMCON,” which measures the presence of communal conflict for the period 1965 to 1989. Countries are coded as either a “0” for no inter-communal conflict, or a “1,” which indicates the presence of at least some inter-communal conflict (*MAR* 2005 83-84).

---

206 According to the database, intra-group conflicts can be regional, communal, or promoted by external sources; intra-group conflicts can also be between organizations or within an organization. The severity of intra-communal conflict is ranked on a scale from “0” to “5,” with a “5” representing the most extreme form of conflict—communal warfare (*MAR* 2005: 72-83).
This study places greater focus on the *MAR Annual Indices of Inter-communal Conflict* (or “COMCO”). COMCO measures conflict annually from 1990 to 2000. This study specifically focuses on COMCO data for the period 1990 to 1992 for Burundi, and 1990 to 1993 for Rwanda.207

This study uses two additional *MAR* indices that pertain to inter-group discord: Protest (“PROT”), and Rebellion (“REB”). The PROT index ranks the severity of protest on a scale of “0” (no activity) to “5” (large demonstrations). The REB index ranks the severity of anti-regime rebellion on a scale of “0” (no rebellion) to “7” (protracted civil war). For both indices data are available from 1985 onward (see *MAR* 2005: 87-90).

**Demographic Stress**

The third control variable examined by this dissertation is *demographic stress*. This study specifically tests the hypothesis made by some scholars that demographic pressures drove extremist Hutu leaders in Rwanda to opt for genocide as a means to preserve resources for the dominant Hutu ethnic group (see for instance, Uvin 1996a, Prunier 1995, and Percival and Homer-Dixon 1995). To disconfirm this hypothesis, it is necessary to demonstrate that both countries have historically experienced similar resource scarcity problems.

To do this, this study includes data from the World Bank’s *World Development Indicators 2006 CD-ROM* database measuring population density and population density per hectare of arable land. Data for the second half of the 20th century are available. *Demographic stress* is also measured by food production, the amount of food aid received and the inflation rate of food prices in both countries. Data for all of these indicators are also obtained from the World Bank, as well as the Economic and Social Department, Statistics Division of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (“FAO”).208

---

207 The COMCO index ranks conflict on an ordinal scale from “0” to “6,” with a “6” representing the most severe form of conflict, communal warfare (*MAR* 2005: 87).

208 Data on the amount of food produced in Rwanda and Burundi are obtained from the Food Production Index created by the FAO. The baseline years for which food production is measured are 1989-1991.
The last control variable is economic health. Economic health addresses the economic climate that prevailed in both Rwanda and Burundi prior to the collapse of multiparty democracy. Special focus is placed on the 1980’s and early 1990’s in order to demonstrate the effects produced by the collapse of each country’s export market, their increased dependence on foreign aid, and the introduction of Structural Adjustment Programs (“SAP’s”). A number of studies suggest that the period of economic decline experienced by Rwanda during the 1980s and early 1990s was a major contributory factor to the genocide that occurred in 1994. Here it is specifically assumed that economic crises exacerbated inter-group tensions in Rwanda and increasing the insecurity of the Hutu incumbent elite. To disconfirm this hypothesis, it is necessary to show that similar, if not identical, economic conditions prevailed in Burundi during similar periods of time.

To achieve this task, this dissertation examines a wide variety of indicators of economic health. These indicators are as follows:

1. Agricultural production as a percentage of GDP
2. Industrial production as a percentage of GDP
3. Service industry as a percentage of GDP
4. Manufacturing as a percentage of GDP
5. Coffee and tea production in metric tons
6. Value of coffee and tea production in U.S. dollars
7. Annual percentage GDP growth
8. Net foreign direct investment as a percentage of GDP
9. Inflation of consumer prices (annual percentage)
10. External balance on goods and services as percentage of GDP
11. Military expenditures as a percentage of GDP
12. Military expenditures as a percentage of central government expenditures
13. Military personnel as a percentage of total labor force.

Many of these indicators have been used in past studies to demonstrate economic conditions in Rwanda and Burundi. Data for the above indices are obtained from sources such as the FAO Economic and Social

---

210 With some exception, this study uses Gross Domestic Product (“GDP”) instead of Gross National Product (“GNP”) as a measure of aggregate economic activity. GNP, which takes into account total income generated by all products and services produced within and outside of a country is generally considered to be a less accurate predictor of domestic economic activity than GDP. GDP, on the other hand, measures all economic
Department, Statistics Division, and the World Bank, *World Development Indicators 2006 CD-ROM* database. Similar to all of the other control variables discussed above, the quantitative data used to assess the economies of both countries are supplemented with data obtained from qualitative studies.\(^{211}\)

Additionally, there are several alternative indicators of economic development that this study considers, many of which are used by structural studies written on the Rwandan genocide (see, for example, Prunier 1995, Uvin 1998 and Verwimp 2000). These indicators are as follows:

1. Human Development Index (HDI) ranking
2. Adult literacy rate
3. GDP per capita (purchasing power parity)
4. Rate of infant mortality
5. Life expectancy at birth
6. Population living below the poverty line (in millions)
7. General government final consumption expenditure (annual rate)
8. Subsidies and other current transfers as a percentage of total government expenditures
9. Wages and salaries as a percentage of total government expenditures
10. Education expenditure as a percentage of GNP
11. Education expenditure as a percentage of total government expenditure
12. Telephone mainlines per 1,000 people
13. Daily newspapers per 1,000 people
14. Television receivers per 1,000 people
15. Radio receivers per 1,000 people
16. Percentage of population with access to health services
17. Percentage of population with access to safe water
18. Percentage of population with access to sanitation
19. Percentage of births attended by health personnel
20. Public expenditure on health services as a percentage of GDP
21. Presence of malnutrition children under five (by height and by weight)

Data for all of these indicators are gathered from sources including the FAO Economic and Social Department, the United Nations Development Programme’s *Human Development Reports*, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization’s *Statistical Yearbooks*, and the *World Development Indicators 2006 CD-ROM* database.

---

\(^{211}\) These qualitative studies include studies by Uvin (1998), Verwimp (2000), Prunier (1995), and Lemarchand (1970, 1994a) among others. This study also consulted reports issued by the Economic Intelligence Unit for varying years.
The use of development indicators such as these may provide a much more accurate picture of a country’s level of economic development than GNP or GDP per capita alone.\footnote{Measures such GDP are considered to be inadequate by themselves because they do not capture many of the different factors that have been associated with development, such as access to health care, nutrition and education among others. This is a conclusion that has been reached by the UN, as well as by authors such as Verwimp (2000) and Uvin (1998) among others.} As stated best by the UNDP:

Human outcomes do not depend on economic growth and levels of national income alone. They also depend on how these resources are used—whether for developing weapons or producing food, building palaces or providing clean water. (2004: 127)

Lastly, this study considers various indicators of foreign aid and foreign indebtedness as measurements of economic health. Specifically, this dissertation includes data on the following indicators:

1. Total external debt in current U.S. dollars
2. Government debt as a percentage of GDP
3. Total debt service as a percentage of exports of goods and services
4. Aid as a percentage of central government expenditures.

Data for these indicators are obtained from the World Development Indicators 2006 CD-ROM database. This study demonstrates that foreign aid was a major source of income for both countries in the 1980’s and early 1990’s. The purpose of including foreign debt in the current study is to examine the suggestion, made by authors such as Uvin (1998), Scherrer (2002) and others that foreign development aid and external debt exacerbated antagonisms between groups in Rwanda and indirectly contributed to the total genocide that occurred.

**Variation within Cases: The Use of Within-Case Analysis**

As indicated previously, for a study that relies on a controlled comparison of a smaller number of cases, it is often preferable to increase the number of theoretically relevant observations in order to increase the significance of the study’s findings. One way to accomplish this task is by shifting the focus of the study away from aggregate to sub-aggregate units; in other words, looking within existing cases for additional
observations at a sub-national level (e.g. state, regional, and individual-levels for example). In terms of comparison between like-units, it has been suggested that a *within*-case analysis is more effective than a *between*-case comparison because of the fact that the similarities between units of observation in the former tend to be even greater (Lijphart 1975: 167-168).

Furthermore, by focusing on sub-national comparisons, new measures can be applied to test new hypotheses that are derived from, and compatible with, the original hypothesis. As King et al. (1994: 225) state:

"Often a hypothesis or theory about political units implies a hypothesis or theory about the process by which the particular outcomes observed at the level of the unit comes about; in particular, the hypothesis at the level of the unit may imply hypotheses about attitudes and behaviors at the level of individuals living within those units. These can then be tested using data on individuals."\(^{213}\)

Increasing the number of observations allows for additional tests of the hypothesized relationship between *social structures, traditional political institutions* and *total genocide*.\(^{214}\)

It is here that the technique of process-tracing is especially relevant to the current study. Process-tracing has been defined by George and McKeown (1985: 35) as a procedure…intended to investigate and explain the decision process by which various initial conditions are translated into outcomes….The process-tracing approach attempts to uncover what stimuli the actors attend to; the decision process that makes use of these stimuli to arrive at decisions; the actual behavior that then occurs; the effect of various institutional arrangements on attention, processing, and behavior; and the effect of other variables of interest on attention, processing, and behavior.

Process tracing is a procedure that takes into account the effect that system-level factors have on individual perception and decision-making, and what type of impact this generates on the outcomes being considered.\(^{215}\)

---

\(^{213}\) To illustrate their point, the authors use as an example a general hypothesis that links agricultural prices to social unrest. Here, “[this] general hypothesis…may suggest hypotheses about uncertainty and unrest in other kinds of units such as firms or government agencies. It may also suggest hypotheses about the behavior of individuals” (1994: 224; for a complete discussion of the different ways in which the number of observations in a research design can be increased, see King et al. 1994: 217-228).

\(^{214}\) Here the main hypothesis of the study can be falsified with additional testing. Constructing a theory that is falsifiable is necessary in order to create a causal theory that is valid (King et al. 1994: 100-105).

\(^{215}\) As George and McKeown (1985: 35) describe it, process-tracing “involves both an attempt to reconstruct actors’ definitions of the situation and an attempt to develop a theory of action.”
The causal path linking primary explanatory variables to the dependent variable is by way of certain mechanisms—in this case, the different ways in which the intervening variable *multiparty democracy* was perceived by the political elite in each country. Identifying the specific causal mechanism which links the intervening and dependent variables is very important, otherwise the ability to clearly establish a causal relationship between the independent and dependent variables is diminished and the explanatory value of the theory lessened.

Process-tracing is considered by a number of comparative scholars to be an invaluable technique for models that rely on only a small number of cases for comparison. Because of the in-depth analysis that is required in a comparison of fewer cases, “the researcher can investigate causal processes in each [case]...in detail, thereby assessing the relevant theories against especially diverse kinds of observations” (Hall 2003: 397).

When individuals are the focus of analysis, the technique of process-tracing further reduces many of the problems associated with the use of a most similar systems model—namely omitted variable bias. As George and McKeown (1985: 36) suggest, because the unit of analysis is often times the individual, and the factors that impact individual decision-making tend to be limited to things such as memory, attention-span, or in the case of the present study, leaders’ perceptions of multiparty democracy, “the process-tracing technique has a chance of constructing a reasonably complete account of the stimuli to which an actor attends.”

---

216 “Causal mechanisms” are defined as “the processes and intervening variables through which an explanatory variable exerts a causal effect on an outcome variable” (Mahoney 2003: 363; citing to Bennet 1997).
217 As Hall (2003) states: “To have explanatory power, any theory...must contain some account of the causal chain whereby one [factor] leads to the other” (393 at ff. 16; see also Mahoney 2003: 361-362).
218 This is especially the case when studies are exploring relationships between factors that occur over longer periods of time (for more on this point, see Mahoney 2003: 365).
219 The use of a few cases provides the researcher with a more complete set of observations with which to work. As stated by Hall (2003: 397): “Reconceptualized in these terms, the comparative method emerges not as a poor substitute for statistical analysis, but as a distinctive approach that offers a much richer set of observations, especially about causal processes, than statistical analysis normally allow.”
220 Because process-tracing takes into account the impact of intervening variables on outcomes, it has also been cited as being a useful means of avoiding spurious correlations between causal and dependent variables (Mahoney 2003: 361-362).
As indicated previously, process-tracing allows for the testing of additional hypotheses that are implied by the causal relationships suggested by the general hypothesis. In this respect, process-tracing is especially helpful to a research design in that

[s]earching for causal mechanisms…provides observations that could refute the [main] hypothesis. This approach may also enable the researcher to develop some descriptive generalizations about the frequency with which each potential causal mechanism is activated; and these descriptive generalizations may provide the basis for later analysis of the linked causal mechanisms and the conditions under which each is likely to occur. (King et al. 1994: 228)

At the same time, theories about causal processes should be rendered, in Hall’s (2003: 394) words, “as ‘brittle’ as possible…” against rival theories. The purpose of doing so is “to yield predictions that could be shown to be false by available data and that are distinguishable from the predictions of rival theories.”

In the present study, the general hypothesis regarding the effect of indigenous social and political institutions on the occurrence of total genocide implies a number of secondary hypotheses that specifically pertain to the ways in which these particular elements impacted the perceptions political leaders in both countries held of multiparty democracy—whether it was perceived “a loss” or as “a gain.” These perceptions in turn impacted the types of policies leaders chose in response to the institutional changes taking place—either “high risk” or “low risk” policies.

The secondary hypotheses examined by this dissertation are as follows:

**Hypothesis 1a:** A greater proportion of the arguments made by members of an incumbent elite group that favor a particular course of action to be taken in response to multiparty democratization are those in which a reference point is used by the speaker.

**Hypothesis 1b:** Arguments made by members of an incumbent elite group that favor a risk-seeking policy course contain a greater proportion of arguments in which the speaker uses the prior system of absolute rule (e.g. the former status quo) as his or her reference point. These are arguments that tend to portray multiparty rule as a complete loss.

**Hypothesis 1c:** Arguments made by members of an incumbent elite group that favor a risk-averse policy course contain a greater proportion of arguments in which the speaker uses the current system of multiparty democracy (e.g. the current status quo) as his or her reference point. These are arguments that tend to portray multiparty rule as a gain.

King et al. also assert that, in order to arrive at valid causal inferences, researchers who use within-case comparison techniques such as process-tracing, must still follow the same rules as those who employ aggregate-level analyses (e.g. independence of observations, avoidance of omitted variable bias etc.) (1994: 228).
Each of these hypotheses is derived from prospect theory, which is used by this dissertation to establish the link between institutional change and individual behavior. Each of the secondary hypotheses is a modified version of the various hypotheses tested by Levy and Whyte (1997). Similar to their study, the rival explanation of individual behavior against which prospect theory is tested is rational choice. The rational choice alternative hypothesis is as follows:

**Alternative Hypothesis 2:** Members of the incumbent political elite in Rwanda and Burundi conducted their decision-making in regards to the implementation of multiparty democracy in a manner consistent with rational choice. Under similar conditions of risk, leaders weighed the costs and benefits of all options before them and chose the option that carried with it the lowest cost relative to benefit.

According to this argument, total genocide was chosen by Hutu extremists in Rwanda because it was believed to be the more cost-effective means to maintain power.

**Intervening Variable: Multiparty Democracy**

Each of the above hypotheses is intended to test the effect the intervening variable—*multiparty democracy*—had on the dependent variable *total genocide*. *Multiparty democracy* is an intervening variable in the sense that the impact the two explanatory variables—*social structures* and *traditional political institutions*—had on the occurrence of *total genocide* in each country was mediated by the introduction of multiparty systems of government in both in the early 1990’s.

For each country *multiparty democracy* represents the period of time that begins six months prior to the legalization of multiparty democracy and ends the date on which the leaders of both countries were assassinated in coups d’état. The specific periods of time examined are as follows:

---

222 In their analysis the authors apply a similar set of hypotheses to explain the processes that culminated in the decision of the Japanese to attack the United States in 1941.
Table 4.1. Multiparty Democracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>01 January 1991 - 06 April 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>01 October 1991 - 21 October 1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth noting that, in the case of Burundi, multiparty democracy ends with the assassination of President Melchoir Ndadaye and not with the death of his successor, Cyprien Ntaryamira. In this latter incident, the Burundian President was not killed as part of a coup d’état. Ndadaye was, however, murdered by an extremist faction of the Tutsi army on 21 October 1993 as a part of a campaign to reestablish complete Tutsi control over the government.

In the present study, multiparty democracy is assumed to represent a critical juncture in the institutional development of Rwanda and Burundi. In both cases, the set of institutions created were of a very similar nature and were implemented in a like manner. Given the variation in outcome that ensued, the transfer process and the type of institutions transferred are considered to be constant factors.

---

223 His death was the unfortunate outcome of his being a passenger in the same plane as the Rwandan President which was shot down in Kigali on 6 April 1994. It is worth mentioning that there is some controversy regarding the identity of those responsible for the death of Juvénal Habyarimana. Many studies have indicated that Habyarimana was most likely killed by extremist Hutu factions in the latter's attempt to wrest control of the government away from Hutu moderates and the RPF (Prunier 1995: 213-229), (African Rights 1995: 97-98), (Des Forges 1999: 182-183). However, recent allegations have been made against RPF leaders, namely the current President of the Republic, Paul Kagame. Specifically, the RPF are charged with shooting down President Habyarimana’s plane in an attempt to seize control of the government. It is further alleged that the RPF knew that the assassination of the president would lead to a massacre of the Tutsi and they intended to use this massacre as an excuse to restart the civil war (see Onana 2002; for further discussion, see also Mann 2005: 450). Regardless of the level of credibility that surrounds these allegations, what cannot be debated is the fact that, following the president’s death, total genocide was perpetrated by Hutu extremists.

224 The types of governing systems instituted in both countries were parliamentary-presidential systems. The president and the legislature in each were to be popularly elected, with the prime minister to be chosen by the president. The transfer process was also quite similar in both countries in that access to future foreign aid was made largely contingent on the success of institutional change.
To test each of the above subsidiary hypotheses, it is necessary to demonstrate that different perceptions of multiparty rule existed among the incumbent leaders of both countries. To do this, this study relies on the analytical technique of content analysis.

Content analysis has been defined as “a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use [italics in original]” (Krippendorff 2004: 18). Understanding the content of a particular text is a function of the variety of ways in which it is analyzed relative to the context in which it was written. Knowing context is therefore fundamental to the types of inferences that can be drawn from a given sample of texts (2004: 24-25). In the present study, the context under consideration is the political atmosphere that prevailed in Rwanda and Burundi during the period of time encompassed by the intervening variable multiparty democracy.

The particular way in which this dissertation uses content analysis closely follows the manner in which it was used by Levy and Whyte (1997). To test each of the secondary hypotheses, a content analysis is performed on news articles/bulletins obtained from a text search using Lexis-Nexis. First, a text search for all articles referencing “Rwanda” and “Burundi” is conducted with a “guided search” of the Lexis-Nexis archive for news articles from Middle East/Africa news sources. These news sources include, among others, Radio Rwanda, Radio Burundi and Radio Uganda, each of which is most often included as the primary source for the news bulletins transmitted by larger international news sources such as BBC Monitoring, Associated Press, and Agence France Presse.

---

225 This particular definition incorporates various elements of previous definitions of content analysis while excluding others; namely the notion that the content of a message is strictly contained within the text of that message, as well as the idea that a message’s content is strictly the property of its source. For a fuller discussion of the various definitions of content analysis that have been used, see Krippendorff (2004: 19-21).
226 The types of inferences that are drawn from studies that use content analysis are abductive inferences. Here a relationship between elements that may otherwise appear to be unrelated is inferred from the particular texts examined (Krippendorff 2004: 37).
227 In their study, Levy and Whyte applied content analysis to their examination of the written transcripts of the Liaison and Imperial Conferences held by Japanese leaders between 2 July 1941 and 1 December 1941. It was during these conferences that the decision to go to war against the U.S. was debated.
228 Lexis-Nexis is considered by Krippendorff (2004: 275) to be one of the more valuable sources available for obtaining textual material for use in content analysis. Lexis-Nexis is especially useful to the present study as it offers a complete, full-text, online archive of international and U.S. news sources for the period under consideration.
A sub-sample of articles is then selected which specifically reference the topic of multiparty democracy (or a variant thereof).\textsuperscript{229} From this sub-sample, articles are categorized according to whether or not they include a statement, or statements, made by members of the incumbent ruling elite which constitute an argument for a particular type of policy to be followed in response to democratization. To determine whether a statement encompasses a policy argument, or arguments, this study uses Levy and Whyte’s (1997: 803) definition of “argument.” Levy and Whyte define an “argument” as “a reason or set of closely related reasons supporting a course of action.”\textsuperscript{230}

The content analysis performed by this dissertation focuses \textit{exclusively} on data obtained from these public news sources. At the same time, to fully grasp the mind-sets of political actors, the types of reference points they used, and how these reference points were formed, it is also necessary for this study to consult a number of qualitative analyses of the two countries for the particular time period in question.\textsuperscript{231} These studies, many of which are cited in this chapter, provide the background against which most of the data used for the content analysis is assessed.\textsuperscript{231} These studies also establish the semantic validity of the particular categories used in the content analysis.\textsuperscript{232}

\textsuperscript{229} As demonstrated by the list of coding instructions contained in \textit{Appendix A}, because of the variety of different ways to which multiparty democracy can be referred (e.g., “joint-rule,” “political pluralism,” “power-sharing” etc.), conducting a text search of articles using only one, or a few of these terms would have substantially reduced the sample size. Instead, the current study used a sampling procedure termed “relevance sampling.” Relevance sampling is a process in which the content units selected for analysis are those which the particular research question addresses (see Krippendorff 2004: 119).

\textsuperscript{230} In the event that a statement contained a number of distinct reasons for a particular course of action, they were each coded as a separate argument. On the other hand, when a leader provided nearly identical reasons for a course of action these were counted as one argument. This is a method of coding similar to that used by Levy and Whyte.

\textsuperscript{231} This particular method is termed “historiographic.” As stated by Levy and Whyte studies that use a historiographic method “[r]ely on a variety of data sources including historians’ and participants’ accounts of the decision; the decision makers’ public statements; and, where available, documentation of the decision makers’ deliberations, including notes, memoranda, and minutes or transcripts of group meetings” (1997: 796).

Because the type of data this study uses for the actual content analysis are policy statements made by individual actors, the hypotheses Levy and Whyte make in their study regarding group decision-making (e.g. the “group polarization effect”) cannot be tested. Levy and Whyte were fortunate to have had available to them evidence which documented group deliberations; such evidence is not available for use in the present study.

\textsuperscript{232} Semantic validity is a type of content validity that refers specifically to the “extent to which the categories of an analysis of texts correspond to the meanings these texts have within a given context” (Krippendorff 2004: 319). In other words, for a category to be semantically valid, it must correspond to the context it is meant to describe. In the present study, when choosing appropriate indices for the “former status quo” category, for example, qualitative studies on the history of power relations between Tutsi and Hutu and the development of racist ideologies in both countries were consulted in order to determine the particular types of phenomena that made joint-rule appear...
The use of additional qualitative studies is also important as a means to achieve correlative validity. For this purpose, studies are considered which include transcripts or portions of transcripts of statements and speeches made by members of the incumbent elite to private media sources—including the infamous Radio-Télévision Libre des Milles Collines (“RTLM”). Many of these same studies also provide extensive information on the variety of pamphlets, books, articles and other materials, written by political and party leaders, in which they expressed their viewpoints regarding joint-rule and their desire for a particular policy course. This study demonstrates that these opinions were often times more extreme than those expressed to the international news media.

The sample of news bulletins/articles that contain policy arguments which are intended for use in the content analysis are next coded according to the type of argument made by political leaders, and the type of policy advocated. As discussed in greater detail below, the particular method of coding used by this study closely resembles the way in which policy arguments were coded by Levy and Whyte (1997).

In his discussion on the rules for coding, Holsti (1969) focuses on three important factors: categorization, unitization and enumeration. The second of these, unitization, pertains to the specific type of recording unit to be coded for analysis. In the present study, the unit of analysis is a “theme” or “a single assertion about [a] subject” (1969: 116). For purposes of the current study, these units are the to be a loss or a gain to political actors.

233 Correlative validity refers to how well a study’s findings correlate with other data used to demonstrate the same relationship.


235 The use of independent data to obtain validity is acceptable so long as the data are not the same data used in the development of the analytical construct (e.g. rules of inference) used for the content analysis (for more on this point, see Krippendorff 2004: 317-318).

236 “Coding” is defined as “the process whereby raw data are systematically transformed and aggregated into units which permit precise description of relevant content characteristics” (Holsti 1969: 94; this is a definition that is very similar to the one used by Krippendorff 2004: 220).

237 The use of a coding scheme similar to that which was successfully used by Levy and Whyte (1997) in their study is extremely helpful to this dissertation as it ensures for a certain degree of functional validity, which is defined by Krippendorff (2004: 332) as “the degree to which analytical constructs are vindicated in use rather than in structure.”

238 Krippendorff (2004: 219) defines “unitizing” as “identifying within a continuum—contiguous sections containing information relevant to a research question. These sections become the units of analysis or recording
statements made by political leaders that contain an argument in support of a particular policy course to be followed in response to democratization.239

Categorization is the procedure for classifying units of data that are drawn from a text. To obtain valid results from any content analysis that are also replicable, it is recommended that the data categories used, “reflect the purposes of the research, be exhaustive, be mutually exclusive, independent, and be derived from a single classification principle” (Holsti 1969: 95).

As it relates to the first of these requirements, it is important is that the researcher be clear on what concepts he or she is trying to explain and how they will be operationalized.240 In the present study, the concept to be explored is the mind-set, or “domain,” of the incumbent political elite of Rwanda and Burundi. Policy arguments are categorized according to the type of domain the speaker demonstrates, which is assumed to be a function of two factors—the actor’s preference for a policy that is either high risk or low risk, and their use of a particular type of reference point (e.g. the former status quo or the current status quo).241

239 According to Holsti (1969: 116-117), as a recording unit, the theme is particularly useful as a means of capturing individual perception. However, its use—as with other types of recording units—is not without its own share of drawbacks, one of which is the fact that coding with themes can be a time consuming process.” A second difficulty rests with the fact that the parameters of the theme can be vague and ill-defined. While the first of these two problems is somewhat difficult to avoid, the latter is alleviated by the specific definition of “argument” used by this study.

In addition, Holsti suggests that when one is attempting to discern things such as attitudes and beliefs, using a recording unit—such as a theme—can be insufficient absent a reference to the context in which it occurs (1969: 117). A “context unit” is defined as “the largest body of content that may be searched to characterize a recording unit” (118). In this case, the context unit is the news article within which an argument is presented.240 According to Holsti (1969: 95), the indices by which data are categorized should be “valid representation[s] of the analyst’s concepts, and [they should be]...sufficiently precise [so as to allow]....coders to produce reliable judgments.” The ways in which the concepts this study explores are operationalized are applicable to all of the requirements associated with the process of categorization.

241 What is crucial to the categorization process overall is that the methods used by the researcher, and the theory he or she is trying to explain, be closely connected (Holsti 1969: 94). How a given text is coded must be guided by theory otherwise the researcher’s findings will be invalid—this refers to the issue of obtaining “structural validity.” According to Krippendorff (2004: 320), “structural validity demonstrates the structural correspondence between available data or established theory and the modeled relationships or the rules of inference that a content analysis is using.” In other words, structural validity deals with the issue of whether or not the categories used for analysis are representative of the relationships to be tested per a given theory.

In the present study, the theoretical basis for the types of categories chosen is prospect theory, specifically as it relates to McDermott’s (1998) suggestion that an actor’s risk propensity is a function of the domain, or mindset, in which he or she is operating. In her analytical framework, McDermott considers domain to represent the independent variable, and risk propensity the dependent variable (1998: 10-11). It is especially crucial to make a
Before proceeding with any further discussion regarding how arguments are coded by this dissertation, it is first necessary to discuss the assessment of risk as it pertains to policy options. To assess risk in this context, this study uses the method suggested by McDermott (1998). In her analysis, McDermott defined a choice as “risky,” relative to others, if “it has greater outcome variance in promoted values than alternative options” (39). In other words, an option is considered to be “risk-seeking” if the difference between the best and worst outcomes of the option is greater than the variance in the best and worst outcomes of the second option (or third, or fourth…). In a domain of losses, options are ranked as follows:

Best A
Best B
Worst B
Worst A

Conversely, in a gains frame, options are ranked:

Best B
Worst B
Best A
Worst A

Under these conditions, all outcomes of option B are preferable to both the best and worst outcomes of option A. Option B is therefore the risk-averse strategy.

As indicated in Chapters 2 and 3, democratization studies contend that during periods of institutional reform political incumbents have one primary goal: to maintain at least some degree of political power within the system. Numerous studies written on the process of democratization in Rwanda and Burundi have indicated that the political elite in each country possessed two primary options with which to achieve this particular goal (see for example the studies by Lemarchand 1994a, 1994b, Reyntjens 1993, 1995, African Rights 1995, Des Forges 1999, and Prunier 1995).242

---

242 In order for prospect theory to be applicable to this study it is essential that there be at least two options from which decision-makers can choose.
For purposes of this study, option $A$ represents a rejection of the multiparty system of government. Actors who have a preference for $A$ seek to revert back to the previous form of authoritarian rule through a strategy of obstruction and violence, including the extreme—total genocide. Violence is assumed by this study to be the risk-seeking strategy relative to more normal avenues of political competition. In accordance with prospect theory, option $A$ is assumed to represent a failure on the part of the political elite to adjust to the losses in power associated with the new system of government.

Option $B$ is the risk-averse strategy of approaching multiparty democracy through the regular channels of normal, non-violent political competition. Actors who advocate a preference for $B$ accept a multiparty system as the status quo. Option $B$ offers the possibility of greater political control in the future through the formal institutions of government. It is a far less costly strategy in that it is not a zero-sum, win-all/lose-all strategy of the type associated with $A$.

As it applies to Rwanda, options were ranked by conservative members of the Hutu political elite as follows:

**Best outcome of $A$:** An authoritarian government entirely controlled by extremist Hutu with no political opposition and no sanctions coming from the international community (financial, military, or legal). Option $A$ is the long-shot; the best outcome of $A$ is highly improbable, but still possible.

**Best outcome of $B$:** All parties have a place in the government—moderates, extremists, and Tutsi. Extremists enjoy partial control through existing institutions of multiparty democracy. Although they suffer a loss of political patronage/jobs, there is a chance for the extremists to gain greater control of the government through a manipulation of the system, made possible by the system’s inherent weaknesses and other circumstantial factors. Rwanda enjoys greater access to foreign development aid.

**Worst outcome of $B$:** A greater shift in power occurs in favor of the Tutsi and the moderate Hutu factions at the expense of the extremists. A weak multiparty government stumbles along indefinitely, bolstered by the international donor community. Low levels of conflict continue to prevail.

**Worst outcome of $A$:** The strategy of genocide reignites the civil war with the RPF and the RPF achieve complete victory over the Hutu extremists. Control of the government now rests entirely in the hands of the RPF and Tutsi politicians. Option $A$ includes a highly probable chance of a complete loss of power for the Hutu extremists and the Hutu group as a whole. Hutu perpetrators of the genocide sustain severe international repercussions in the form of financial, military and legal sanctions (e.g. war crimes tribunals).
In the case of Burundi, although the options faced by the incumbent Tutsi elite were similar to those faced by Hutu leaders in Rwanda, the bulk of the Tutsi elite ranked their options as follows:

**Best outcome of B:** All parties have a place in the government—Hutu and Tutsi. Tutsi enjoy substantial control through existing institutions of multiparty democracy. They sustain a loss of political patronage/jobs, but they maintain some level of power within the system, with a possible chance for more later on through the electoral process. Burundi enjoys greater access to foreign development aid.

**Worst outcome of B:** The Tutsi lose substantial power to the Hutu as a result of future elections; the system of government rapidly evolves into a true system of “majority rule.”

**Best outcome of A:** A government under complete control of the Tutsi bureaucracy and military. Although there are no immediate massive Hutu uprisings, the government is in a state of flux and the chance of civil war is likely, as are possible sanctions from the international community for refusal to cooperate with the political liberalization process. The government struggles along indefinitely. Low levels of conflict exist between Hutu hard-line groups and the government.

**Worst outcome of A:** The Hutu respond to the army’s coup d’état with a violent uprising that culminates in a civil war. Option A includes the highly likely chance of a complete and total loss of power for the Tutsi, as well as their possible massacre.

To appropriately categorize all policy arguments, it is important that the categories chosen be mutually exclusive and independent, all of which is a function of a researcher’s knowledge of the particular subject area and his or her ability to properly operationalize the concepts to be explored.243

The present study first categorizes arguments by whether or not the speaker uses a reference point in his or her argument. In their study, Levy and Whyte coded arguments as reference point related if they explicitly or implicitly identified and emphasized a neutral point against which the status quo or [leaders’] options to respond to the status quo were compared. Such arguments often referred to the aversiveness of the status quo or the worsening of the status quo over time.” (1997: 804)

This dissertation codes arguments in a similar manner. Arguments that demonstrate either an aversion to or an approval of the prospect of joint-rule are coded “1.” All other arguments that do not evidence the use of a reference point are coded “0.” Non-reference point arguments are those which include references

---

243 On this point Holsti (1969: 99) writes: “The requirement of mutual exclusiveness stipulates that no content datum can be placed in more than a single cell. In other words, operational definitions of the investigator’s variables must be precise and unambiguous.” The categories into which data are placed should also be independent of each other, meaning that “assignment of any datum into a category not affect the classification of other data” (100).
made by speakers to abstract concepts such as “the spirit of democracy,” or “national dignity,” as reasons to justify a particular course of action.244

Next, this study sub-categorizes all reference point related arguments according to the type of reference point used.245 Arguments which evidence the use of the former status quo (“FSQ”) as a reference point are coded “1.” If the reference point in an argument is the current status quo (“CSQ”), the argument is coded “0.” The “former status quo” is defined as the system of absolute, one-party rule that existed prior to the advent of multiparty politics. The “current status quo” is defined as the multiparty system of government that either had been, or was in the process of being, implemented at the time of collapse.246

Arguments are also categorized according to the type of option preferred by the speaker. For the sake of simplicity, this study assumes that the incumbent political elite in each country were faced with two policy options—a “high risk” (“HR”) and a “low risk” (“LR”) option.247 Arguments in support of the HR option are coded “1.” All arguments that support the LR option of maintaining the multiparty system of government are coded “0.”248

In order to appropriately code all policy arguments, it is necessary for the coder to “read between the lines.” Very often, many of the seemingly harmless statements made by political leaders in fact

---

244 This is very similar to the Levy and Whyte study (1997). In their study, non-reference point arguments made by Japanese leaders include arguments that justify a policy course by its likelihood of success or by its effect on the “national dignity” of Japan (1997: 805: for all indicators of non-reference point arguments, see Appendix A).

245 The type of reference point used by speakers is one particular avenue that is not adequately explored by Levy and Whyte.

246 Indicators of a speaker’s preference for the FSQ include allusions made to the many problems multiparty rule would mean for members of the incumbent political elite’s communal group (ranging from job losses to ethnic massacres), as well as positive references to the former system of government, and negative references made to the opposition. By way of contrast, indicators of a speaker’s preference for the CSQ include positive references made to the opposition, as well as references made to the benefits multiparty democracy meant for his or her country as a whole. A full list of all coding indicators is included in Appendix A. The fact that the same indicators used to categorize arguments by reference point are also used to categorize arguments by reference-point type should not pose a problem for this study given that the latter arguments are sub-categories of the first.

247 “High risk” and “low risk” correspond to risk-averse and risk-seeking respectively.

248 Arguments that demonstrate a speaker’s preference for the LR option include positive references made to ongoing negotiations with the opposition that are intended to further the democratization process, as well as references to current and future reforms to be made to the governing system for purposes of ending corruption and creating equality of opportunity. Arguments that demonstrate a speaker’s preference for a HR option include arguments that favor violence as a solution to democratization, as well as arguments that favor tactics aimed at
contained hidden messages, the meaning of which was intended for certain groups only. As a result, it is essential that the coders used in this study possess a substantial knowledge of the context in which these statements were made, as well as the identity of those who made them.

To achieve reliability, this study uses two coders, the researcher and a fellow graduate student who is generally familiar with the political, social and economic histories of both countries. To statistically assess inter-coder reliability Cohen’s kappa ($\kappa$) is used. Disagreements between coders are resolved by consensus in post-coding discussion. Policy arguments on which consensus can not be reached are discarded.

The last part of the coding process discussed by Holsti (1969) is enumeration. The particular type of enumeration used by the present study is the frequency of occurrence of each type of argument, cross-tabulated according to the hypothesis tested.

---

249 The reason for this is simple. The likelihood that a leader would make a statement to the international press advocating a policy of genocide is quite small. Instead, similar to other cases of genocide, euphemisms were frequently used by speakers. In the case of Rwanda, for example, statements made by actors often include calls for “Hutu vigilance” or “self-defense.” According to studies written about the genocide, statements such as these were euphemisms for genocide (see especially the studies by African Rights 1995, Prunier 1995 and Des Forges 1999).

250 Although the use of a greater number of coders would have been preferable, due to a lack of financial resources, this was not possible.

More generally, achieving results that are reliable is a matter of the level of agreement between coders which is in part a function of the clarity of the coding instructions used, as well as the criteria used for the selection of coders. Reliability is also a matter of the conditions under which coders work. They must work independently of one another (see Krippendorff 2004: 216-219).

251 Cohen’s kappa measures inter-coder reliability on a scale from “1” to “0,” with a “1” indicating perfect agreement and a “0” indicating that agreement between coders is no more likely due to chance. For further information on Cohen’s kappa, see Chapter 8.

252 This was a procedure similar to that followed by the Levy and Whyte study. Although it would have been preferable to have a third individual to serve as a “tie breaker” this was not possible due to a lack of resources (see above). However, based on the level of knowledge the researcher and the second coder possess regarding the subject matter examined, it was frequently possible to overcome most of the inter-coder disagreements. As indicated above (and below), in situations in which inter-coder agreement was not possible, the policy argument (or arguments) in dispute was discarded from the full sample.

253 According to Holsti (1969), there are two assumptions associated with the use of frequency as a system of enumeration in content analysis. The first of these is the assumption that frequency itself is a valid indicator of the concept the researcher is trying to address. Secondly, it is assumed that whatever type of recording unit the researcher is using—word, sentence etc.—all are given equal weight (122). The former assumption is important to take into consideration especially given the fact that the present study is addressing individual perceptions and attitudes. Holsti also notes that the one of the problems associated with the use of frequency as an indicator of attitude is that the intensity of attitudes cannot be discerned. How much of a problem this poses for the current study—or any study—is dependent on the researcher’s knowledge of context, as well as his or her use of independent data as a supplement to the data used in the content analysis.
arguments that demonstrate the use or non-use of a reference point, with those that support either of the two types of options. These arguments are cross tabulated as follows:

Table 4.2. Use of Reference Point and Policy Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-reference point</th>
<th>Reference point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LR (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, this study cross-tabulates arguments according to the type of reference point used by speakers and the type of policy advocated. The cross-tabulation is as follows:

Table 4.3. Type of Reference Point Used and Policy Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSQ</th>
<th>FSQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LR (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test the significance of each relationship examined, this study performs a chi-square test.²⁵⁴

²⁵⁴ The chi-square test is designed to test whether or not a relationship between variables is entirely due to chance. The test statistic is \(X^2 = \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}\), where E represents expected frequency and O represents observed frequency of values. The null hypothesis can be discarded if the value of \(X^2\) is greater than the critical value listed for lower probabilities per degrees of freedom. (Hamilton 1996: 224-227).
Conclusion

This chapter has addressed two types of analysis performed by this dissertation. The first of these is a systems-level analysis of two cases—Rwanda and Burundi—for purposes of testing the general hypothesis against a structural alternative hypothesis. This systems-level analysis constitutes a most similar systems design in which all of the structural/contextual similarities between both countries are held constant. By using a most similar systems design, it is possible to eliminate each of these factors as rival explanations of the genocide that occurred in Rwanda, in the process attributing the variation in the dependent variable to the two primary explanatory variables—social structures and traditional political institutions.

However, relying on a systems-level approach alone is insufficient, as the causal link between social structures, traditional political institutions and total genocide cannot be clearly established. As this chapter has discussed in great detail, the use of a within-case analysis is preferable as a means to establish the link between institutions (larger-scale factors), and individual behavior. Specifically, the within-case analysis used by this study is designed to test a number of hypotheses about individual perception that are implied by the general hypothesis. These secondary hypotheses are all intended to test the relationship between risk perception and risk preference that is posited by prospect theory. Similar to many other studies that have used prospect theory in the past to explain decision-making behavior, these hypotheses are tested against a rational choice alternative hypothesis.

As this study demonstrates in upcoming chapters, a substantial segment of the incumbent political elite in Rwanda perceived multiparty democracy to be a “sure loss” relative to the system of absolute Hutu rule that had existed for decades. It was no coincidence that the same Hutu who perceived the new government to be a loss were the same ones who opted for, and eventually attempted, a complete takeover of the government through an elimination of all those in opposition to absolute Hutu rule.

In the case of Burundi, this study demonstrates that the 21 October 1993 coup d’état was attempted by a segment of the Tutsi military who also considered joint-rule with the opposition to be a complete and total loss. However, total genocide did not occur. This study suggests that this divergence
in outcome is due to the fact that the organizers and perpetrators of the coup were a minority relative to other Tutsi leaders who were committed to maintaining the status quo of multiparty democracy.

Before commencing with an analysis of the decision-making processes of the leaders in question, the next chapter assesses each of the structural control variables, paying close attention to the particular studies that have used these variables to explain the genocide in Rwanda, and demonstrating that all of these variables fail as adequate explanations for the genocide that occurred.
CHAPTER 5

STRUCTURAL EXPLANATIONS OF GENOCIDE

As discussed in Chapter 2, many studies of the Rwandan genocide and the violence in neighboring Burundi explain conflict as the result of structural conditions and what are best described as “bad circumstances.”

In the case of Rwanda, these unfavorable conditions included the simultaneous occurrence of civil war, economic stagnation, and resource scarcity. All of the studies written specifically on the genocide further assume that the blend of these particular conditions fueled a rise in extremism among members of the Hutu elite. The choice to perpetrate total genocide is depicted by these analyses as a strategic decision made by certain members of the Hutu incumbent elite in an effort to maintain control over the governing system. Structural studies of the violence in Burundi identify very similar conditions as the cause of violence and bloodshed in that country.

The above statement represents a paradox which none of the structural studies can adequately explain and which constitutes the primary puzzle on which this dissertation focuses. Simply put it is puzzling, given the similarity in structural circumstances in the two countries that a total genocide occurred in Rwanda but not in Burundi.

To begin to address this puzzle, this dissertation examines evidence concerning the different structural conditions and problems that both countries faced in the period preceding the violence in question. The specific purpose of the present chapter is twofold: firstly, this chapter tests a structural alternative hypothesis which is as follows:
**Alternative Hypothesis 1:** The occurrence of total genocide in Rwanda was a result of the onset of certain crises. These crises, which included economic downfall, resource scarcity, and communal violence, served to exacerbate group tensions in an already heavily pluralized society.

This hypothesis is intended to test the combined effects of four structural variables. Three of these variables—*domestic conflict, demographic stress* and *economic health*—pertain to the crises referenced in the above hypothesis. The fourth variable—*pluralized society*—addresses the role of a divided society in the occurrence of *total genocide*. For the structural hypothesis to be discarded, it is necessary to demonstrate that the above-mentioned conditions produced an outcome of total genocide in only one of the two cases.

As indicated in Chapter 2 of this study, democratization is depicted by structural studies of Rwanda and/or Burundi as a trigger event that unleashed group violence in countries that were already heavily burdened by a number of other more serious problems. In terms of the present study, however, democratization is *not* examined as a structural control variable. As discussed in Chapter 4, *multiparty democracy* is instead assessed as an intervening variable. In other words, this study hypothesizes and demonstrates that the effect multiparty democracy had on the occurrence of *total genocide* is a function of each country’s past institutional experience.

By examining the above structural variables, this chapter achieves a second purpose; to demonstrate that the aforementioned variables can be eliminated as controls. This leaves the remaining independent variables—*social structures* and *traditional political institutions*—as the most likely causes of the variation in outcome between Rwanda and Burundi.

The current chapter proceeds as follows. First, this chapter provides a brief discussion regarding some of the more obvious similarities that exist between Rwanda and Burundi, including geographical likeness. Next, this chapter turns to a full examination of each of the four control variables discussed above. Both the qualitative and quantitative data demonstrate that nearly *identical* conditions existed in Rwanda and Burundi prior to the outbreak of major violence in each in the 1990s.

This chapter concludes with a summary of the findings obtained from the analysis of the structural control variables and a concise review of the structure-agency problem which all of the
genocide studies discussed in this chapter encounter. The current chapter then provides a few brief remarks regarding the topic of discussion in Chapter 6.

Rwanda and Burundi: A Study of Two Similar Cases

The similarities between Rwanda and Burundi have long been noted by scholars of these countries. Both are located in the Rift Valley in east-central Africa. They are separated from one another by the Akanyaru River and the Kagera River valley. To the east, both are bordered by Tanzania and to the west by the Democratic Republic of the Congo. To the north, Rwanda is bordered by Uganda; Burundi is bordered by Rwanda (see Map 5.1).

The two countries are nearly identical in size, terrain and climate. Rwanda is 26,338 sq. km. (10,169 sq. mi.) in size; Burundi 27,834 sq. km. (10,747 sq. mi.). Both countries have grassy uplands and hills with a mountainous region to the west and savannah to the east. Both have a temperate climate and experience both rainy and dry seasons.

In addition to physical similarities, the two countries have similar histories and social systems. The process of state formation in both countries was roughly comparable and each was subject to colonial rule from the end of the 19th century until 1962. In terms of their societies, Lemarchand (1970: 45) notes that Rwanda and Burundi have historically been
elitist, hierarchically organised societies, in which power was concentrated at the top in the hands of a small oligarchy; both attached certain physical and moral stereotypes to castes, and tended to associate qualities of intelligence and resourcefulness with the upper strata; both tended to equate power with wealth and wealth with cattle and land; and in both societies the ties of clientage formed the basis of social and/or political relations.

---

255 All information on the geography and climate of both countries was obtained from a variety of sources including the CIA World Factbook, Political Handbook of the World 1999, and the studies by Lemarchand (1970: 13-17), Louis (1963) and Prunier (1995) among others.
256 The climate and geography of both countries was what led explorers to dub them the “Switzerland of Africa”; a land with “bucolic charm as well as a touch of grandiose beauty,” complete with mountains, hills and lush green valleys (Lemarchand 1970: 13, see also Louis 1963: 112-113).
257 For a more complete discussion concerning the consolidation of the kingdoms of Rwanda and Burundi, see Lemarchand (1970: 19-21). In terms of colonial rule, both countries were ruled first by Germany as part of the colony of German East Africa, and then by Belgium as the joint colony of Ruanda-Urundi (Lemarchand 1970: chap. 2; see also C. Newbury 1988 and Vasina 2004).
Map 5.1: Rwanda and Burundi

However, as is made clear in this chapter and in subsequent chapters, many of these comparable attributes and experiences are largely superficial to the extent they mask a substantial set of differences that heavily influenced the course of political development and group relations in each country.258

**Pluralized Society**

The first control variable examined by this study is *pluralized society*.259 Studies that have been written on the genocide in Rwanda suggest that the particular type of society that existed in Rwanda—with one group in a clear position of dominance vis-à-vis the other by virtue of their communal identity—provided the “structural base” for the genocide.

In accordance with a number of ethnic conflict scholars including Bates (1983), Horowitz (1985) and others, the present study is more specifically concerned with the effect that group size had on the propensity for collective violence in both countries. As discussed in Chapter 2, Ellingsen (2000) has statistically demonstrated that countries in which the second largest group is medium-sized face twice the risk of conflict than do countries in which the second largest group makes up less than five percent of the population (2000: 241-243). Although Ellingsen’s analysis does not explicitly address Rwanda and Burundi, her findings can nevertheless be applied to them, and as such are worthy of further examination.

An analysis of demographic data for the 20th century indicates that the percentages of Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda and Burundi are strikingly similar and have changed little over time.260 In Rwanda, the

---

258 This is a point stressed time and again by scholars such as René Lemarchand. On a separate note, this chapter relies heavily on the work of Lemarchand whose studies of Rwanda and Burundi are an invaluable source of information on the political, economic and social systems that have historically existed in each country. This study does not, however, imply that Lemarchand’s analyses use a structural argument to explain the violence in Rwanda and Burundi. As this dissertation makes clear, Lemarchand adopts more of an institutionalist approach to explaining the origins of group conflict in each country.

259 As indicated in Chapter 4, a “pluralized society” is generally defined as one in which “deep and pervasive cleavages” exist between groups which are differentiated from one another by virtue of their communal identities (see Kuper 1984: 39).

260 For demographic data this dissertation consulted the *World Almanac*, the *Encyclopedia Britannica Book of the Year*, the *New International Yearbook*, and *Africa Contemporary Record*. The most reliable data found for both countries were for the period beginning in the 1970s (1972 for Rwanda; 1978 for Burundi). Population data for Rwanda and Burundi are not readily available for the period prior to and immediately after independence. Demographic data for the pre-independence period pertain primarily to the colony of Ruanda-Urundi. However, historical studies of Ruanda-Urundi indicate that the population percentages of Hutu and Tutsi have changed little.
percentage of Hutu has fluctuated between 85 and 90%; the percentage of Tutsi between eight and 14%. In Burundi, the population percentages of Hutu and Tutsi have been a bit more consistent—remaining at roughly 85 and 14%, respectively.

On a more superficial level perhaps one can argue a correlation does exist between group size and conflict in these two countries. As the data in Tables 5.1 and 5.2 indicate, each country has a history of inter- and intra-group discord that stretches back at least as far as the 19th century. However, attaching causal significance to the size of the first and second largest groups says little about the severity of the conflict that has occurred in both countries, particularly when the latter-half of the 20th century is taken into consideration. Stated differently, the fact that both countries have historically had similar demographic make-ups does not tell us why, for instance, a partial genocide occurred in Burundi and not Rwanda in the early 1970s, or why total genocide erupted in Rwanda and not Burundi in the 1990s.

This latter point raises certain questions regarding the perceptions group members have of each other and the effect these perceptions have on the prevalence of collective violence. Lemarchand (1994b: 588), for one, suggests that the root of the conflict between Hutu and Tutsi in both countries lies in the “interplay between ethnic realities and their subjective reconstruction (or manipulation) by political entrepreneurs.” As this applies to Rwanda more specifically, Mamdani (2001) contends that the identities “Hutu” and “Tutsi” are in actuality political identities that have been shaped and reinforced by institutions of authority—including those imposed under the period of colonial rule. He argues that

the Rwandan state was a powerful political engine that restructured social relations wherever its tentacles took hold. The tendency was for social relations to follow [italics added] rather than to precede or accompany the spread of political authority. The outcome was testimony to the primacy of politics. A whole array of institutions—from the army to the clientship—enforced and undergirded the reproduction of Hutu and Tutsi as binary political entities. (2001: 56)

Consequently, any common cultural identity shared by the Hutu and Tutsi took a backseat to their political identities (for more on this point, see also C. Newbury 1988; Mann 2005: 10-11, 18-20, 432).

since both were colonized by Germany in the late 1800’s. At that time, the Hutu population was estimated by the Germans to be around 85%, with estimates of the population of Tutsi varying depending on the survey (see Louis 1963: 107-108; also Lemarchand 1970: 19).
As discussed in Chapter 2, several of the authors who have studied Rwanda and Burundi make the argument that collective identities have been heavily influenced by violent events (see for instance Uvin 1998, Des Forges 1999 and Prunier 1995). However, assuming this is the case, none of these analyses can adequately explain why a similar history of excessive violence in Burundi did not prompt the country’s ruling elite to perpetrate total genocide in 1993. This explanatory deficiency suggests that, in order to more fully understand the relationship between group identities and group violence, more must be taken into account than just a history of collective violence and bloodshed. Instead, as Lemarchand, Mamdani and others would suggest, it is also necessary to comprehend the influence that formal and informal institutions have historically had on the formation and reproduction of collective identities in both cases. This latter topic is one to which this dissertation returns in subsequent chapters.261

**Domestic Conflict**

Closely related to the first control variable, the second control variable also addresses group conflict in Rwanda and Burundi, albeit more directly. The purpose of including *domestic conflict* in this study is to test two related hypotheses made by scholars who have written on the sources of group conflict and genocide in Rwanda.

The first of these hypotheses suggests the episodes of collective violence perpetrated by party militias, death squads and other governmental agents during the civil war in Rwanda contributed greatly to the 1994 genocide by lowering existing social constraints against the use of violence (see for example African Rights 1995, Prunier 1995, Des Forges 1999, Longman 1999, and Kakwenzire and Kamukama 1999).262

---

261 Although Lemarchand (1994a) suggests that the processes of political competition and rapid social change were the primary factors responsible for the polarization of group identities in Burundi, the fact that polarization occurred rather late in the country’s history is a testament to the power of institutions in formulating and undergirding communal identities. Based on his earlier 1970 comparative study of Rwanda and Burundi, Lemarchand would likely agree.

262 It is important to note that few of the studies of the Rwandan genocide suggest that civil war was *the* actual cause of the genocide. Instead, as discussed in greater detail below, most scholars contend that the civil war in Rwanda *increased* the likelihood of genocide by serving as a pretext for the greater use of violence by
The second hypothesis suggests that much of the inter-group violence that occurred between Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda in the early 1990s was a result of the violence that took place in Burundi after the assassination of the Burundian president. To be more specific, a number of studies contend that the collapse of multiparty rule in Burundi in October 1993 helped to facilitate genocide by negatively shaping the perceptions many Hutu in Rwanda held regarding the likely outcome of joint-rule with the Tutsi.263

With regard to the first hypothesis, many structural studies of the Rwandan genocide suggest that the numerous acts of brutality that occurred between groups in the years immediately prior to the genocide created a culture of impunity in which violence emerged as a preferred means of conflict resolution.264 Described by some scholars as a “central feature of life” in Rwanda, this culture of impunity permitted

the well-connected…to steal public funds without sanction; [it allowed] the military, police and mobs to kill without fear. Its impact on society [was] powerful: it [discredited] the institutions of law and order and [encouraged] all forms of abuse since there [was] no fear of punishment. Through all these mechanisms, impunity [created] violence. (Uvin 1999: 264)265

In this context, murder, torture and arbitrary imprisonment became part of a “broad spectrum of political tools” with which the incumbent Hutu elite dealt with members of the opposition, including the Tutsi (Prunier 1995: 62).

A similar argument has also been applied to conditions in Burundi. Scholars such as Ndikumana (1998) and Lemarchand (1994a), for instance, suggest that the lack of punishment meted out for the
government forces.

263 Structural studies that make this argument include the studies by Uvin (1998, 1999), Prunier (1995), DesForges (1999), Harff (1998) and Davies et al. (1998). Lemarchand offers a similar suggestion in his 1994 study which addresses the history of conflict and violence in Burundi.

264 Many of these studies also contend that the culture of impunity in Rwanda was by no means a recent development but stemmed, at least partially, from the government’s lack of accountability for past abuses perpetrated against the Tutsi community (Kakwenzire and Kamukama 1999: 81), (Verwimp 2000), (Prunier 1995: 84-90).

265 It is important to note that Uvin also uses this concept to describe conditions in Burundi. In the case of Rwanda, many studies suggest that an additional factor that contributed further to the culture of impunity was the absence of international condemnation of the violence perpetrated by the Habyarimana government between 1990 and 1994 (see Des Forges 1999, Prunier 1995, African Rights 1995, Kakwenzire and Kamukama 1999, Longman 1999; in regards to the relationship between the international aid community and the culture of impunity, see Uvin 1998: chap. 5).
excessive abuses perpetrated by the Tutsi military against the country’s Hutu civilian population in 1972, 1988 and 1991 reinforced the use of violence as an acceptable tool to “safeguard” political stability.

Returning again to the case of Rwanda, scholars such as Longman (1999: chap. 17; 1999) suggest that the decline in public support for the Habyarimana government and the invasion of the country by the Tutsi-led RPF in October 1990 induced the president and his supporters to rely on the coercive capacity of the state as a means to effectively deal with both external and internal threats.\(^{266}\) In this respect it has been said that war allowed the government “to take advantage of the ‘Tutsi feudalist threat’ and recreate around itself [at least for a time] the atmosphere of unanimity it used to enjoy before the onset of the [democratization] movement” (Prunier 1995: 108; on this point see also Kakwenzire and Kamukama 1999: 73 and Verwimp 2000: 44).

It is in this context that what Longman (1999) refers to as the “organization of chaos” was created. The organization of chaos was a strategy used by Habyarimana and his supporters to reduce the legitimacy of the opposition and create a sense of nostalgia on the part of the public for a return to authoritarian rule. To achieve these goals, blame for the disorder and instability caused by the conservative Hutu political parties, their militias and the military was placed on the RPF and the moderate opposition parties; violence and mayhem was thus associated with multiparty rule (1999: 348-350).

\(^{266}\) Although it is also appropriate to incorporate Longman’s analysis with the democratization literature discussed in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, it is included in the present chapter because it offers excellent insight into the circumstances that led to the culture of violence that permeated Rwandan society in the early 1990’s. Additionally, the argument Longman makes is essentially a structural argument in that he assumes certain predisposing factors (e.g. economic, societal) doomed the democratization project in Rwanda to failure.

One additional note: the use of violence by Hutu extremists for the purposes of “self-defense” is a characteristic that makes the 1994 genocide a retributive one. “Retributive genocides” are defined as those in which “one party, usually the government [commits genocide in order to] systematically…destroy its opponent’s support base” during or after a civil war (Harff 2003: 61; see also Fein 1993). It is also worth mentioning that the 1994 genocide in Rwanda encompassed many of the characteristics that are associated with “ideological genocides.” An “ideological genocide” is defined by Harff as one in which an elite rises to power “with a transforming ideology of a new society purified of unwanted or threatening elements,” (2003: 61).

Many studies of the Rwandan genocide indicate that the incentive behind the genocide in Rwanda was twofold. On the one hand, the Hutu perpetrators were motivated by a desire to eliminate all current and future opponents of absolute Hutu rule. On the other hand, these same Hutu extremists sought to destroy an enemy (e.g. the Tutsi) that was considered to be less than human according to the dictates of the prevailing ideology. In this respect, the Rwandan genocide can be considered both an ideological and retributive genocide.
The effect that the civil war had on democratization in Rwanda was to reinforce and increase the ethnicization of politics and further reify existing cleavages between Hutu and Tutsi (Kakwenzire and Kamukama 1999: 72-77). Similar to the ways in which coercion and violence were used by extremists to control political opponents, the civil war was utilized by conservative factions within the government as another means to justify a system of absolute Hutu rule.267

On a more practical level, Longman (1999) suggests that the expansion of the military that occurred as a result of the war further increased the government’s potential for mass violence. Within a year of the RPF invasion, the size of the Rwandan army was expanded from 5,200 to 30,000 troops.268 Additionally, military aid—in the form of money and weapons from outside sources (e.g. France)—was used to arm and train many of the groups that eventually emerged as the primary perpetrators of the genocide in 1994.269

Closely associated with the above suggestion is the contention made by scholars such as Prunier (1995), Verwimp (2000) and others that the instances of violence perpetrated by the military and other extremist groups during the early 1990’s were a dry run for the larger-scale massacres that eventually occurred.270 Committed under the cover of civil war, the small scale massacres of the Tutsi population in northern Rwanda were actually “genocidal tests,” perpetrated by the Hutu extremists as a means to check the public’s reaction to the use of violence on a larger scale.271

---

267 This dissertation revisits this particular topic in Chapter 6 in conjunction with the discussion on the relationship between the media and political instability in Rwanda.
268 Guichaoua puts the number of troops (including the gendarmerie) at 10,000 in 1990 and 35,000 in 1994 (1995: 770). Prunier (1995: 113) contends that, by the time peace negotiations began in 1992, the number of Rwandan troops was as high as 50,000.
270 Much of this suggestion is based on the similarities between these earlier massacres and the 1994 genocide. According to Prunier (1995: 137-139), the genocide and the pogroms which occurred between 1991 and 1993 both used civilians as “willing executioners.” Both also used local officials to desensitize civilian populations, and in both cases, references were made to the killings as umuganda or “collective work.” Prunier strongly suggests that those responsible for the pre-genocidal massacres were “apprentice totalitarians within a semi-totalitarian regime” (1995: 169; for further discussion on this point, see also African Rights 1995: 94-95).
271 Verwimp suggests that these massacres were also intended as a means to test the reactions of the international community, local officials and the military (2000: 43).
Scholars have largely attributed the motivation for the use of violence by the Rwandan government and military to self-defense, or at least the protection of the privileges associated with Hutu rule. The use of violence by civilians—notably members of the political opposition groups—has been attributed to a variety of motives including fear, opportunism, and relative deprivation.\(^{272}\) However, what is of greater relevance to the present study is that these violent acts further contributed to the sense of paranoia held by conservative Hutu factions, specifically their belief that certain segments of the population posed a direct threat to the preservation of Hutu political, economic and social domination.\(^{273}\)

Many of the studies written on the 1994 genocide of the Tutsi and moderate Hutu in Rwanda suggest that one of the contributing factors was the violence that erupted in Burundi in the early 1990’s.\(^{274}\)

\(^{272}\) “Relative deprivation” is defined by Gurr (1970: 24) as an “actors’ perception of discrepancy between their value expectations and their value capabilities” (see also Gurr 1970: chaps. 2-5, Ellingsen 2000: 230). In the context of Rwanda, Uvin (1998) suggests that the relative deprivation felt on the part of the Hutu stemmed from conditions of “structural violence,” in particular policies of economic exclusion (107; 118-127; for further information on the concept of structural violence, see below). Additionally, scholars such as Lemarchand (1994a: 120-127) have associated much of the violence that occurred in Burundi in 1988 and afterwards to feelings of relative deprivation. In this latter instance, despite—and in many ways because of—the efforts made by President Buyoya to liberalize political institutions, many Hutu resented the fact that their political status was not drastically improved in the short term.

Concerning the motive of opportunism, several studies of the Rwandan genocide and the violence in Burundi suggest that many of those involved in the carnage acted out of a desire to acquire material and other benefits from their victims (Prunier 1997: 231-232), (Uvin 1998: 219), (Lemarchand 1994a), (African Rights 1995: 24-25). This particular hypothesis is ground in the instrumentalist school of ethnic conflict theories which suggest that groups mobilize against one another for strategic or material reasons. According to this perspective, ethnic identities are situational. They are “a set of socially attributed characteristics having both behavioural and idefitive dimensions,” and are used by groups for strategic purposes (see Carment 1983: 138; see also Tilly 1978: 59-87, Bates 1983, Gurr 1993, and Gurr and Harff 1994: 78-79; for an additional discussion of the instrumentalist argument, see Ellingsen 2000: 230-231 and Thompson 1989).

\(^{273}\) Much of the violence committed by members of the opposition parties was part of a tactic known as *kubohoza* (“to help liberate”). Initially, *kubohoza* was a strategy in which force or the threat of force was used to recruit people from the ruling party. It was later used with greater frequency by the extremist parties against their moderate opponents (Des Forges 1999: 54-57).

\(^{274}\) This particular assumption stems from a more general argument made by scholars of the Great Lakes area that tensions between “kindred groups” in one of the two countries have historically impacted inter-group relations in the other. On a more abstract level, scholars such as Lemarchand (1994a) contend that events such as the 1959 Hutu Revolution in Rwanda and the 1972 genocide in Burundi created a “self-fulfilling prophecy” for groups in both countries. In the case of Burundi, despite possessing a more complex set of social and political institutions, the revolution in Rwanda became a source of inspiration for many Hutu in Burundi and a source of fear for many Tutsi. The Hutu in this case “imputed to the Tutsi of Burundi hegemonic motives that the Tutsi did not at first possess but to which they eventually gave a substance of truth. Conversely, many Tutsi saw in the Rwanda upheaval an ominous prefiguration of their destinies” and acted accordingly (see 1994a: 60, also 61-62, 29-30). Other scholars such as Uvin (1998: 34) suggest that these violent events “became a traumatic part of the identity of both Hutu and Tutsi—in both cases, and for both sides, creating self-images of vulnerability and weakness.”

On a more practical level, since independence the governments of Rwanda and Burundi and opposition
To be more specific, a number of scholars including Prunier (1995), Uvin (1998), and Des Forges (1999) contend that the assassination of Burundian president Melchoir Ndadaye increased the potential for large scale violence in Rwanda by serving as a confirmation for many of what would likely transpire should the institutions of the Broad Based Transitional Government (“BBTG”) be fully implemented.\textsuperscript{275} To bolster their arguments, they point to the fact that, in the days and weeks that followed Ndadaye’s death, the major opposition parties in the country were split into two factions as support for the extremist Hutu-Power movement drastically increased among the once-politically moderate Hutu.\textsuperscript{276}

Further evidence of this shift in perspective is demonstrated by speeches made at events such as the 23 October 1993 Hutu-Power rally in Kigali. At this rally, the motives of the coup makers in Burundi were attributed by speakers to the RPF and to the Tutsi in Rwanda as a whole. Froduald Karamira, the Second Vice President of the Mouvement Démocratie Républicain (“MDR”), went so far as to declare that the Hutu “cannot sit down and think that what happened in Burundi will not happen here, since the enemy is among us” (Des Forges 1999: 138).

In one way or another, all of the aforementioned structural studies imply that the attempted coup d’état in Burundi induced many Hutu in Rwanda to perceive multiparty democracy as a complete and total loss. Unfortunately, none of these studies provides any explanation or systematic analysis of the groups within both countries have given aid to kindred groups in the neighboring country. For instance, many of the Tutsi rebels who invaded Rwanda in the 1960s did so from refugee camps located in Burundi and, in 1965 Tutsi rebels from Rwanda helped a group of Tutsi politicians in Burundi assassinate the Hutu prime minister. By the early 1990’s the government of each country was accusing its counterpart of attempting to topple it through the support of insurgency movements (see EIU Country Reports: Zaire, Rwanda, and Burundi 1991 Nos. 2-3, and 1992 Nos. 1-3; Lemarchand 1994a: 153-154, and Des Forges 1999: 136-137; 1992: 27; for a full discussion on the role of Burundi in the rebel invasions of Rwanda, see Lemarchand 1970: 215-223, 357-358, 387-390; see also Prunier 1995: 55).

\textsuperscript{275} The election of the moderate candidate Melchoir Ndadaye of the Front pour la Démocratie au Burundi (“FRODEBU”) was looked on as a source of pride by many Hutu in Rwanda. When Ndadaye and other Hutu members of the government were murdered by a faction of the Tutsi military in October 1993, many Hutu politicians and party members in Rwanda saw their worst fears confirmed. The assassination was perceived as “irrefutable proof that the Tutsi were bent on dominating the entire region and would use force, if necessary, to achieve that goal,” (Des Forges 1999: 135).

\textsuperscript{276} Experts on human rights conditions in Rwanda consider the Hutu-Power movement to have been “built upon the corpse of Ndadaye” (Des Forges 1999: 117). Hutu-Power was a coalition consisting of extremist members of the major political parties in Rwanda. The consolidation of the Hutu-Power movement divided the large opposition parties into two wings: a moderate wing that was amenable to the democratization process and an extremist “Power” wing closely allied with the former ruling party. As a general rule, the movement sought to completely obstruct the implementation of the transitional multiparty system of government (1999: 137-140; see
ways in which group perceptions translated into group behavior. In other words, these studies cannot elucidate how conditions in Burundi impacted the Hutu leaders in Rwanda in the particular ways that they did. As a result, it becomes difficult to understand why the Hutu extremists in Rwanda did not attempt to annihilate the Tutsi in October 1993, instead waiting until April 1994.\textsuperscript{277}

Although they do not offer an individual-level analysis of the causes of collective violence in either country, Harff (1998) and Davies et al. (1998) do attempt to resolve the above-mentioned puzzle by considering the number of accelerating events that occurred in Rwanda prior to the October 1993 coup d’état. “Accelerating events” are defined by Harff (1998: 73) as events that are “typically reflective of, and are linked to, larger interests or issues.”\textsuperscript{278} These scholars find that greater numbers of accelerating events lead to more severe bouts of communal violence, given a variety of other background and intervening conditions.\textsuperscript{279}

According to the authors, one type of accelerating event that is especially relevant is the occurrence of collective violence between kindred groups in neighboring countries. Although Harff (1998) and Davies et al. (1998) contend that this particular type of event is a “key accelerator,” they find that it only exerts a significant impact on the likelihood of genocide (or communal wars) when its occurrence coincides with the presence of other accelerating events. As this applies to the case of Rwanda more specifically, the authors conclude that the Ndadaye assassination had at best a negligible impact on the occurrence of genocide because it took place at a time when far fewer accelerating events were present.

\textsuperscript{277} A similar point can be made with respect to Burundi. Absent any explanation of the causal mechanism whereby events are linked to individual perceptions, we have no way of knowing why the massacres of Tutsi civilians in Rwanda between 1991 and 1993 did not induce the Tutsi army to massacre the Hutu civilian population in Burundi.

\textsuperscript{278} The authors distinguish accelerating events from trigger events. “Trigger events,” are defined by Davies et al. as “single events that, in the presence of background and intervening conditions, plus accelerators precipitate the final stage of a crisis,” (1998: 82). It is worth noting that the distinction these scholars make between trigger events and accelerating events is vague and somewhat arbitrary.

\textsuperscript{279} In the Harff model, the period of time the author considers for both Rwanda and Burundi is the 12 months prior to the outbreak of major hostilities. In her analysis Harff finds that Rwanda experienced 54 accelerating events prior to the April 1994 genocide. Burundi, on the other hand, experienced only 25 accelerating events prior to the assassination of Ndadaye and the outbreak of civil war (1998: 75).
What is extremely problematic about the Harff and Davies et al. studies is that they cannot explain why certain accelerating events and not others led many of the Hutu in Rwanda to deem the Tutsi and Hutu moderates as worthy of total destruction. Likewise, sequential models such as these cannot explain why fewer accelerating events in Burundi led to the assassination of the president and the collapse of the multiparty system of government.  

A far greater problem that all of the structural studies encounter stems from the lack of comparison they make between conditions in Rwanda and those which existed in Burundi over similar periods of time. As a result, whatever conclusions the authors of these analyses reach about the relationship between past violence and future episodes of group conflict or genocide are tenuous at best.

In order to provide a more adequate test of the two conflict hypotheses addressed in this section, it is necessary to compare and contrast the patterns of group conflict experienced by each country. To achieve this task, the current study consulted a variety of resources including qualitative studies that address the history of inter- and intra-group relations and quantitative data gathered from the *Minorities at Risk* database.

Tables 5.3 through 5.8 present data on group conflicts obtained from the *Minorities at Risk* dataset. Unfortunately the data provided by *MAR* are somewhat inconsistent and provide a misleading picture of the nature and severity of the conflicts that occurred in each country. For example, the *MAR* data provided in Table 5.3 indicate that from 1965 until 1992 there were no factional disputes among the Tutsi in Burundi. This finding contradicts several qualitative studies which demonstrate that intra-
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280 To explain this particular turn of events, Davies et al. (1998: 91) offer the weak suggestion that, since the construction of coup plots are seldom public knowledge, the 21 October 1993 coup could not have been predicted.
281 As stated in previous chapters, there are few data available that address the nature of group relations in Rwanda and Burundi before the 19th century. As a result, the conclusions this study makes regarding the similarities and differences in the patterns of collective violence that have occurred in these two countries are limited to the time period for which data could be obtained.
282 *MAR* data are available for varying periods of time depending on the type of conflict-related activity examined. The *MAR* data used by this dissertation largely cover the period from 1985 until the year prior to the outbreak of major conflict in each country.
283 To rephrase, the *MAR* data indicate that there were no disputes between any identifiable groups in Burundi. For the year 1992, the severity of the conflict between unnamed Tutsi factions is characterized as “bombings and assassinations.”
group disputes among the Tutsi elite were a fairly common occurrence in the decades after independence. 284

Table 5.4 provides data on intra-group conflicts in Rwanda. The MAR data indicate that, since independence, factional disputes have existed between Hutu “extremists and moderates”; from 1990 until 1993 between Hutu “elites and others.” Although the conflict between “elites and others” is catalogued by MAR as involving episodes of sporadic violence, very little information is given regarding the severity of the conflict between the former set of Hutu factions. 285

In terms of inter-group conflict, the MAR index NOCOMCON specifies that from 1965 until 1989 collective violence between communal groups took place in both countries. 286 For the period after 1989 the MAR composite index COMCO provides a somewhat different picture. 287 According to the COMCO index, between 1990 and 1993 the Hutu-Tutsi conflict in Rwanda involved episodes of communal rioting (see Table 5.6). 288 In the case of Burundi, however, the COMCO index indicates that no inter-group conflict was manifest between 1990 and 1992 (see Table 5.5). 289 As demonstrated below, this finding is in direct opposition to what the qualitative data—and additional MAR data—suggest.

In order to attain a fuller picture of the type of inter-group conflict that prevailed in both countries, this study considered data from two additional MAR indices: the PROT index which measures
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284 Additionally, the only intra-group conflict listed for the Hutu in Burundi is a conflict between two Hutu factions—the Parti Libération du Peuple Hutu (“PALIPEHUTU”) and the Conseil National pour la Défense de Démocratie (or “CNDD”). The MAR database depicts this struggle as having existed since 1965 when in fact it did not begin until the latter part of the 1990’s (Banks et. al. 1999: 170-172). To be fair, this factional dispute has only been included in the MAR database since the 1999 update. However, this still does not explain why it is depicted by MAR as being a 30 year old conflict.

285 Similar to the MAR data on intra-communal conflicts in Burundi, the data for Rwanda are also somewhat ambiguous. For example, the nature of the conflict between Hutu “elites and others” is catalogued by MAR as a regional dispute that has been in existence since 1990. However, according to the historical evidence presented in many of the qualitative studies referenced in this chapter, the conflict between the southern, central and northern Hutu originated at or around the time of independence.

286 Because the NOCOMCON index only codes for the presence or absence of inter-group conflict and not the severity or the nature of the conflict, it was not especially useful to this study and is not included with the other data.

287 Unfortunately data were not available for the Communal Conflict Index (“COMCON”), which measures inter-group conflict by decade for the period 1940 to 1999.

288 Although data for 1994 are not included in Table 5.6 it is worth mentioning that, for that year, the conflict between both groups is characterized by MAR as communal warfare.

289 Although for the year 1993 the Tutsi are coded as having engaged in communal rioting, no acts of
group protest activity from 1985 onward, and the REB index which measures activities associated with anti-regime rebellion for the same period.

In the case of Burundi, the data in Table 5.7 indicate that the level of protest initiated by the Hutu against two consecutive Tutsi regimes—the Bagaza and Buyoya regimes—escalated over the years from verbal opposition to small demonstrations. In the case of Rwanda, the MAR data listed in Table 5.8 indicate that the Tutsi engaged in protest activity only in the years 1991 and 1992.

However, both countries were very similar in terms of the occurrence of anti-regime activity. The data provided in Table 5.8 indicate that from 1985 until 1993 anti-regime activities conducted by the Tutsi in Rwanda ranged from small-scale to large-scale guerilla warfare. Table 5.7 indicates that from 1988 until 1992 the type of anti-regime activity most frequently perpetrated by the Hutu of Burundi involved local rebellion and small to intermediate-scale guerilla warfare.

In light of the limitations associated with the MAR data, this study turned to a variety of qualitative resources for additional information on the history of communal and factional conflict in both countries. All of the data obtained from these sources are included in Tables 5.1 and 5.2. Although data for 1993 are not included in Table 5.7, it is worth noting that MAR categorizes Hutu protest activity for that year as “symbolic resistance.” According to MAR, “symbolic resistance” includes activities such as sit-ins, sabotage, and “political organizing activity on a substantial scale” (MAR 2005: 88-89). In the case of the Tutsi, no protest activities are listed for the entire period examined. However, for the year 1993, the data indicate that “medium demonstrations” were conducted by Tutsi. “Medium demonstrations” are defined by MAR as demonstrations that involve less than 100,000 people (2005: 89). During this time period, Tutsi protest activity amounted to small political demonstrations. MAR defines “small demonstrations” as demonstrations that involve less than 10,000 people (MAR 2005: 89). It is somewhat odd that the MAR data indicate that the Hutu did not engage in any protest activities between 1991 and 1993 (see Table 5.8).

In 1994 MAR categorizes Tutsi anti-regime activity as civil war. With the exception of 1994, there are no anti-regime activities listed for the Hutu. However, for 1994, the Hutu are coded as having been involved in terrorist activities.

The type of rebellious activity engaged in by the Tutsi in 1993 is recorded as having been “political banditry and sporadic terrorism.” These qualitative sources include reports from human rights organizations and the United States Department of State, scholarly articles and books written by experts on both countries, and news reports obtained from the Lexis-Nexis database.

This study readily admits to the fact that not every episode of violence that occurred in both countries during the late 1980s and early 1990s are included in Tables 5.1 and 5.2. Much of this stems from the fact that violence had become so widespread and commonplace in both countries during this period that not all instances of murder, rape, arson etc. could have possibly been recorded. Nevertheless, this dissertation contends that the data compiled in Tables 5.1 and 5.2 are an accurate reflection of the extent and severity of the collective violence that
As the data demonstrate, the patterns of inter- and intra-group violence that occurred in both countries since the late 19th century are remarkably similar, with some variation. In both counties conflicts among royal factions were commonplace in the period prior to independence, although the discord that prevailed among the ganwa in Burundi far outlasted any of the factional disputes between members of the Tutsi monarchy in Rwanda. Until the monarchy was overthrown in 1966, the clash between the Bezi and Batare ganwa factions in Burundi strongly influenced the direction of politics in the country. According to scholars who have studied both countries, it was not until the assassination of Prime Minister Prince Louis Rwagasore and the revolution in neighboring Rwanda, that the conflict in Burundi evolved into an inter-communal battle between Hutu and Tutsi.

In contrast, since the Tutsi monarchy in Rwanda consolidated its control over the independent chiefdoms, the groups in contention have been the Tutsi and Hutu. For reasons made clear in Chapters 6 and 7, during the revolutionary period the Hutu elite drastically altered the balance of power in the country by replacing the existing political system with one under complete Hutu control. The Hutu Revolution also ushered in a period of violence in which tens of thousands of Tutsi were either killed or displaced.

In Burundi, a similar revolution did not occur. Although a coup d’état was attempted by members of the Hutu elite in October 1965, the actual overthrow of the ganwa monarchy did not take occurred in each country for the time period in question.

296 In Burundi the ganwa royal class was a group that was socially distinct from both Hutu and Tutsi. As discussed in greater detail in Chapters 6 and 7, the existence of a ganwa class is one of a number of characteristics that distinguishes the traditional political system in Burundi from that which existed in Rwanda (for further discussion regarding the origins of the Bega-Banyiginya royal dispute in Rwanda, see Lemarchand 1970: 58-60 and C. Newbury 1988; for information on the Bezi-Batare conflict in Burundi, see Lemarchand 1970: 21-23; 301-323; 1994a: chap. 3).

297 By the late 1950’s and early 1960’s, the ongoing feud for power between the Bezi and Batare had transformed itself into a political contest between two parties—the Parti de l’Unité et du Progrès National (“UPRONA”) and the Parti Démocrate Chrétien (“PDC”), respectively (see Chapter 7 of this dissertation).

298 According to Lemarchand (1970), due to the charisma and leadership abilities of Prince Rwagasore his death dealt an especially harsh blow to the fate of the broad-based UPRONA and to Hutu-Tutsi relations as a whole (338-342, 350-353; see also 1994a: 53-57).

299 There are two points that are important to acknowledge with regard to the revolution and the violence that followed in its wake. Firstly, although the “Hutu Social Revolution” originated in 1959, the actual deposition of the Tutsi monarch was not achieved until January 1961. Secondly, a great deal of the violence perpetrated by Hutu government forces against the Tutsi in Rwanda was a response to the Tutsi rebel invasions that occurred between
place until November 1966. This is not to say of course that inter-group violence did not occur during these years. In the wake of the abortive October coup Hutu were purged from the government and military and thousands more were killed by the Tutsi-led army.\(^{300}\) Ironically, despite guaranteeing the survival of the crown, the military quickly emerged as the chief contender for political power in Burundi.\(^{301}\)

Regardless of the difference in timing, the revolutions in both countries produced very similar governing systems. In each case, the government that emerged was one in which authority was vested almost entirely in the hands of a single group.\(^{302}\) However, it must be stated that in neither country was the ruling group monolithic. Instead, the post-independence governments of Rwanda and Burundi can be characterized as systems in which various factions continually “[struggled] for control over the party, the army, the government, the civil service, and parastatals” (Lemarchand 1994a: 77). In both cases, these intra-group struggles frequently culminated in coups d’état.

However, compared to Rwanda, in the three decades after independence, Burundi experienced a far greater number of coups d’état perpetrated by factions of its ruling elite.\(^{303}\) Between May 1967 and October 1993, there were at least eight coups (attempted and successful) or coup plots, most of which led
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\(^{1961}\) and 1966 (on this latter point, see Lemarchand 1970: chap. 7).

\(^{300}\) The violence in the country lasted until July 1966 at which time the military assumed partial control over the political system.

\(^{301}\) Over the course of the subsequent year, the Tutsi military and bureaucratic elite consolidated their grip over the political system and eventually achieved complete control of the government on 28 November 1966. According to Lemarchand, the Tutsi-led military had initially supported the ganwa monarchy against the Hutu conspirators out of a desire to maintain stability in the country. Once the monarchy began to usurp greater power from the civilian-military government, however, the army was forced to bring the Mwami’s rule to an end (for a more complete discussion concerning the circumstances surrounding the establishment of the First Republic in Burundi, see Chapter 7 and Lemarchand 1970: chap. 16).

\(^{302}\) However, as discussed in Chapter 7, an important distinction between Rwanda and Burundi rests with the fact that, until 1972, the Hutu in Burundi were not entirely disenfranchised. Additionally, in the decades that followed the partial genocide, the Hutu were allowed once again to participate in government.

\(^{303}\) The patterns of political conflict that prevailed in Burundi during the First through Third Republics were in many ways similar to those which existed under the previous monarchical system of government (Lemarchand 1970; 1994a). Whereas the major groups in contention during the reign of the various mwami were the ganwa factions, after the overthrow of the monarchy, the major groups in contention became Tutsi factions from the provinces of Bururi and Muramvya, and Tutsi of Hima and Banyaruguru social descent (for more information on the distinction between Hima and Banyaruguru, see Chapter 6).
to purges of the offending faction from the government and military. In the case of Rwanda, approximately three coups were initiated by members of the Hutu elite.\(^{304}\)

On the other hand, the same data also indicate that periods of institutional change in Rwanda have been met with a greater *frequency* of inter- and intra-group violence compared to Burundi. Excluding the genocide that began in April 1994, the civil war and the democratization process in Rwanda led to the deaths of thousands of Tutsi and an untold number of Hutu.\(^{305}\) Similar conditions existed in the country in the years during and after the Hutu revolution. From November 1959 until July 1966, at least 20,000 Tutsi were killed by government forces and Hutu civilians (see Table 5.2).

Although fewer in number the conflicts between the Hutu and the government of Burundi have been no less severe in scope. Between 2,500 and 5,000 Hutu were massacred by the Tutsi army in response to the abortive 1965 coup d’état and an additional 5,000 to 10,000 more were killed in August 1988.\(^{306}\) These numbers, however, pale in comparison to the number killed in the wake of the Hutu uprisings that occurred in April 1972. In response to the deaths of approximately 2,000 Tutsi civilians, the Tutsi military perpetrated a mass slaughter of all Hutu who were believed to be associated with the
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\(^{304}\) This number includes the April 1994 coup d’état which led to the establishment of an interim government comprised of Hutu extremists. Similar to Burundi, the factional disputes between the Hutu elite were also ethno-regional in character. The ongoing struggle for power between the northern Hutu and Hutu from the southern and central regions led to the bloodless overthrow of President Grégoire Kayibanda by Maj.-Gen. Juvenal Habyarimana in 1973. Over the next two decades, the northern Hutu ruled as the dominant force in the country (for more information, see Chapter 6).

One additional note: coups d’état resulting from *inter*-group disputes were also more frequent in Burundi than in Rwanda. In the period between independence and the 1993 assassination of the Hutu president, there were at least six coups or coup plots initiated by members of the “ethnic” opposition. Five of these coups or attempted coups were perpetrated against the *ganwa* monarchy by either the Hutu or the Tutsi-led army. By way of contrast, the only coup attempt made by an opposing communal group in Rwanda was made by the Hutu revolutionaries during the period 1959 to 1961.

\(^{305}\) The greater frequency of violent events that occurred in Rwanda after the legalization of multiparty politics and before the April 1994 genocide would appear to render some support to the findings made by Harff (1998) and Davies et al. (1998) (see above). At the same time, it is difficult to accept the notion that the violence which occurred in Burundi during this same time period was somehow *less* significant.

\(^{306}\) Amnesty International estimates that the total number killed in the 1988 massacres (Hutu and Tutsi) is approximately 20,000 (Amnesty International Oct.1988; see also Reyntjens 1995: 9, 29 at ff. 7). The massacres in 1988 were conducted by the military in response to the murder of hundreds of Tutsi by Hutu civilians in the Ntega and Marangara communes. Between 500 and 1,000 Hutu were also killed by the military in 1991 in response to an outbreak of violent attacks perpetrated by members of PALIPEHUTU in Bujumbura and other provinces (for a full discussion of the circumstances that surrounded the 1988 and 1991 massacres, see Lemarchand 1994a: chap.7; also 152-159; for more information regarding the government’s response to the 1965 coup d’état, see Lemarchand 1970: 416-422; 1994a: 70-74).
Hutu rebels. Included among those targeted were politicians, priests and the educated. All told, it is estimated that over 100,000 Hutu were killed by the Micombero regime in the three-month period between April and August 1972 (Lemarchand 1994a: chap 5; also Melady 1974).

The qualitative data on group conflict pose certain problems for both of the conflict hypotheses discussed above. If a culture of impunity does contribute to total genocide, it is difficult to explain why the Tutsi military in Burundi—as a “repeat offender” of this worst sort—did not perpetrate genocide after political stability in the country began to deteriorate in 1993. This finding is especially problematic given the fact that neither the military nor the government of Burundi was ever brought to task for its past abuses. None of the structural studies written on the genocide in Rwanda address this particular anomaly.

Additionally, the qualitative data demonstrate that episodes of violent conflict in one country have not always produced similar levels of violence in the neighboring country. All of the above-mentioned scholars would agree that the 1972 genocide of the Hutu intelligentsia in Burundi was an event of significant proportions for the Hutu as a group. The genocide did not, however, prompt the government of Rwanda to take similar measures against the country’s Tutsi population. Likewise the massacre of Tutsi which took place in Rwanda in December 1963 did not induce the Tutsi military in Burundi to begin indiscriminately attacking Hutu civilians.

A more general criticism that can be made against arguments that emphasize a casual connection between past and future violence is that they are essentially tautological and explain little about the actual origins of violent behavior. As indicated previously, most of the structural studies discussed in the current section suggest that inter- and intra-group violence create further violence by negatively influencing group perceptions of “the other.” However, none of these studies provides any in-depth
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307 Additionally, the former *Mwami* of Burundi—Ntare III—was murdered by Tutsi officials. The rationale for this execution was the belief that Ntare was plotting to regain control of government with the aid of European mercenaries (see Lemarchand 1994a: 91-93).

308 In response to the genocide in Burundi, the most the Kayibanda government did was to ensure that the country’s ethnic quotas were tightly upheld. Although some violence against Tutsi did occur, very few were killed (see Table 5.1).
analysis of the ways in which this particular process occurs. Instead, the authors of these studies tend to rely more on anecdotal evidence to support their arguments.

Demographic Stress

The third control variable this study examines is demographic stress. Arguments that consider the population density of Rwanda to have been a factor in the genocide all share a basic assumption that environmental or resource scarcity plays a role in the occurrence of collective violence. As mentioned in Chapter 2, where many of these theories differ is over whether the link between scarcity and group violence is assumed to be direct or indirect.309

Uvin (1998) suggests that most of the scholars who have written on the relationship between resource scarcity and the genocide in Rwanda contend that the link between the two was indirect. In their 1995 study Percival and Homer-Dixon, for example, suggest that resource scarcity played a significant, albeit limited, role in the 1994 genocide.310 The authors state that in this particular instance:

Environmental scarcities, particularly as they affected food production...increased grievances within the Rwanda rural population and generally weakened the legitimacy of the regime. Scarcities limited the opportunities for wealth creation and for achieving economic and social status within Rwandan society. (1995: 10)311

In order to assess the reliability of the resource scarcity arguments, this study considered data on population density and food production from the World Bank and the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations.
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309 Those theories that posit a direct relationship between environmental scarcity and the occurrence of group violence generally assume that the latter is a natural outcome of the former. On the other hand, studies that posit an indirect relationship between scarcity and violence contend that there are certain elements that mediate the impact that population growth has on communal discord (for a fuller discussion of these theories, see Uvin 1998: 180-183).

310 They contend that it was the political insecurity of the Hutu incumbent elite that had the greater impact on the occurrence of genocide in Rwanda (for more on this point, see also Uvin 1996a).

311 According to the authors, there are three types of “environmental scarcity”: demand-induced, supply-induced and structural scarcity. The first stems from population growth, the second from a degradation of resources and the latter from an unequal distribution of the former two. According to the authors, all three types of scarcity were present in Rwanda, as were three of the four types of social effects produced by environmental scarcity: increases in population displacement, losses of production potential in agriculture, and “the disruption of legitimized and authoritative institutions and social relations” (1995: 3).
As the data in Table 5.9 demonstrate, Rwanda and Burundi have both experienced a steady increase in population density since the early 1980s.\textsuperscript{312} Between 1980 and 1992 population density in Burundi grew at an average annual rate of three percent. In Rwanda, over a similar period, population density increased at an almost identical rate.\textsuperscript{313}

The data in Table 5.10 indicate that over this same time period both countries also experienced a drastic shortage of arable land.\textsuperscript{314} The amount of arable land per person steadily decreased over time in both countries with few exceptions. From 1980 to 1992, the population density per hectare of arable land in Burundi increased by an average of three percent per annum; for Rwanda this figure was two percent.\textsuperscript{315} For countries that have historically been heavily dependent on agriculture for their economic survival, a lack of arable land can have disastrous consequences (see below).\textsuperscript{316}

By the mid to late 1980’s, food production in both countries stagnated with each experiencing food shortages at varying periods of time (see Table 5.11). This was a problem that was especially severe in Rwanda, which faced famine in its southern regions in 1989 and 1990.\textsuperscript{317} The food shortages in Rwanda are reflected in the dramatic increase in food aid received by the country since the early 1970’s. As shown in Table 5.12, in cereals alone, aid was increased from 6,367 metric tons in the period 1969 to 1971 to 21,145 metric tons between 1990 and 1992. Although the data demonstrate that Rwanda was the

\textsuperscript{312} In an effort to save space, data for the period 1961 to 1979 were excluded from Tables 5.9 through 5.10. However, it is worth mentioning that population density increased at a similar rate per annum for both countries during this period.

\textsuperscript{313} However, over this same period, the average population density in Rwanda was substantially higher than in Burundi (257 persons per sq. km compared 191 persons per sq. km).

\textsuperscript{314} To get a better picture of the level of resource scarcity present in Rwanda and Burundi, the current study followed Uvin’s (1998: 185) suggestion and utilized population density per hectare of arable land as a measure of scarcity instead of simply hectares of arable land.

\textsuperscript{315} Similar to population density, average population density per hectare of arable land was much higher in Rwanda than in Burundi. From 1980 to 1993, the average number of persons per hectare of land in Rwanda was seven; Burundi averaged out at five persons per hectare of arable land.

One of the many factors that added to the lack of land availability in Rwanda was the fact that large portions of arable land were confiscated for development projects and/or were purchased by the small percentage of wealthy elite who ruled the country. According Uvin (1998: 112-115), the rise in landlessness and wealth inequality that resulted contributed to an increase in frustration and resentment on the part of the rural poor (see also Des Forges 1999: 46).

\textsuperscript{316} Additional factors that further contributed to this problem included soil degradation and erosion stemming from land overuse (Clay et al. 1995; Uvin 1998).

\textsuperscript{317} The famine in southern Rwanda occurred largely as a result of poor weather conditions which impacted
recipient of greater amounts of food aid than Burundi, between 1980 and 1992, the average level of food production in Burundi was lower compared to Rwanda.\textsuperscript{318}

Accompanying these declines in food production were drastic fluctuations in food prices. In 1989, the rate of inflation for food prices in Burundi jumped from seven and a half to 18\% before dropping substantially in the years immediately prior to the Ndadaye assassination. In Rwanda, in the year before the genocide, the annual rate of inflation for food prices was as high as 22\%. The data in Table 5.11 indicate that between 1982 and 1993 inflation averaged over nine and a half percent in Rwanda; in Burundi between 1981 and 1992 the average rate of inflation for food prices was six and a half percent.

Taken at face value, the data for Rwanda may provide some support for a “hard” Malthusian argument. However, the fact that violence directed towards the Tutsi also occurred during periods in which the country was experiencing increases in food production creates difficulty for any attempt to directly link resource scarcity and collective violence.\textsuperscript{319} Absent a consideration of political and cultural factors, determinist arguments such as these cannot explain why excessive violence occurred in both countries during relatively “good” times, or why a total genocide did not occur even earlier in Rwanda when the country was going through an especially difficult period.\textsuperscript{320}

Although “soft” Malthusian arguments do address the relationship between ecological scarcity, social and political processes, and the occurrence of genocide, they fail to clearly explain the causal

\footnotesize{the production of several of the country’s main food staples, including the haricot bean, cassava and sweet potatoes (\textit{EIU} No. 4 1989: 22, Nos. 1 2).

\textsuperscript{318} For the period 1980 to 1992, the average food production index score for Burundi is 91.5; for Rwanda 96.1. It is important to recognize that food production in Rwanda dropped substantially in 1993. The food production index score for that year is 82.7. However, averaging this figure in with the other scores, the average food production index score for Rwanda is still higher compared to Burundi (95 compared to 91.5).

\textsuperscript{319} This is a point that has been stressed by Uvin. The episodes of violence that occurred in Rwanda between 1959 and 1963 and in 1973 occurred during periods in which more land was available for farming and there were no famines (1998: 197). Also, an argument of this nature cannot explain why the military in Burundi massacred Hutu civilians in 1988 and 1991 when food production was higher relative to other years.

\textsuperscript{320} As discussed in greater detail below in relation to the variable \textit{economic health}, the civil war in Rwanda produced economic stagnation and severe food shortages. One of the major causes of the drop in food production in the early 1990s in Rwanda was the military advances made by the RPF into the northern regions of the country. Many of the productive farms located in the territory gained by the rebel army were abandoned as Hutu fled the area (for further discussion, see African Rights 1995: 21-22 and Uvin 1996a: 14; 1998: 199).}
processes by which these elements are linked. For example, a soft Malthusian argument cannot explain how the insecurity of the Hutu ruling elite—in conjunction with ecological scarcity—transformed itself into a desire to completely annihilate a substantial segment of the country’s population. This metamorphosis is especially difficult to comprehend in light of the negative consequences associated with the Habyarimana government’s continued efforts to obstruct implementation of the joint-rule government.  

Another problem shared by both types of arguments is their assumption that contests over material resources always take on a zero-sum quality. As Percival and Homer-Dixon state:

Under situations of environmental scarcity, where group affiliation aids survival, intergroup competition on the basis of relative gains is likely to increase. As different ethnic and cultural groups are propelled together under circumstances of deprivation and stress, we should expect inter-group hostilities, in which a group would emphasize its own identity while denigrating, discriminating against, and attacking outsiders. (1995: 3)

In the case of Rwanda, it is assumed that this contest for survival was between Hutu and Tutsi. However, this does not explain why Hutu were also among those murdered in the genocide.

Additionally, although scholars such as André and Platteau (1995) point to evidence which suggests that at least some Hutu were murdered by “opportunists” for their land, this does not explain why these murders did not occur on a larger scale. On a similar note, if one accepts the suggestion made by hard and soft Malthusian arguments that the Tutsi were targeted for annihilation based in whole or in part on a competition for scarce resources, this cannot account for why the wealthy, corrupt Hutu evolués were not also primary targets for destruction. As Uvin states:

One can easily imagine the poor people’s anger turned against the dignitaries of the regime; the dignitaries were, after all, the ones whose policies contributed to the crises and who were visibly enriching themselves and buying up land. (1998: 200)

---

321 As discussed in greater detail below, much of this problem stems from the fact that resource scarcity studies make the assumption—either implicitly or explicitly—that actors behave as rational decision-makers. Similar to other rational choice explanations of the Rwandan genocide, the risks associated with a decision to commit total genocide are not adequately addressed.

322 This is a problem also encountered by a third group of arguments which Uvin refers to as “anti-Malthusian.” Anti-Malthusian arguments suggest that political and social factors were the sole causes of the genocide in Rwanda, not resource scarcity (Uvin 1998: 183-184).

323 Instead, Uvin contends that who was and was not made a target for murder had more to do with the conditions of structural violence that prevailed in the country at the time. Structural violence” is analogous to Kuper’s concept of the “pluralized society” (see above). According to Uvin, structural violence is manifest in “a
On a related note, in his analysis Verwimp (2000) argues that the problems associated with population growth in Rwanda were not a factor of major importance to President Habyarimana, despite all of his declarations to the contrary. No viable population control policies were ever initiated by the government (24-25; see also Prunier 1995: 88-89 and African Rights 1995: 16-17). Instead, Verwimp suggests that Habyarimana actually desired an increase in the Hutu population to increase the country’s ability to attain greater economic self-sufficiency.\footnote{The particular development philosophy followed by the Habyarimana regime stressed the productive value of the Hutu peasant and the importance of agriculture as means of achieving self-sufficiency, as well as wealth for the country. The fact that many of the policies pursued by Habyarimana were actually harmful to the country’s economic development has led scholars such as Verwimp to conclude that the real purpose behind these policies was not economic growth, but control of the population (2000: 19-22; see also Prunier 1995: 76-77 and Uvin 1998: 23-26). A similar argument has been applied to the economic policies pursued by Jean-Baptiste Bagaza, president of the Second Republic of Burundi (see Lemarchand 1994a: 109-110).} Much of his talk regarding the dangers of overpopulation had more to with preventing the return of Tutsi refugees to the country (see 2000: 24-26, African rights 1995: 16-17).

**Economic Health**

Closely associated with resource scarcity hypotheses is the suggestion that the period of economic decline experienced by Rwanda was a major contributory factor to the total genocide that occurred in 1994. Studies by Prunier (1995), Des Forges (1999), African Rights (1995), and Scherrer (2002) among others contend that the economic crisis and stagnation that began in Rwanda during the mid- to late-1980s contributed to the occurrence of genocide by exacerbating group tensions and by increasing the insecurity of the Hutu incumbent elite. Similar to the other structural factors discussed previously in this chapter, the largest problem economic arguments encounter rests with the fact that very similar economic conditions prevailed in Burundi during this same period of time; in many ways these conditions were worse relative to those in Rwanda.
As previously indicated, Rwanda and Burundi are heavily dependent on agriculture as a primary source of revenue. However, between 1980 and 1992, agriculture constituted a greater share of Burundi’s gross domestic product. According to data obtained from the World Bank, agricultural production accounted for an average of 57% of the GDP of Burundi during this period—compared to only 38% for Rwanda (see Table 5.13). The economy of Burundi was also not as diversified; together services, manufacturing, and industry accounted for a far lower percentage of the country’s GDP relative to the economy of Rwanda (see Table 5.14).

Regardless of any attempts to diversify their economies, for both countries, coffee has long-been the major product for export. Prior to the collapse of the International Coffee Agreement on 3 July 1989, coffee brought in 85% of Burundi’s export earnings; in Rwanda, coffee was responsible for 75% of the country’s total export earnings (EIU No. 4 1990: 28-29, 32).

A heavy reliance on one agricultural product for export has traditionally left both countries extremely vulnerable to factors such as inclement weather, land overuse, crop disease, and external shocks to the market. Given these particular circumstances, it is understandable that, when the price of coffee finally collapsed in 1989, the economies of Rwanda and Burundi were hit especially hard.

The collapse of the coffee market contributed to balance of payments difficulties for both countries, although Burundi’s trade imbalance surpassed that of Rwanda. Between 1989 and 1992, the negative balance of goods and services as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product for Burundi increased

---

325 In both countries well over 90% of the population is either engaged in the business of agriculture or farms for subsistence purposes (Banks et al 1999: 166, 822).
326 The data in Table 5.14 demonstrate that, between 1980 and 1992, services accounted for an average of 27% of Burundi’s GDP, industry 16% and manufacturing 10%. By way of contrast, the service and industrial sectors in Rwanda averaged 41% and 20% of the country’s GDP, respectively; manufacturing accounted for 13.8%. Given the relatively low level of industrial development present in each country, it is no surprise that neither was an especially attractive candidate for foreign direct investment (see Tables 5.17 and 5.18 below).
327 As demonstrated in Tables 5.15 and 5.16 (see below) from 1980 until 1992 in Burundi and 1980 to 1993 in Rwanda, the average amount of coffee exported per year was 31,429 and 33,927 metric tons, respectively. In some years, due to unfavorable weather conditions and crop disease, the amount exported included the amount of coffee produced plus what was held in reserve (see Food and Agricultural Organization, “Food Balance Sheets: Burundi and Rwanda” 1980-1992).
328 Although efforts were made by both to increase the production of tea and other products for export during this period, the earnings from these products were not enough to compensate for the losses in earnings from coffee exports (for further information regarding the negative effects associated with the collapse of the coffee
from -13.2% to -20.1%. Conditions in Rwanda over this same period were only slightly more favorable (see Tables 5.17 and 5.18).\footnote{Between 1989 and 1993, Rwanda’s external balance on goods and services increased from -11.1\% to -15.3\% (see Table 5.18).}

For this same time period, however, the data also indicate that the rise in inflation and the decline in GDP experienced by Rwanda were actually worse compared to Burundi. For the year 1991 alone, inflation on consumer prices was as high as 19\%; the annual rate of GDP growth declined from zero in 1989 to negative eight percent in 1993.\footnote{In the case of Burundi, the average rate of inflation for consumer goods between 1989 and 1992 averaged at just over seven percent. During this period, Burundi experienced an average GDP growth rate of two and a half percent (see Table 5.17).}

Due to a substantial decline in export earnings both countries came to increasingly rely on foreign aid as a source of revenue. Tables 5.19 and 5.20 provide data on the level of external debt for both countries. By 1993 Rwanda owed 909 million (in U.S. dollars) to foreign creditors; by 1992 Burundi was responsible for over one billion dollars in foreign debt.\footnote{The total debt service calculated as a percentage of goods and services was also higher in Burundi than in Rwanda. The bulk of the foreign debt owed by both countries during this time period was owed to multilateral donors such as the International Development Association.}

A large part of the increase in Rwanda’s external debt load has been attributed to the civil war that began in 1990 (Prunier 1995: 159-160, Uvin 1998: 57). Military spending increased substantially from one and a half percent of the country’s GDP in 1988, to four and a half percent in 1993 (see Table 5.22 below).\footnote{The amount of debt owed by the central government of Burundi reached as high as 104\% of the country’s GDP in 1992 (see Table 5.19).}

By comparison, in neighboring Burundi, military spending consistently averaged at almost three and a half percent of the country’s GDP.\footnote{Table 5.22 also demonstrates that military spending as a percentage of total government expenditures in Rwanda rose from almost nine percent in 1989 to almost 19\% in 1993.}
On a related note, the civil war in Rwanda proved to be quite damaging to the economies of both countries. The war contributed to a rise in inflation in Rwanda, a decline in the production of commodities for export, and a collapse of the country’s tourism industry (EIU Nos. 2-3, 1991, Nos. 1-4, 1992; African Rights 1995: 21-22; Uvin 1996a: 14, 1998: 54-57, and Prunier 1995: 159-160). In Burundi, the Rwandan civil war increased prices on the transportation of goods for exportation and importation by blocking existing trade routes through Uganda and Rwanda.

Studies of Rwanda argue that the country’s reliance on foreign aid acted to further decrease the stability of the Habyarimana government. According to authors such as Prunier (1995), greater access to foreign aid fueled an increase in factional disputes among the Hutu elite. More specifically, “the various gentlemen’s agreements which had existed between the competing clans since the end of the Kayibanda regime started to melt down as the resources shrunk and internal power struggles intensified” (1995: 84).

The misuse of foreign development aid by public officials and the government’s general mismanagement of the economy also contributed towards a decline in the level of public support for Habyarimana and an increase in the demands made for reform. At a time of economic crisis in which income inequality was increasing and food production stagnating, scandals associated with the

---

335 According to data from the World Bank, in 1990 tourism accounted for seven percent of total export earnings for Rwanda; by 1991 this number decreased to three percent (see World Development Indicators 2006, CD-ROM).

336 More specifically, the civil war in Rwanda blocked Burundi’s main northern trade route. This forced trucks from Burundi to reroute through Tanzania. The lengthier route required additional fuel which, at higher prices, caused transportation costs to escalate dramatically (EIU Nos. 1-3, 1991).

337 These factional disputes, which were namely between Hutu leaders from the two northern préfectures of Gisenyi and Ruhengeri, were by no means civil. For instance, Prunier attributes the April 1988 murder of Colonel Stanislas Mayuya to the competition between Hutu clans over control of the regime and the spoils associated with it. Mayuya, who was rumored to have been Habyarimana’s choice for successor, was murdered by a member of the akazu. The akazu (or “little house”) was the ruling clique made up of members of the family of Habyarimana’s wife and other close associates (1995: 84-87; for further discussion, see African Rights 1995: 22-23).

338 The origin of much of this competition stemmed from the fact that in Rwanda, as in many other African countries, “the state was the main if not the only avenue for rapid wealth accumulation” (Uvin 1998: 21; on this point as it pertains to Rwanda, see also Des Forges 1999: 45-47).

development projects served as yet another reminder of the corruption associated with the current system of single party rule.  

By the early 1990s, access to foreign aid for both countries was made contingent on the success of their ability to successfully democratize their political institutions. During this period Rwanda and Burundi were also forced to contend with the austerity measures mandated by IMF. Among the various changes both countries instituted were devaluations of their currencies, and attempts to privatize publicly owned industries.

It is somewhat difficult to assess the full impact that Structural Adjustment Programs had on the societies and economies of both countries. On the one hand, bilateral aid to each country, and aid

---

340 One of the more widely-known scandals involved the Gebeka development project. The purpose of the Gebeka project was to clear lands in the Gishwati forest to create grazing pastures for cattle. Instead of benefiting the dairy industry in Rwanda, however, the profits from this venture were shared among members of the Habyarimana regime and “crooked World Bank expatriates” (Prunier 1995: 88).

341 Threats to cut off aid were frequently voiced by donor countries and financial institutions in response to the human rights violations perpetrated by both countries in the late 1980s and early 1990’s. However, the fact that aid levels for each country stayed primarily the same is an indicator that the conditions placed on foreign aid were not entirely inflexible. Uvin (1998) discusses this at great length in his study of the Rwandan genocide. According to the author, the international donor community was largely unphased by the violence that occurred in Rwanda between 1990 and 1994 (90-91). There were some exceptions to this however. In 1993, for instance, in response to the publication of reports which documented the occurrence of substantial human rights abuses in Rwanda, the World Bank completely cut off aid to the country (Uvin 1998: 90-92). At the same time, very little changed in the government’s behavior as a result of these actions (on this point, see also Des Forges 1999: 17 and African Rights 1995).

342 In the case of Burundi, a five-year SAP was begun in 1986; in Rwanda, a three-year SAP was agreed on in November 1990 and signed in 1991 (Uvin 1998: 57).


344 Some studies indicate that there were job losses associated with the privatizations of parastatals, as well as increases in the prices of consumer goods due to the numerous currency devaluations (Uvin 1998: 58). Additionally, measures like the “national solidarity tax” in Rwanda were no doubt felt by the public. Announced on 25 April 1991, the solidarity tax was an eight percent tax on the monthly net earnings of all private and public employees (EIU Nos. 1 and 2, 1991).
granted in the form of Structural Adjustment Loans ("SALs") increased. On the other hand, it does not appear to be the case that either government drastically reduced its level of expenditures. In some areas the amount of money spent by the governments of Rwanda and Burundi actually increased after the SAPs were implemented. Much of this stemmed from the ongoing communal conflicts that were occurring in both countries during this time, and the fact that government resources had long been used as a form of political patronage in each.

As previously discussed, the civil war in Rwanda led to a substantial increase in the size of the country’s armed forces. Where it had once constituted only two percent of the country’s total workforce, by 1993 the army made up almost eight percent of the workforce of Rwanda. As a point of comparison, between 1989 and 1992, the size of the military in Burundi remained at a steady four percent of the country’s workforce (see Tables 5.21 and 5.22).

Lastly, it must be stated that the amount of money spent by the governments of Rwanda and Burundi had little impact on either country’s level of development. By the early 1990s, both countries remained extremely poor and underdeveloped. Much of the data provided in Tables 5.23 through 5.30

---

At the same time others suggest that the SAP made at best only a small dent in the amount of money spent by the Habyarimana government. Most of the measures mandated by the agreement were never implemented (Uvin 1998: 57-59).

SALs consist largely of program aid, which is aid “given without a specific purpose (unlike more ordinary project aid, which is donated for specific inputs in a previously agreed-on project),” (Uvin 1998: 87; also 93-94). SALs are intended to help a country better adjust to the negative effects associated with austerity measures.

In terms of education, for example, the data presented in Table 5.25 indicate that, between 1986 and 1992, the amount of money spent by the government of Burundi on education actually increased in certain years (with the exception of 1992). Unfortunately there are no data available on education expenditures in Rwanda for the period 1990 to 1993. However, it is somewhat telling that the amount of money spent by the Habyarimana government on wages and salaries did not change substantially between 1989 and 1992 (see Table 5.26).

With regards to healthcare, the data in Tables 5.29 and 5.30 demonstrate that both countries devoted only a small percentage of their GDPs to healthcare services. In Rwanda, from 1990 to 1993, the government spent an average of 0.6 percent of its GDP on healthcare; in Burundi the average percentage spent between 1990 and 1992 was 0.7. These figures can more accurately be interpreted as a reflection of the general lack of emphasis placed on public healthcare needs.

Exceptions to this are for the years 1987 and 1989 in Burundi and 1993 in Rwanda (see Tables 5.25 and 5.26).

Prunier (1995: 160) states that the “army [in Rwanda]…dwarfed all other civil service sectors and…continued to grow relentlessly.” This meant that any positive effects that a decrease in public-sector jobs would have had on the economy were cancelled out by the increase in the size of the military (on this points, see also Uvin 1998: 58 and Des Forges 1999: 122-123).

The fact that military expenditures did not decrease in Burundi after 1986 can be attributed to the position of importance traditionally held by the Tutsi-army.
fully support this assertion. Both countries had poorly developed infrastructures, high rates of adult illiteracy, infant mortality and malnutrition, and very low levels of life expectancy. A final indicator of the economic status of Rwanda and Burundi for this period of time is demonstrated by the Human Development Index (“HDI”) score for each country. In the year prior to the outbreak of major conflict in each, Rwanda was ranked as the 149th least developed country; Burundi the 142nd least developed (see Tables 5.23 and 5.24 below).

**Conclusion**

The evidence presented in this chapter demonstrates that any comparison made between structural conditions in Rwanda and those in Burundi is an “apples to apples” type of comparison. The countries have similar, if not identical, demographic structures and population densities, and both are extremely poor and underdeveloped. Both Rwanda and Burundi have endured similar patterns of group violence since independence, and each country underwent a period of economic stagnation in the 1980s and 1990s for largely the same reasons.

However, the fact that a genocide was not perpetrated by the Tutsi incumbent elite in Burundi in 1993 raises serious doubts about arguments that posit a causal relationship between structural factors and the genocide in Rwanda. What is even more problematic for many of the structural studies written on the Rwandan genocide is the fact that conditions in Burundi were worse in a number of ways compared to those in Rwanda.350

Prior to 1993, Burundi consistently had a lower GDP per capita than Rwanda, a greater level of external debt, and was frequently ranked lower in terms of overall social and economic development.351 Additionally, Burundi had experienced genocide within the first decade after independence. According to

---

350 As indicated in the above discussion, none of the structural studies offer any sort of systematic comparison between Rwanda and Burundi. At best, these analyses make only passing reference to conditions in Burundi and usually for the purpose of highlighting the impact that certain violent events in Burundi had on inter-group relations in Rwanda.

351 From 1975 until 1992 the average GDP per capita in Burundi was $ 753.16; in Rwanda between 1975 and 1993 GDP per capita averaged at $ 1,123 (see Tables 5.23 and 5.24).
the structural arguments presented in this chapter, the likelihood of total genocide occurring was greater for Burundi not Rwanda. The fact that total genocide did not take place in Burundi severely weakens the alternative structural hypothesis, and leaves institutional factors as the likelier causes of this variation in outcome.

A second major problem all structural genocide studies encounter was one first addressed in Chapter 2. It is the problem of structure and agency. Few of the structural studies can adequately explain how or why larger-scale factors impacted political actors in the various ways described. To get around this particular problem, many of these arguments fall back on the untested assumption that leaders in Rwanda behaved as rational utility maximizers in response to economic crisis, domestic violence etc.

However, if one accepts the contention that members of the Hutu incumbent elite were behaving in a strategic manner, this still does not explain why the Hutu considered total genocide to be an optimal strategy relative to other non-violent political solutions or at a minimum, lesser forms of violence. Compared to the other policy alternatives available to the Hutu at the time, the objective risks associated with genocide were far more serious in scope.

Destroying a substantial segment of the country’s population would have possibly led to the imposition of harsh sanctions by the international community. More importantly, however, the odds that genocide would reignite the civil war with the RPF were quite substantial. In her analysis, Des Forges (1999) provides evidence which strongly suggests that the chances of an RPF victory were great and this was a fact that was known to Habyarimana and his supporters at the time.

In conclusion, absent an analysis of the decision-making processes of political leaders of either country, it is extremely difficult to discern why total genocide was selected by the Hutu elite in Rwanda or why the majority of Tutsi elite in Burundi opted to follow a different policy course altogether. The fact that leaders in both countries chose differently indicates that something else—aside from a simple cost-benefit analysis—was driving the decision-making process. This is a topic this study revisits in Chapter 8.
Chapter 6 of this dissertation examines the first of the two main independent variables. The purpose of the analysis provided in Chapter 6 is to provide a partial test of this study’s main hypothesis which suggests that indigenous institutions—*not* structural conditions—had the greater impact on the type of collective violence that occurred in Rwanda and Burundi following democratization.
Table 5.1. Inter- and Intra-Communal Disputes, Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Incident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1852-1966</td>
<td>Battle between the Bezi and Batare ganwa factions for control of the government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 1900's</td>
<td>Conflict over control of the Imbo plain area (Rumonge-Nyanza-Lac area) between sons of Hutu subchief Damvia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912-1922</td>
<td>Revolt in Rubenge in response to the recent annexation of the area by the Batare. Conflict between Hutu and the Batare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Runyota-Kanyarufunzo revolt occurs in area recently brought under the control of Batare chief. Conflict between Hutu (of the Abajiji clan) and the Batare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>The Inamujandi revolt occurs in the Ndora region. The revolt, led by Hutu, is in response to the recent annexation of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Apr-60</td>
<td>Tensions break out between Bezi and Batare political factions in Ngozi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Oct-61</td>
<td>Prime Minister Louis Rwagasore (UPRONA) is assassinated by Greek gunman hired by PDC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Jan-62</td>
<td>Kamenge riots occur in Bujumbura. Hutu personalities are targeted; arson and property damage occur and at least four persons are killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Bloody scuffles are provoked by Tutsi militants affiliated the JNR. The acts of provocation are instigated against Hutu trade unionists and politicians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-1964</td>
<td>A series of violent incidents occur along the border with Rwanda. Those responsible for the violence are Tutsi refugees from Rwanda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-64</td>
<td>An abortive coup d’état is initiated by the Hutu-UPRONA faction against the pro-Tutsi Nyamoya government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Jan-65</td>
<td>Prime Minister Pierre Ngendadumwe (a Hutu) is assassinated by Tutsi from Rwanda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Oct-65</td>
<td>A coup d’état is attempted by Hutu members of the army and gendarmerie. Between 2,500 and 5,000 Hutu are killed by the army. The violence lasts until Jan-66.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Over the summer of 1966, radical members of the JRR, the UNEBA, and the FTB launch repeated attacks against supporters of the crown.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17-Jul-66 A dynastic government coup occurs. *Mwami* Mwambutsa is deposed and Ntare III assumes the crown.

11-Sep-66 Failed coup attempt is launched against *Mwami* Ntare III and his followers by radical Tutsi politicians.

28-Nov-66 *Mwami* Ntare III is formally deposed by the Tutsi army led by Capt. Michel Micombero.

5-May-67 Violent scuffles occur in Bujumbura. Left-leaning extremist Tutsi politicians are purged from the government and army.

4-Nov-67 A purge of members of the government who are Abasapfu is conducted. The reason given for the purge is a suspected coup plot.

16-Sep-69 *Mwami* Ntare III is formally deposed by the Tutsi army led by Capt. Michel Micombero.

5-May-67 Violent scuffles occur in Bujumbura. Left-leaning extremist Tutsi politicians are purged from the government and army.

4-Nov-67 A purge of members of the government who are Abasapfu is conducted. The reason given for the purge is a suspected coup plot.

16-Sep-69 *Mwami* Ntare III is formally deposed by the Tutsi army led by Capt. Michel Micombero.

5-May-67 Violent scuffles occur in Bujumbura. Left-leaning extremist Tutsi politicians are purged from the government and army.

4-Nov-67 A purge of members of the government who are Abasapfu is conducted. The reason given for the purge is a suspected coup plot.

16-Sep-69 *Mwami* Ntare III is formally deposed by the Tutsi army led by Capt. Michel Micombero.

5-May-67 Violent scuffles occur in Bujumbura. Left-leaning extremist Tutsi politicians are purged from the government and army.

4-Nov-67 A purge of members of the government who are Abasapfu is conducted. The reason given for the purge is a suspected coup plot.

16-Sep-69 *Mwami* Ntare III is formally deposed by the Tutsi army led by Capt. Michel Micombero.

5-May-67 Violent scuffles occur in Bujumbura. Left-leaning extremist Tutsi politicians are purged from the government and army.

4-Nov-67 A purge of members of the government who are Abasapfu is conducted. The reason given for the purge is a suspected coup plot.
19-Oct-91 Three die in clashes between Hutu and government forces in the province of Cibitoke, north-western Burundi.

23-Nov-91 PALIPEHUTU rebels attack the Muzinda military camp; also Bujumbura, Kayanza, Cibitoke, Bubanza and other provinces. Dozens of Tutsi are killed. Between 500 and 1,000 Hutu are killed by the military in response.

4-Mar-92 Thirty Tutsi soldiers attempt a coup d’état and are caught. No one is injured.

8-Apr-92 PALIPEHUTU rebels attack targets in Buganda, Gasenyi, Ndava, West Cibitoke, Mabaiy and Butahana, near the border with Rwanda. The government launches anti-rebel offensive and 61 are killed.

25-Apr-92 Incursions by PALIPEHUTU rebels.

14-May-92 Incursions by PALIPEHUTU rebels.

May-92 A coup d’état is attempted by Tutsi soldiers and is put down by the government.

16-Oct-92 The military allegedly kills Hutu peasants in the commune of Giharo.

4-Jun-93 Street protests launched by Tutsi begin in Bujumbura following the presidential election. Some violence occurs.

2-Jul-93 An attempted coup is launched by 40 Tutsi troops led by army officers. The coup is put down by the military.

Sep-93 Isolated killings and harassment of Tutsi occur as Hutu refugees reclaim land seized decades ago.

21-Oct-93 President Melchoir Ndadaye is assassinated along with other FRODEBU politicians. Conflict erupts between Hutu and government forces throughout the country. Between 10,000 and 150,000 are killed; 800,000 to 1 million refugees. A period of civil war begins.

Table 5.2. Inter- and Intra-Communal Disputes, Rwanda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Incident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1895-1920</td>
<td>The Bega and Banyiginya dispute begins following the death of Mwami Kigeri Rwabugiri. The number killed is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Nov-59</td>
<td>The Hutu Social Revolution begins. Violence breaks in Gitarama on 1-Nov and spreads to entire country. Hundreds of Tutsi sub-chiefs and chiefs are murdered or arrested. The violence lasts into the Summer of 1960. An estimated 10,000 Tutsi are killed; 200,000 are forced to flee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-61</td>
<td>Coup d'état of Gitarama occurs. The Tutsi monarchy is officially overthrown by the PARMEHUTU. The First Republic is declared under President Grégoire Kayibanda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-61</td>
<td>Tutsi rebels conduct raids from Uganda into Nyagarare, Rwanda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-62</td>
<td>Tutsi rebels raid communes of Mugira and Gatunda in Biumba, Rwanda. Two Hutu are killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Mar-62</td>
<td>Tutsi rebels raid the commune of Nkana in Biumba préfecture. Army reprisals indiscriminately target Tutsi for the massacre. Violence lasts until 27-Mar. Four Hutu are killed; 1,000 to 2,000 Tutsi are killed by the army.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-62</td>
<td>Tutsi rebels invade Rwanda from Zaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Violent campaign of intimidation is launched by PARMEHUTU against another Hutu party, NZERUKA (offshoot of PARMEHUTU).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Nov-63</td>
<td>Abortive raid conducted by Tutsi rebels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-63</td>
<td>Tutsi rebels raid from Congo into Cyangugu, Rwanda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Dec-63</td>
<td>Tutsi rebels invade Bugesera from Burundi. Military conducts mass reprisals against Tutsi civilians. In total an estimated 10,000-15,000 Tutsi are killed; 150,000-200,000 more flee the country. The violence lasts until Jan-64.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-64</td>
<td>Tutsi rebels conduct a series of raids into Cyangugu. The raids are launched from Zaire and last until Jul-64.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-66</td>
<td>The Tutsi rebels invade from Tanzania. They also raid two times from Burundi in Nov-66. A total of 200 persons are killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-72</td>
<td>In response to the genocide in Burundi, vigilante committees are organized to scrutinize schools, the civil service and private businesses to make sure that ethnic quotas are upheld. Tutsi are purged from government, educational institutions and businesses. A few dozen Tutsi are killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-73</td>
<td>Violence occurs between Hutu students at the National University at Butare and the government. The violence continues for several months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Jul-73</td>
<td>Kayibanda is overthrown in a bloodless coup d'état by military forces led by Maj.-Gen. Juvenal Habyarimana. Some fighting occurs between Hutu and Tutsi civilians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-80</td>
<td>A coup attempt, launched by current and former government officials, is foiled. The leader of the coup, Maj. Theonaste Lizinde, is sentenced to death. His sentence is later commuted to life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-88</td>
<td>Col. Stanislas Muyuva, possible successor to Habyarimana, is murdered by members of the akazu (“the little house”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-89</td>
<td>Editor-in-chief of the Catholic newspaper Kinyamateka, Abbé Silvio Sindambiwe, is murdered. It is possible that Sindambiwe was killed by those affiliated with the government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-90</td>
<td>Government soldiers fire into a crowd of students during a demonstration at the National University in Butare. One person is killed; five seriously injured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct-90</td>
<td>RPF invades Rwanda from Uganda; the civil war begins. The government calls a state of emergency. Eight thousand Tutsi and Hutu political opponents are arrested. Violence is perpetrated by Hutu civilians against Tutsi in the countryside. By the end of 1990, a few hundred Tutsi are killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Jan-91</td>
<td>RPF attacks and briefly captures control of Ruhengeri in northern Rwanda. Security forces and civilians perpetrate violence against Tutsi (members of the Bogogwe clan). Between 500 and 1,200 Tutsi are killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-May-91</td>
<td>Army units mutiny throughout northern Rwanda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-91</td>
<td>Hutu attack Tutsi residents in Byumba préfecture. Local government officials and security forces order and/or condone the violence. At least one person is killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Nov-91</td>
<td>Inter-party clashes in eastern Rwanda occur between the MRND(D) and the opposition parties; the MRND(D) is accused by the MDR of inciting the violence. Nine people are killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Jan-92</td>
<td>Fifty-thousand supporters of the main opposition parties take to the streets to protest the new government; various acts of provocation occur. Order is restored by security forces with teargas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Jan-92</td>
<td>Unauthorized protest by opposition parties occurs in Kigali. Property damage occurs and some civilians are injured by the protestors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-92</td>
<td>A mine explodes in southern Rwanda. The government blames the bombings on the RPF; the opposition parties blame the MRND(D).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-92</td>
<td>Killings of Tutsi civilians occur in Gisenyi and elsewhere in the country. Dozens of conflicts occur between MRND(D), local officials and their constituents. These problems continue through Apr-92.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Mar-92</td>
<td>Ethnic violence is perpetrated by local officials in Bugesera. The <em>interahamwe</em> militia is used for the first time. Extensive property damage occurs and an estimated 300 Tutsi are killed; 15,000 displaced. Thousands are arrested in response to the violence, but nearly all are released.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Mar-92</td>
<td>A mine explosion kills 10 in Nyanza.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Mar-92</td>
<td>An explosion in a collective taxi at the Kigali bus station leaves five dead and 50 wounded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Mar-92</td>
<td>A mine explodes in Nyanza; four are killed and four injured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Apr-92</td>
<td>A mine blast in Bugesera kills one person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Apr-92</td>
<td>A bomb explodes in bus station in Kigali; 34 are injured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-May-92</td>
<td>A mine blows up in a minibus in Ruhango. Seventeen are killed; 13 are wounded. The MRND(D) is accused of the attack by members of the opposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-May-92</td>
<td>A bomb explosion in a collective taxi in Kigali. Six are killed and 10 injured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-May-92</td>
<td>A bomb injures 30 in a hotel in Butare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-May-92</td>
<td>Education Minister Agathe Uwiligiyimana is assaulted in her home by 20 unknown assailants. The assailants are armed with machetes, grenades and clubs. Political opponents of Uwiligiyimana are accused of the attack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-May-92</td>
<td>Members of the opposition party the PL attack members of the MRND(D) in Kimisagara.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-May-92</td>
<td>In Kigali youth members of opposition groups clash with youth supporters of the MRND(D). Demonstrators also clash with security forces. Property damage occurs; dozens are injured. A strike is launched by taxi workers over the murder of a colleague by a member of the CDR; five to seven people are killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-May-92</td>
<td>Units of Hutu soldiers rampage through the towns of Ruhengeri, Gisenyi, and Biumba. The riots spread to Butare, Kibuye and Cyangugu. Rumors of a possible coup circulate. Property damage and looting occurs, some banks are robbed. The violence lasts until 3-Jun. Over 30 are killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Jun-92</td>
<td>Police kill MDR opposition activist in Kigembe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-92</td>
<td>Twenty-one people are killed and 12 injured in fighting between the MRND(D) and the opposition parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-92</td>
<td>Eighty-five Tutsi are killed in Kibuye préfecture by Hutu extremists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Aug-92</td>
<td>CDR protestors clash with police in Kigali. Three people are killed, over six injured. Some of those targeted are Tutsi civilians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Aug-92</td>
<td>Violence breaks out in Rwamatamu commune. Almost 100 perpetrators are caught. Two to five people are killed; 16 seriously injured.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prefects relay secret orders to the burgomasters to compile lists of people known to have left the country; burgomasters are also told to confiscate the registration cards of these people. The army general staff directs all units and military camps to provide lists of RPF accomplices.

A commission composed of senior military officers issues a report titled the "Definition and Identification of the Enemy." Those considered to be "enemies of the state" include all Tutsi who render support to the RPF and Hutu who do not support the government.

Soldiers mutiny at the Kanombe military base near Kigali.

Radio Muhabura reports of summary executions being conducted by the interahamwe. Radio Muhabura also reports that the CDR has created a list of names of those suspected of supporting the RPF.

Clashes occur between supporters of the MDR and the MRND(D) at Shyorongi. Seven people are killed.

Nearly 10,000 members of opposition parties demonstrate in Kigali. Violence ensues between demonstrators and those suspected of membership in MRND(D). In total 100 are arrested and over 50 are wounded.

In a speech given by political activist Leon Mugesera all Tutsi and members of the opposition are labeled as accomplices of the RPF. The speech also calls for a renewal of civil war and includes a threat that the Tutsi will be annihilated.

An explosion at night club owned by members of Habyarimana's family kills over 12 people. Both the opposition parties and the RPF are blamed by supporters of Habyarimana.

Bomb explosion occurs in a hotel in Butare. Seven people are injured.

The MRND(D) and the CDR-youth block roads and attack Tutsi and political opponents in northeast Rwanda. Beginning the week of 18-Jan, protests by members of the CDR and the MRND(D) paralyze the cities of Kigali and Ruhengeri. In Gisenyi the MRND(D) youth attack and kill Tutsi, members of Bagogwe herding clan, and supporters of the opposition parties. Over 300 are killed; 4,000 are displaced.

At a press conference the CDR issues a call to Hutu to “be vigilant for the fatherland is in danger.”

Interahamwe informant tells UNAMIR officials of a Hutu plot to exterminate the Tutsi. This information is passed on to UN officials by Gen. Romeo Dallaire the following day.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-Jan-93</td>
<td>A letter sent to Habyarimana from group of soldiers threatens dire consequences for supporters of the RPF. The letter advocates an aggressive program of Hutu “self-defense.” The RPF launches a renewed attack on government forces in Ruhengeri in response to the Jan-93 murder of more than 300 Tutsi in northern Rwanda. The government arrests persons suspected of supporting the RPF; many are beaten, tortured and killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Feb-93</td>
<td>The RPF is accused by the MRND(D) of murdering Hutu officials and those believed associated with the MRND(D) and the CDR. Calls are issued from government officials and political activists for Hutu “self defense.” Hundreds, possibly thousands are killed; 600,000 are temporarily displaced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Mar-93</td>
<td>The RPF is accused by the government of killing civilians in Nagarama on 17-Mar. An investigation conducted by the UN Commission for the Defense of Human Rights cannot determine who is responsible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-93</td>
<td>A television journalist is murdered outside of his home. No one is arrested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Apr-93</td>
<td>A bomb blast occurs in a post office in Kigali. No one is killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-May-93</td>
<td>The MDR chairman for Gikongoro, Emmanuel Gapyisi is murdered outside of his home. The RPF is accused of the crime by Hutu politicians. Members of the MDR are also accused. MDR members take to the streets to protest Gapyisi’s death on 31-May.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-May-93</td>
<td>A bomb blast in a marketplace in Kirambo in southwestern Rwanda kills 16 and injures 120.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Jul-93</td>
<td>A bomb explodes at a marketplace in Kigali. According to eye-witnesses, eight people were injured, one of them seriously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Aug-93</td>
<td>MRND(D) leader Fidele Rwanbuka is assassinated. Associates of the president accuse the RPF who denies the charge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Sep-93</td>
<td>Bomb explosion in a suburban cafe in Nyamirambo. One person is killed and five others are wounded. A second explosion occurs at a private residence in downtown Kigali critically wounding 1 child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Sep-93</td>
<td>Members of the MRND(D) and the MDR clash in central Rwanda during week of 27-Sep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Oct-93</td>
<td>Clash occurs between members of the MRND(D) and the MDR in the Taba commune.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8-Oct-93  A grenade explosion occurs in Kigali. Three civilians are injured. One soldier is beaten to death by the population in response. Two other soldiers are seriously injured.

23-Oct-93  Hutu-Power rally occurs in Kigali in response to the assassination of Burundian president Melchoir Ndadaye. Members of several of the moderate opposition parties attend. Support for the Hutu-Power movement is solidified among the opposition. Speakers condemn the RPF, the Tutsi and Hutu supporters of the RPF and Tutsi.

5-Nov-93  MDR demonstrators in Kigali clash with police. Some injures are reported.

14-Nov-93  State prosecutor and chairman of the Association for the Defense of Human Rights in Rwanda Alphonse-Marie Nkubito escapes assassination although he does not escape injury.

17-Nov-93  Over 40 are killed in the demilitarized zone near Ruhengeri; two are wounded. The RPF is accused of the violence by the MRND(D) and the military. The victims are reported to be members of the MRND(D). The RPF accuses the MRND(D) of the violence. The attack breaks the ceasefire of Aug-93.

23-Nov-93  The CDR issues a press release calling for resignation of the president and prime minister if they continue to fail to act in response to the killings of 17- and 18-Nov. The press release asks all Hutu to be ready to liquidate all enemies.

29-Nov-93  More than a dozen persons are killed in the Mutara commune in northwestern Rwanda.

30-Nov-93  Soldiers from Burundi massacre at least a dozen civilians in Rwanda and slaughter an unknown number of others. The attack occurred in the Ngenda district of Rwanda. It is unknown whether the victims are Rwandan or Burundian refugees. Five Tutsi are killed in Ngenda that same day.

3-Dec-93  A number of school children are killed and others injured when a mine explodes on a road in central Rwanda.

3-Dec-93  Senior military officers write a letter to UNAMIR Gen. Romeo Dallaire warning him of a plan to initiate attacks against the Tutsi to restart the civil war. The officers warn that opposition politicians will be assassinated. They also state that the plan was devised by Habyarimana with help of a handful of military officers from his home region.

17-Dec-93  The journal *Le Flambeau* reports on the existence of a plot to exterminate the Tutsi. The alleged massacres are to begin on 20-Dec or 23-Dec. The massacres are to be conducted by the *interahamwe*.

22-Dec-93  A meeting of military commanders takes place in the office of chief of staff of the military. Weapons and uniforms are supplied to Hutu extremists.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-Jan-94</td>
<td>According to Belgian intelligence, a meeting at MRND(D) headquarters brings together the MRND(D), <em>interahamwe</em> leaders and agents of the secret police. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss hiding weapons from UNAMIR forces. Those who attend the meeting resolve to disrupt relations between the Rwandan police and UNAMIR officers to create conditions of instability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Jan-94</td>
<td>A violent demonstration by <em>interahamwe</em> and members of the Presidential Guard occurs in Kigali.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Jan-94</td>
<td>At a meeting of 4,000 to 5,000 MRND(D) supporters arms are distributed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Jan-94</td>
<td>The <em>interahamwe</em> are arrested for bombing a house in Kigali; other <em>interahamwe</em> riot on 24-Jan. In separate incidents assailants shoot at UNAMIR officers and two grenades explode at a government building on 26-Jan and 27-Jan. MRND(D) leaders meet with <em>interahamwe</em> leaders to discuss ways of creating conflict with Belgian soldiers. An RTLM broadcast on 27-Jan requests that all Hutu defend themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Jan-94</td>
<td>RTLM and Radio Rwanda accuse Belgian soldiers of trying to kill Jean-Bosco Barayagwiza (CDR). In another incident, a grenade is thrown at UNAMIR soldiers. RTLM broadcasts that “the time has come to take aim at Belgian targets.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-94</td>
<td>In late-Feb Major Stanislas Kinyoni requests that the heads of police brigades in Kigali prepare lists of persons suspected to have ties with the RPF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-94</td>
<td>In late Feb-94 the second issue of <em>Kangura</em> warns of a “final attack” that the RPF is going to make on Kigali. The Hutu are asked to be on alert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb-94</td>
<td>Belgian intelligence sources report that the chief of staff of the Rwanda military has put all troops on alert, ordered more ammunition and arms, canceled leaves and asked for the recruitment of more soldiers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Feb-94</td>
<td>Senior military officers meet with Habyarimana to express their concern over the possibility of a renewed war with the RPF. At the meeting the president warns that if the RPF attacks the country their accomplices will be dealt with harshly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Feb-94</td>
<td>Members of the MDR are attacked in demonstrations by members of the MDR-Power faction. Looting and property damage occur. Future Prime Minister Twagiramungu’s bodyguard and seven others are killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Feb-94</td>
<td>Members of the CDR hold 40 workers hostage at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The stand-off is to protest allegations that Foreign Affairs Minister Anastase Gansana is siding with the RPF in peace negotiations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Feb-94</td>
<td>PSD leader and Minister of Public Works and Energy Felicien Gatabazi is assassinated. The CDR, the MRND(D) and several persons close to Habyarimana are blamed. The installation of the interim government is postponed as a result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Feb-94</td>
<td>Radio Rwanda reports that 100,000 have fled from southern Rwanda in response to the threat of an attack by forces from Burundi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Feb-94</td>
<td>Martin Bucyana, leader of the CDR, is assassinated by a mob of PSD supporters. In a separate incident, a UNAMIR convoy escorting RPF soldiers is attacked and one RPF soldier is killed. Hutu from Bucyana’s neighborhood in Kigali attack Tutsi. At least 70 are killed by the <em>interahamwe</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Feb-94</td>
<td>Meeting of <em>interahamwe</em> leaders occurs in which greater vigilance against the Tutsi in Kigali is recommended. <em>Interahamwe</em> members are asked to be ready for war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Feb-94</td>
<td>Habyarimana warns the UN Secretary-General that his life is in danger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-94</td>
<td>Violence continues throughout the country. The RPF threatens to renew the civil war unless the BBTG is sworn in. An ambush of RPF soldiers by government forces in northern Rwanda is reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-94</td>
<td>A <em>Kangura</em> article written by Hassan Ngeze titled “Habyarimana will Die in March” is published. The article warns that dire consequences will result if the BBTG is implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Mar-94</td>
<td>Belgian intelligence is informed by an MRND(D) informant of a plan to exterminate all Tutsi should the RPF resumes hostilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Mar-94</td>
<td>Two unidentified people throw a hand grenade against the residence of former Prime Minister Nsengiyaremye; no one is hurt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Mar-94</td>
<td>Five Hutu civilians are killed in the Byumba préfecture in the demilitarized zone. Victims include the head of a tea plantation, his wife and three employees. Members of the MRND(D) and the PL blame the RPF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Mar-94</td>
<td>The president of PL-Power, Justin Mugenzi, calls on the Rwandan people to rise up against future Prime Minister Twagiramungu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Mar-94</td>
<td>Ferdinand Nahimana issues a call to the Hutu elite for “self defense” and asks for suggestions for the final solution to the Tutsi problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Mar-94</td>
<td>Alphonse Ingabire, operational head of the CDR, is murdered. In response the CDR kill members of the PSD and injure 3 others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Apr-94</td>
<td>RTLM warns the public that the RPF may attack between 3- and 8-Apr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Apr-94</td>
<td>At a party Col. Theoneste Bagosora declares that “the only plausible solution for Rwanda would be the elimination of the Tutsi.” This comment is reportedly overheard by Gen. Dallaire and other officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Apr-94</td>
<td>President Juvénal Habyarimana is assassinated and the genocide of the Tutsi begins. Moderate Hutu politicians are also murdered. The perpetrators include the interahamwe, the Presidential Guard and ordinary Hutu civilians. Theodore Sindikubwabo assumes the presidency of an interim government on 9-Apr. Over the next 100 days, between 200,000 to as many as 1 million are killed; over 1 million flee country. In the military offensive launched by the RPF in Apr-94 atrocities are committed against Hutu. After capturing Kigali victory is declared by the RPF on 18-Jul.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.3. Intra-Communal Conflicts, Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Antagonists</th>
<th>Source of conflict</th>
<th>Severity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>PALIPEHUTU/CNDD</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>PALIPEHUTU/CNDD</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>PALIPEHUTU/CNDD</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>PALIPEHUTU/CNDD</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>PALIPEHUTU/CNDD</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>PALIPEHUTU/CNDD</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>PALIPEHUTU/CNDD</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>PALIPEHUTU/CNDD</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>PALIPEHUTU/CNDD</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>PALIPEHUTU/CNDD</td>
<td>Organizational conflict</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>PALIPEHUTU/CNDD</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>PALIPEHUTU/CNDD</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>Bombings/assassinations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data for Tables 5.3 through 5.8 were obtained from Minorities at Risk Project (2005) College Park, MD: Center for International Development and Conflict Management (retrieved from http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/inscr/mar/, 12 December 2006).
Table 5.4. Intra-Communal Conflicts, Rwanda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Antagonists</th>
<th>Source of conflict</th>
<th>Severity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Extremists and moderates</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Extremists and moderates</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Extremists and moderates</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Extremists and moderates</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Extremists and moderates</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Extremists and moderates</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Extremists and moderates</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Extremists and moderates</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Extremists and moderates</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Extremists and moderates</td>
<td>Organizational conflict</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elites and others</td>
<td>Regional cleavages</td>
<td>Sporadic attacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Extremists and moderates</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elites and others</td>
<td>Regional cleavages</td>
<td>Sporadic attacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Extremists and moderates</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elites and others</td>
<td>Regional cleavages</td>
<td>Sporadic attacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Extremists and moderates</td>
<td>No basis for judgment</td>
<td>Sporadic attacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elites and others</td>
<td>Regional cleavages</td>
<td>Sporadic attacks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5. Inter-Communal Conflict (COMCO index), Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>COMCO Index, 1990-1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>No conflict manifest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>No conflict manifest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6. Inter-Communal Conflict (COMCO Index), Rwanda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Antagonist</th>
<th>COMCO Index, 1990-1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>1990-1993 conflict characterized as communal rioting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>1990-1993 conflict characterized as communal rioting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7. Protest and Anti-Regime Rebellion, Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Initiator</th>
<th>Protest</th>
<th>Rebellion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Verbal opposition</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Verbal opposition</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Verbal opposition</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Small demonstrations</td>
<td>Local rebellion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Small demonstrations</td>
<td>Small-scale guerilla activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Small demonstrations</td>
<td>Local rebellion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Small demonstrations</td>
<td>Intermediate guerilla activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>Small demonstrations</td>
<td>Small-scale guerilla activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.8. Protest and Anti-Regime Rebellion, Rwanda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Initiator</th>
<th>Protest</th>
<th>Rebellion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>Small-scale guerilla activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>Small-scale guerilla activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>Small-scale guerilla activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>Small-scale guerilla activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>Small-scale guerilla activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>Large-scale guerilla activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>Small demos</td>
<td>Large-scale guerilla activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>Small demos</td>
<td>Large-scale guerilla activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Hutu</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutsi</td>
<td>No protest</td>
<td>Large-scale guerilla activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9. Population Density (Persons per Square km), Rwanda and Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: All data for Tables 5.9 and 5.10 were obtained from World Bank, *World Development Indicators 2006, CD-ROM*. 
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**Table 5.10.** Population Density (per Hectare of Arable Land), Rwanda and Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.11.** Food Production and Inflation, Rwanda and Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Food Production Burundi</th>
<th>Food Production Rwanda</th>
<th>Inflation of food prices Burundi</th>
<th>Inflation of food prices Rwanda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>109.1</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Data for food production were obtained from the Food and Agricultural Organization (1999: 8-9); see also “Notes: Food Production Index.” Data for inflation of food prices was obtained from the World Bank, *World Development Indicators 2006, CD-ROM.* The food production index measures the aggregate volume of food produced per year relative to the base period 1989-1991. The items which are considered food are those which are edible and have nutritive value. Items such as seed and feed are not included. “Inflation of food prices” is measured by yearly percentage.
Table 5.12. Food Aid, Rwanda and Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Cereals Burundi</th>
<th>Cereals Rwanda</th>
<th>Non-cereals Burundi</th>
<th>Non-cereals Rwanda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969-71</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>6,367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-81</td>
<td>10,758</td>
<td>13,516</td>
<td>2,058</td>
<td>2,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-92</td>
<td>2,567</td>
<td>21,145</td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td>3,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: All data on food aid were obtained from the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, Economic and Social Department, Statistics Division (retrieved at http://www.fao.org/faostat/foodsecurity/index_en.htm, accessed 10 October 2005). “Non-cereal” and “cereal food aid” are measured in metric tons.

Table 5.13. Agricultural Production as a Percentage of GDP, Rwanda and Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: All data for Tables 5.13 and 5.14 were obtained from World Bank, World Development Indicators 2006, CD-ROM.
Table 5.14. Industry, Services and Manufacturing as a Percentage of GDP, Rwanda and Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Industry Burundi</th>
<th>Services Burundi</th>
<th>Manufacturing Burundi</th>
<th>Industry Rwanda</th>
<th>Services Rwanda</th>
<th>Manufacturing Rwanda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.15. Coffee and Tea Production, Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Coffee exports</th>
<th>Value of coffee exports</th>
<th>Tea exports</th>
<th>Value of tea exports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>18,894</td>
<td>5,819,100</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>151,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>27,106</td>
<td>6,604,800</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>235,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>30,459</td>
<td>7,845,900</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>283,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>24,835</td>
<td>7,076,600</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>246,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>29,002</td>
<td>8,301,600</td>
<td>3,073</td>
<td>722,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>34,097</td>
<td>9,418,100</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>590,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>36,689</td>
<td>14,988,300</td>
<td>3,451</td>
<td>452,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>27,071</td>
<td>6,389,400</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>497,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>36,684</td>
<td>11,506,000</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>528,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>29,084</td>
<td>5,995,600</td>
<td>3,772</td>
<td>633,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>33,501</td>
<td>5,654,100</td>
<td>3,920</td>
<td>669,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>41,163</td>
<td>7,496,500</td>
<td>5,143</td>
<td>839,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>39,991</td>
<td>4,830,100</td>
<td>5,696</td>
<td>914,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: All data for Tables 5.15 and 5.16 were obtained from the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, Economic and Social Department, Statistics Division, (retrieved from http://www.fao.org/es/ess/toptrade/trade.asp’s, 01 October 2005). “Coffee” and “Tea exports” are measured in metric tons. The value of production is measured in U.S. dollars.
Table 5.16. Coffee and Tea Production, Rwanda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Coffee exports</th>
<th>Value of coffee exports</th>
<th>Tea exports</th>
<th>Value of tea exports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>22,418</td>
<td>4,396,400</td>
<td>6,973</td>
<td>1,281,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>29,065</td>
<td>5,710,400</td>
<td>6,365</td>
<td>958,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>27,030</td>
<td>6,100,700</td>
<td>7,027</td>
<td>756,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>29,188</td>
<td>5,503,500</td>
<td>7,354</td>
<td>557,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>31,554</td>
<td>5,695,700</td>
<td>7,998</td>
<td>588,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>34,259</td>
<td>6,125,100</td>
<td>10,776</td>
<td>746,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>41,210</td>
<td>14,355,100</td>
<td>10,346</td>
<td>1,650,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>46,407</td>
<td>10,927,200</td>
<td>9,243</td>
<td>1,219,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>31,293</td>
<td>7,700,300</td>
<td>12,218</td>
<td>1,416,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>35,814</td>
<td>8,505,900</td>
<td>12,996</td>
<td>1,944,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>45,579</td>
<td>6,712,300</td>
<td>11,759</td>
<td>2,149,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>37,642</td>
<td>5,765,700</td>
<td>13,297</td>
<td>2,236,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>33,851</td>
<td>3,516,400</td>
<td>13,486</td>
<td>2,008,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>29,667</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>11,594</td>
<td>1,860,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.17. Economic Indicators, Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GDP growth</th>
<th>Net foreign direct investment</th>
<th>Annual percent inflation</th>
<th>External balance on goods and services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>-12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>-16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>-15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>-13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-20.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: All data for tables 5.17 and 5.18 were obtained from World Bank, *World Development Indicators 2006, CD-ROM*. “GDP growth” is measured by annual percentage. “Net foreign direct investment” is measured as percentage of GDP, as is “external balance on goods and services.”
Table 5.18. Economic Indicators, Rwanda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GDP growth</th>
<th>Net foreign direct investment</th>
<th>Annual percent inflation</th>
<th>External balance on goods and services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>-11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>-11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>-12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>-10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>-12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>-15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.19. Foreign Debt, Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total debt</th>
<th>Government debt</th>
<th>Total debt service</th>
<th>Foreign aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>165,700,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>178,600,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>227,400,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>307,700,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>348,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>455,100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>570,400,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>769,600,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>800,700,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>888,900,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>906,900,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>963,500,000</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1,022,400,000</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: All data in Tables 5.19 and 5.20 were obtained from World Bank, *World Development Indicators 2006, CD-ROM*. “Government debt” is measured by percentage of GDP; “total debt service” is measured by percentage of goods and services, and “foreign aid” is measured by percentage of central government expenditures.
Table 5.20. Foreign Debt, Rwanda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total debt</th>
<th>Government debt</th>
<th>Total debt service</th>
<th>Foreign aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>189,800,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>196,600,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>218,300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>240,500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>290,100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>365,600,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>451,300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>605,100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>653,600,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>623,300,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>711,700,000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>809,900,000</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>857,100,000</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>909,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.21. Military Spending, Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Military expenditure</th>
<th>Military expenditure (percentage government expenditure)</th>
<th>Military personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: All data for Tables 5.21 and 5.22 were obtained from World Bank, World Development Indicators 2006, CD-ROM. “Military expenditures” (first column) are measured as percentage of GDP; “military personnel” are measured as percentage of labor force.

Table 5.22. Military Spending, Rwanda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Military expenditure</th>
<th>Military expenditure (percentage government expenditure)</th>
<th>Military personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.23: General Development Indicators, Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>HDI Rank</th>
<th>Adult literacy rate</th>
<th>GDP per capita</th>
<th>Infant mortality rate</th>
<th>Life expectancy at birth</th>
<th>Population below the poverty line (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: With the exception of HDI scores, all data in Tables 5.23 and 5.24 were obtained from the World Bank, *World Development Indicators 2006, CD-ROM*. “GDP per capita (PPP)” is GDP per capita based on the purchasing power parity of international dollars. “International dollars” are defined as dollars which have the same purchasing power as the U.S. dollar in 1995 (see, “Notes: GDP per capita, PPP,” *World Development Indicators 2006, CD-ROM*). Data for HDI scores were obtained from the United Nations Development Programme, *Human Rights Reports* (1990-1993). The HDI score was modified for both countries for the year 1990. In that year, the HDI score for Burundi is actually 11; for Rwanda 21. In other words, Burundi ranked as the 11th least developed country in the world (out of 130 countries) and Rwanda ranked as the 21st least developed country. The 1990 HDI score for both countries was changed to make it accord with the scores for all subsequent years examined.
Table 5.24. General Development Indicators, Rwanda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>HDI Rank</th>
<th>Adult literacy rate</th>
<th>GDP per capita</th>
<th>Infant mortality rate</th>
<th>Life expectancy at birth</th>
<th>Population below the poverty line (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.25. Government Expenditures, Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>General government final consumption expenditure</th>
<th>Subsidies and other current transfers</th>
<th>Wages and salaries</th>
<th>Education expenditure as a percentage of GNP</th>
<th>Education expenditure (as percentage of government expenditure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: All data in Tables 5.25 and 5.26 were obtained from the World Bank, *World Development Indicators 2006, CD-ROM*, and *UNESCO Statistical Yearbooks* for varying years. “General government final consumption expenditures” are measured by annual percentage growth rate. “Subsidies,” and “wages and salaries” are measured as percentage of total government expenditures. For “education expenditures,” (column 5) GNP is calculated in local currency.
Table 5.26. Government Expenditures, Rwanda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>General government final consumption expenditure</th>
<th>Subsidies and other current transfers</th>
<th>Wages and salaries</th>
<th>Education expenditure as a percentage of GNP</th>
<th>Education expenditure (as percentage of government expenditure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.27. Transportation and Communications Infrastructure, Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Telephone mainlines per 1,000 people</th>
<th>Daily newspapers per 1,000 people</th>
<th>Television receivers per 1,000 people</th>
<th>Radio receivers per 1,000 people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: All data in Tables 5.27 and 5.28 were obtained from UNESCO Statistical Yearbooks for varying years.
Table 5.28. Transportation and Communications Infrastructure, Rwanda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Telephone mainlines per 1,000 people</th>
<th>Daily newspapers per 1,000 people</th>
<th>Television receivers per 1,000 people</th>
<th>Radio receivers per 1,000 people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.29. Health Profile and Healthcare System, Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Access to health services</th>
<th>Access to safe water</th>
<th>Access to sanitation</th>
<th>Percentage of births attended by health personnel</th>
<th>Public expenditure on health percentage of GDP</th>
<th>Malnutrition (by height)</th>
<th>Malnutrition (by weight)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: All data for Tables 5.29 and 5.30 were obtained from the United Nations Development Programme Human Development Reports (1990 to 1993) and the World Bank, World Development Indicators 2006, CD-ROM. The indicators “access to health services,” “access to safe water,” and “access to sanitation” are measured by the percentage of total population with access to these services. “Malnutrition by height” and “malnutrition by weight” are for children under five years of age.
Table 5.30. Health Profile and Healthcare System, Rwanda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Access to health services</th>
<th>Access to safe water</th>
<th>Access to sanitation</th>
<th>Percentage of births attended by health personnel</th>
<th>Public expenditure on health percentage of GDP</th>
<th>Malnutrition (by height)</th>
<th>Malnutrition (by weight)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6
HISTORICAL INSTITUTIONALISM AND COLLECTIVE VIOLENCE IN RWANDA AND BURUNDI
PART 1: SOCIAL STRUCTURES

All of the studies discussed in Chapter 5 agree that the transition from single party to multiparty rule in Rwanda produced an outcome that was clearly suboptimal. Many of these studies attribute the failure of democratization to the process itself, notably its timing and the way in which it was conducted by domestic and international actors.\textsuperscript{352} Democratization is generally depicted by these studies as a trigger event that unleashed massive group violence in a country already burdened with civil war, a history of group violence, high population density and extreme poverty.\textsuperscript{353} However, the fact that Burundi endured similar troubles during its transition to democracy and did not incur the same fate as Rwanda raises questions as to the reliability of structural explanations.

The current chapter focuses on the first of the two primary independent variables examined by this study—\textit{social structures}. The purpose of the analysis provided in this chapter and the next is to test the portion of the main hypothesis that addresses the general impact indigenous institutions have on the ability of political actors to accept multiparty governance. More specifically, the main hypothesis suggests that indigenous social structures and political institutions in Rwanda and Burundi impacted the

\textsuperscript{352} Although the present study does not deny these factors certainly made the failure of the BBTG in Rwanda more likely, they are not the root causes of its collapse.

\textsuperscript{353} To be fair, some of the genocide studies do suggest that institutions in Rwanda were intermediate structures that influenced the preferences of actors (see for example the studies by African Rights 1995 and Des Forges 1999). However, the role of institutions in this capacity is never fully explored. The reason for this can be attributed to the fact that no other cases are provided for comparison in these analyses. Other scholars, most notably Uvin (1999), entirely discount the possibility that the institutional dissimilarities between Rwanda and Burundi exerted any influence whatsoever on the divergence in outcome that ensued. His position on this matter is well
occurrence of total genocide by diminishing the ability of multiparty democracy to acquire legitimacy among members of the incumbent political elite in both countries.

This hypothesis is derived from the theory of historical institutionalism and firmly grounded in the democratization literature—both of which assume that past institutions impact future institutional development by constraining the choices and behavior of political actors. In keeping with historical institutionalist scholars who assume a reciprocal relationship between informal institutions and the state, this dissertation demonstrates that neither social structures nor the second independent variable, traditional political institutions, is assumed to have affected the dependent variable independently of the other.

As stated previously in this study, social structures is defined as the type of social cleavages that have traditionally existed in Rwanda and Burundi. In order to determine which type of cleavages was more prevalent in each of these two cases, this study considers both quantitative and qualitative data.

The current chapter first provides an assessment of social structures with data obtained from the Minorities at Risk or “MAR” database. As demonstrated below, the MAR differentials indices provide at best a rudimentary picture of the types of cleavages that exist within both countries and for a very limited period of time.

This chapter next provides an in-depth analysis of social structures using qualitative data obtained from a variety of studies that have been written on one or both countries. More specifically, these studies are used to assess a number of alternative measurements of social structures, paying close attention to the ways in which group identities associated with these structures have changed over time. The chapter concludes with a brief summation of the findings obtained from the preceding analyses, and a few remarks concerning the subject matter addressed in the next chapter. Conclusions regarding the impact that the independent variable social structures had on the democratization process in Burundi and Rwanda are reserved for the next chapter.

demonstrated by his suggestion that “to explain current violence in both countries it is of little importance to know the exact nature of the pre-colonial political relations between Hutu and Tutsi” (1999: 254-255).
Cultural Differentials Index

The first explanatory variable, social structures, is measured in part with quantitative data. More specifically, two indices from the MAR database are used—the Cultural Differentials Index, and Economic Differentials Index (“CDI” and “EDI” respectively). The basis for the use of these indices is the assumption that greater cultural and economic differences between the Hutu and Tutsi are an indicator of a greater presence of reinforcing cleavages.

As demonstrated in Table 6.1, it is somewhat difficult to assess the exact nature of the objective cultural differences that exist between Hutu and Tutsi in Burundi. Whereas the Hutu are coded as differing substantially from the Tutsi in terms of culture, the Tutsi are coded as differing only slightly from the Hutu. To reconcile this discrepancy, this study examined the individual measures of difference that comprise the CDI: MAR indices CULDIFX1 to CULDIFX6.

According to these indices, the Hutu and Tutsi of Burundi are differentiated from one another by ethnicity, as well as by historical origin. On both measurements the difference is coded as being significant (see Table 6.2). With respect to all other measures (e.g. language, religion etc.), there are no differences listed between the two groups. Given this, it is therefore somewhat unclear why the differences between Tutsi and Hutu are depicted by the composite CDI as only “slight.”

Similar difficulties are found with CDI data for Rwanda. Although the composite CDI consistently codes the differences between the Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda as slight, the data are less than clear when the individual indices are examined. For instance, the Tutsi of Rwanda are coded as differing

---

354 As addressed in Chapter 4 of this dissertation, the CDI is a composite index of six measures of cultural difference—language, ethnicity/nationality, historical origin, religion, social customs and place of residence (indices CULDIFX1 through CULDIFX 6). The EDI, on the other hand, is a composite index of six measures of economic difference—income, ownership of property, access to higher education, presence in commerce, presence in the professions and presence in official positions (indices ECDIFX1 to ECDIFX6) (see MAR 2005: 27-28, 30-32).

355 This is also the justification for the use of the CDI and EDI by Saideman et al. (2002). As stated in the Chapter 4, the purpose of focusing on social cleavages is to provide an additional test of the assumption made by Lipset (1960), Truman (1951), and other scholars that a greater presence of cross-cutting cleavages within society leads to a better functioning, more efficient democracy. Furthermore, in accordance with social capital scholars such as della Porta (2000) and Rothstein and Stolle (2002), this study also assumes that the kinds of cleavages that exist within society are, at least in part, a function of the type of governing institutions in place (for more on this latter point, see also Bratton 1989, Berman 1997).

356 A coding of “2”on the composite CDI indicates “substantial differentials” between groups; a “1”
significantly from the Hutu on the basis of ethnicity and historical origin. At the same time, the Hutu are
coded as differing significantly from the Tutsi in terms of historical origin and residence, but not ethnicity
(see Table 6.3).

**Economic Differentials Index**

Tables 6.4 through 6.6 provide data for the Economic Differentials Index. As shown in Table 6.4, the
economic differences between the Hutu and the Tutsi of Burundi are consistently coded as “major”
differences.357 Looking at the separate indices for the EDI, the Hutu are listed as having lacked access to
higher education, as well as fair access to positions in commerce, the professions and government (see
Table 6.5). By comparison, the Tutsi are coded as having been economically advantaged relative to the
Hutu on all of the economic differentials indicators. These results are consistent with data regarding the
economic status of both groups obtained from a number of qualitative studies (see for example

Although the EDI appears to provide a relatively reliable picture of inter-group economic
differentials in Burundi, the same cannot be said of the data for Rwanda. The EDI codes Rwanda’s Tutsi
as possessing some economic advantage relative to the Hutu (see Table 6.4), a finding consistent with a
number of qualitative studies of Rwanda (see for example Lemarchand 1970, Prunier 1995 and Uvin
1998). However, the Hutu are coded as possessing no significant economic advantages relative to the
Tutsi (see Table 6.6). This particular result obfuscates the fact that many Hutu in Rwanda—specifically
those with close connections to the ruling elite—enjoyed substantial economic benefits.358

---

357 A coding of “3” on the composite EDI represents “major differentials” between groups, a group that is
coded “-2” is a group with major economic advantages, a “-1” represents “some advantages,” and a “0” represents
“no socially significant differences” between groups.

358 As indicated in Chapter 5, a number of studies including those by Prunier (1995), Uvin (1998) and Des
Forges (1999) indicate that members of the Hutu elite and their supporters derived substantial economic benefit
from the government-controlled enterprises, as well as the numerous development organizations that proliferated the
country. As Mann states, under Habyarimana’s reign: “A northwestern patronage/corruption system distributed
state and development aid resources to a favored Hutu minority, rivaling and then outdistancing the commercially
based wealth of the Tutsi elite” (2005: 436).
Both the CDI and the EDI indicate that the Hutu and Tutsi in both countries differ from one another economically and culturally. Unfortunately these data cover a period of time that is largely limited to the years following independence. Furthermore, the groups appear to be scored inconsistently on a number of the individual differentials indices. Based on the use of MAR data alone, it is therefore difficult to arrive at any definitive conclusions regarding the types of social cleavages that were most prevalent in Burundi and Rwanda. For this reason, the variable, social structures, is also assessed by this dissertation with the use of qualitative data. Specifically, this study considers two additional measures of social structures: civil society and indigenous institutions.

Civil Society

Two indicators of civil society are considered in this study: associational membership and the relationship between civil society associations and the state. In keeping with the democratization literature on the relationship between civil society and the state in the developing countries (see Chapters 2 and 3), this study hypothesizes that membership in civic associations reflects the type of social cleavages present within society. Where membership in these associations is predominately defined by objective group characteristics, this is understood to be a sign that reinforcing cleavages are present within a society or “bonding” social capital. If, on the other hand, civic associations appear to have more heterogeneous memberships, this is taken to be sign that cross-cutting cleavages or “bridging” social capital is more prevalent within a society.

This study also assumes that the closer the relationship between civil society and the state, the greater the likelihood that institutions of civil society are used by political actors as a means to justify certain policies and practices, as well as to promote a particular agenda. The strength of the nexus between state and society is further assumed to have important implications for the types of social cleavages that are most prevalent within a society. Here it is assumed that the state uses the institutions of civil society to either enhance or to weaken existing social cleavages.
Studies indicate that civil society associations in one or both countries had memberships that were largely conducive to the formation and reinforcement of social divisions—with some variation (see below) (Uvin 1998), (Lemarchand 1994b), (Longman 2001). A greater degree of difference, however, is detected in the ways in which civil society associations were traditionally used by the political elite in each country.

When assessing civil society in Rwanda and Burundi, it is important to note at the outset that the growth of an independent civil society in both countries has been a recent event. For decades, both were ruled by single party presidential regimes, and in both cases, civil liberties were largely nonexistent. Under the First and Second Republics in Burundi and Rwanda, the state was virtually dominant in all aspects of life—social, economic and political. Many of the “civil” associations that did exist during this particular period were organizations largely affiliated with the government and the ruling party. It was not until 1991 in Rwanda, and 1992 in Burundi, that the right of association was expanded to allow for the formation of political parties and voluntary civic associations independent of state control (U.S. Dept. of State 1990-1995).

By the early 1990s civil society in Rwanda was replete with a fairly extensive network of cooperatives, farmers’ organizations (“pre-cooperatives”), savings and credit associations (“tontines”), as well as a variety of local non-governmental development organizations (“NGOs”). According to data compiled by Uvin (1998), during this period Rwanda had well over 200 registered cooperatives—all of which were closely associated with and controlled by the state. There were approximately 3,000 farmers’ organizations, and the number of tontines in the country was as high as 30,000. By the late

---

359 It must be stated at the outset that, with the exception of religious institutions and to some extent development non-governmental organizations, there are very few specific data available on group membership in civic society associations for Rwanda and Burundi. What little data exist on either the number of civic organizations, or their memberships, tends to vary from study to study. As a result it is somewhat difficult to independently verify the suggestion made by experts on both countries that the divisions within civic organizations in Rwanda and Burundi mirror those which existed in the larger society of each.

360 The exception to this is the freedom of religion. In Rwanda and Burundi, the freedom to practice religion has been guaranteed by law throughout most of the post-independence period, with few exceptions (U.S. Department of State 1991-1995).

361 In their analysis of civil society in Rwanda during the early 1990s, ARD reports that the number of cooperatives during this time was as high as 707 (2001: 16).
In the 1980’s, there were between 143 and 268 development NGO’s operating in the country. Similar to the formal and informal cooperatives, most of these NGO’s were affiliated closely with the Catholic and Protestant churches, and largely dependent on the state and foreign donors for their survival (Uvin 1998: chapr. 8).

In Burundi, by the early 1990s, the number of non-profit associations is reported to have been as high as 162 (Gahama 2002: 16). Similar to Rwanda, Burundi also had a number of farmers’ cooperatives that were largely associated with the government and religious institutions, similar to its NGOs. By and large, it is the opinion of scholars such as Uvin (1998) that civil society in Burundi in the early 1990s was far less extensive than that which existed in Rwanda.362

It is important to note that cooperatives and other civic associations did exist in both countries prior to the efforts to democratization in the late 1980s and early 1990s. However, for a variety of reasons, many of these associations did not last in the long term. For example, in the case of the cooperatives that were formed in Rwanda and Burundi around the time of independence, many terminated operations in later years because of financial problems, mismanagement and corruption, or because they had been co-opted by the state (as occurred with the CCB in Burundi).363 In the case of Burundi, an added factor was the 1972 partial genocide of the Hutu which severely crippled operations for a good number of cooperatives and other civic associations in the country.364

362 Uvin bases this statement on personal experience. In June 1993 he was sent on a mission to Rwanda to study how to replicate the development of grass-roots civil society associations in Burundi (1998: 179n).
363 The CCB was the Cooperatives des Commerçants du Burundi. Created in 1957 by Prince Louis Rwagasore, the CCB had a short life span thanks to the Belgians. To eliminate the CCB’s influence in the country’s political affairs, the colonial administration refused to support the organization. As discussed in greater detail in Chapter 7, the reason for the colonial authority’s attitude had a great deal to do with the pro-independence leanings of Rwagasore and the political party he was associated with, the UPRONA (Lemarchand 1970: 331, 331n).
364 These cooperatives included the Gitega Federated, the Busiga and the Bugarama cooperatives. Because all of these organizations had large Hutu memberships, they were easy targets during the genocide (for information on these and other cooperatives in Burundi, see Weinstein 1976: 71-72, 96, 102, 124-125, 140, 180). Also considered to be a threat to Tutsi rule was the Association des Etudiants Bahutu whose members were believed by the Micombero government to have been involved in several of the Hutu uprisings.

On a separate but related note, in the years after the 1972 genocide, the tight control exercised by the governments of the First and Second Republics led many Hutu to refrain from engaging in any sort of associational activity (Lemarchand 1994a: chap. 6).
The creation of human rights associations in Rwanda and Burundi has been a far more recent development. By 1994, Rwanda had nine human rights organizations. Five of these associations were created between 1990 and 1991 and came to form a consortium: the Collectif des Ligues et Associations de Défense des Droits de l’Homme (or “CLADHO”). The purpose of CLADHO was to investigate and report on human rights abuses and to assist the victims of these abuses. In Burundi, as of October 1993, there were only two independent human rights organizations operating in the country—the Ligue Burundaise des Droits de l’Homme (“ITEKA”) and the Association pour la Défense et al Promotion des Droits de l’Homme (“Ligue SONERA”). Similar to Rwanda these groups also documented and investigated human rights abuses perpetrated by the government (U.S. Department of State 1993-1994).

Perhaps the most significant segment of civil society for both countries has been, and continues to be, the church. Based on his extensive research into the role of religion in both countries, Longman suggests that Christian churches in Rwanda and Burundi have long-served a dual purpose—to “protect the interests of the powerful and [to] provide opportunities for the weak to challenge the status quo and improve their social standing” (1998: 50).

In terms of their relationship to the masses, churches have long been the primary providers of social services in both countries. In addition to bestowing spiritual, health and educational services to the public, the churches in Rwanda and Burundi have also offered one of the few sources of employment and economic advancement for those aspiring to move beyond farming and other less lucrative occupations.

---

365 The first human rights organization, the Association Rwandaise pour la Défense des Droits de l’Homme (“ARDHO”), was created in September 1990. ARDHO quickly emerged as a major voice against the arbitrary detention of Hutu and Tutsi civilians following the October 1990 RPF invasion (U.S. Department of State 1992-1994; also ARD 2001: 22).

366 Many social services, including health and family care, were provided through the foyers sociaux (“social centers”). The foyers sociaux were first created by the Catholic Church in the 1940's. In later years, several of these centers were run by other religious organizations and by the state (Weinstein 1976: 137).

367 The other major source of employment for citizens in both countries has and continues to be the state. Employment in the government sector has traditionally been dominated by members of the urban population. The rural populations in Rwanda and Burundi have historically gravitated towards the church (Longman 1998: 51-52; 59-60; see also Barrett et al. 2001: 629-632; 159-162).
The Catholic Church and the variety of other Christian churches in Rwanda and Burundi continue to have broad-based memberships that include both Hutu and Tutsi. According to data obtained from the *World Christian Encyclopedia*, 76% of the Hutu population and 85% of the Tutsi population of Burundi are affiliated with Christian churches. In the case of Rwanda, these percentages are 83% and 89%, respectively (Barrett et al. 2001: 54-55, 196-197).368

On the surface, churches would appear to be an excellent source of cross-cutting cleavages, or bridging social capital. However, like all other types of civic associations discussed above, the extent to which this was possible depended largely upon the type of the relationship that existed between religious institutions and the state.

With respect to unions, it is important to remember that the economies of both countries have been and continue to be predominately agricultural. As such union membership has traditionally represented only a small fraction of the working population of each country.369 According to data obtained from the U.S. Department of State, 75% of all wage earners in Rwanda were unionized by the early 1990’s. However the percentage of wage earners relative to the rest of the working population was only seven percent (U.S. Department of State 1993).370 In the case of Burundi, the number of persons unionized was even smaller. By 1993, only 15,000 wage earners in the country were members of a union.371 Given their small membership bases and their recent independence from state control, the

---

368 These numbers reflect group membership in the year 2000. Although data available for membership by group for all previous years are somewhat sparse, what little data are available indicate that church membership for both groups has been consistently high (see Barrett 1982).

369 Unions are strangely absent from Uvin’s (1998) analysis of civil society in Rwanda, as noted by ARD (2001: 13). As discussed in previous chapters, well over 90% of the population of Rwanda and Burundi are engaged in subsistence agriculture, and a major share of the GDP of both countries stems from their production of coffee and tea (see Chapter 5, Tables 5.13, 5.15-5.16).

370 By the early 1990’s, there were four major union federations in Rwanda: the Centrale Syndicale des Travailleurs Rwandais (“CESTRAR”), Le Conseil de Concertation des Organisations Libres au Rwanda (“COSYLI”), the Association des Syndicats Chrétiens (“UMURIMO”) and Imbaraga (ARD 2001: 17-19). The largest of these, CESTRAR, was created in 1985 and for years was closely controlled by the government and the sole political party, the MRND (U.S. Department of State 1994). Unlike the three other union organizations, CESTRAR by far had the largest membership—estimated at 300,000 members before the war (see ARD 2001: 14).

371 This is a drop in the bucket compared to the 2 million plus persons engaged in the business of agriculture (*Africa South of the Sahara* 1990-1994). On a more general note, prior to its dissolution in December 1991 and its replacement by the Confédération Syndicale du Burundi (“CSB”), the Union des Travailleurs du Burundi (“UTB”) was the sole umbrella union organization allowed to operate in the country. Founded in 1967 and
federated union groups in Rwanda and Burundi could hardly serve as “lead institutions” in the expansion of civil society.372

Furthermore, both countries lacked the “material dimension” conducive to the formation of civil society. According to Bratton, “material conditions exist for civil society when individuals and social groups develop an independent capacity to accumulate capital” (1994: 64).373 However, data on each country indicate that a middle class consisting of entrepreneurs, businessmen and other professionals was virtually nonexistent.374 Instead access to wealth, and the ability to generate wealth, was more a function of one’s connections to the ruling elite.

More generally, several scholars have strongly argued that the civic associations that existed in Burundi and Rwanda in the early 1990s were limited in their ability to effectively contribute to the democratization process for a variety of reasons. Firstly, Uvin (1998: 169-170) emphasizes the fact that most of the cooperatives and NGOs that existed in Rwanda were created from policies and directives issued by the government of Rwanda, as well as by the foreign donor community. With regard to the NGOs more specifically, the author (1998: 170) states that their creation was,

not so much the reflection of the presence of a civic space conquered by people going beyond the boundaries of family, ethnic group, and location as the reflection of externally defined policies by government and foreign aid agencies, backed up by significant external resources and social

______________________________
372 For a general discussion on the role of lead institutions in the formation of civil society, see Bratton (1994: 66-68).
373 In this respect, a middle class is assumed to be especially important to the creation and maintenance of a well-functioning, vibrant civil society that can effectively counter the state. The middle class fulfills this function by “[lending] a distinctive weight to claims from civil society: They provide respectability and authority to the discourse of opposition; a useful set of leadership, management, and organizational skills; and a degree of protection from the threat of repression by virtue of class affinities with incumbent leaders” (Bratton 1994: 61-62; on this point, see also Snyder 2000: 72-74).
374 Prior to the genocide in 1994 in Rwanda, there were only two primary business organizations: the Chambre de Commerce et d’Industrie du Rwanda and the Association de Employeurs du Rwandais (“AER”). Created in 1982, the Chambre of Commerce is described as having been a “quasi-state institution under the supervision of the Ministry of Commerce.” Until 1995, membership was obligatory for all private sector businessmen (ARD 2001: 17). In the case of Burundi, the Chambre de Commerce et de l’Industrie du Burundi, founded on 23 March 1923, had only 130 members (Africa South of the Sahara 1990-1994). More generally Ottaway (2000) suggests that, because the majority of the population of many African countries is rural, poor and often landless (as is the case for both Rwanda and Burundi), it is difficult to form groups based on economic interests. Consequently, the interests of small farmers and peasants are seldom taken into account (2000: 79; Lemarchand makes note of this fact with regard to the communal committees in rural Burundi, see 1994a: 110-111).
Because of their dependence on external resources, many of the newly created civic associations in Rwanda did not have the ability to operate in a manner that was completely independent of government control. As such, these organizations did not exercise an autonomous voice within society.

A second critical issue involves the lack of actual grass-roots support enjoyed by many of the NGO’s in Rwanda and in Burundi. Uvin strongly suggests that the development NGO’s in Rwanda more closely represented the interests and preferences of their sponsors, rather than the rural masses. The author attributes much of this to the fact that the mandates of these particular organizations were largely defined in apolitical terms. Because they were more concerned with economic development, these associations tended to disregard the problems of inequality, racism and violence that plagued the country (Uvin 1998: 174-176). Lemarchand (1989a: 25) makes a similar observation with respect to the development NGOs in Burundi. As he states:

Neglect of the socio-economic parameters within which aid projects are formulated and implemented has been a recurrent characteristic of most development efforts, with the consequence that there has been remarkably little concern over monitoring the social impact of such efforts.

In this context, development NGOs, and the development aid that is channeled through them, serve to legitimize the status quo.

There is also another side to the issue of grass-roots participation. Rueschemeyer (1998: 13) suggests that participation in associations that are limited in both scope and membership does not automatically lead to a higher quality of democratic governance for the simple reason that these particular

---

375 Many development NGOs had been co-opted by the Habyarimana government from the late 1980s onward. According to Uvin (1998) and others, NGO leaders were frequently given positions in the civil service and the ruling party (1998: 177).
376 The same argument has been extended to NGOs operating in other African countries (see for example, Ottaway 2000: 82-84; also Chabal and Daloz 1999: chap. 2).
377 Uvin considers the mandate of the NGOs to be a perfect reflection of the views of the foreign donor community, which tended to frown upon “organizations with political goals or with nonstandard projects” (1998: 175; on this point see also ACORD 1995: 62).
378 Lemarchand notes further that this absence of concern is apparent in the reports written on Burundi by the World Bank, and USAID (1989a: 25).
379 On this point, see also Ndikumana (1998: 43-44).
associations do not “sufficiently empower the interests of [their] participants to affect broader politics, even though participation in them may have…other beneficial consequences.” In the case of the tontines, for example, because of their extremely narrow memberships (usually limited to family and close neighbors), and the fact that they have generally refrained from contact with outside parties (e.g. the state), their influence on the political process and civil society more generally has been quite limited (ARD 2001: 14).

Rueschemeyer also argues that civic associations are not especially conducive to democracy if they have hierarchical structures, or if the interests of their members are socially exclusive and non-democratic (1998: 13-14; see also Narayan 1999). Many of the civic associations in Rwanda in the early 1990s were hierarchically organized and clearly represented vertical networks of civic engagement. According to Uvin (1998: 175), even the development NGO’s operated in a manner that was “as authoritarian and top-down as the government’s.”

Lastly, Laely suggests that the ability of religious institutions, NGOs and other types of civic associations to effectively challenge state authority, “[depends] on the scope of freedom which those in power, and their functionaries, are willing to concede” to these organizations (1997: 714).

Despite the fact that the laws in Rwanda and Burundi were changed in the early 1990s to allow for an expansion of civil liberties, the civic and political associations created in both during this time could not be too critical of the government. In the case of Burundi, associations had to abstain from any activities that were considered to pose a threat to “National Unity” (U.S. Department of State 1991-1994). In Rwanda, the activities of human rights workers were closely monitored by the government; members who strayed too far from acceptable boundaries were subject to attack by government officials and others.

---

380 This latter issue is a function of the distribution of power within a society. As Rueschemeyer suggests: “Where antidemocratic groups gain hegemonic control over the organizational expression of broad-based other interests, the democratizing effect of an organizationally dense civil society is not only neutralized but turned into its opposite” (1998: 14; see also Ottaway 2000: 80).

381 Although Laely applies this statement to Burundi, others such as Uvin have make a similar argument with respect to Rwanda (1998: 176-178).
closely associated with Habyarimana and the ruling elite (U.S. Department of State 1992-1994, ARD 2001: 22).\footnote{382 Those subject to attack were not just human rights workers, but also those who provided information and assistance to the human rights organizations. For example, Human Rights Watch reports that a number of persons who had given testimony to the International Commission of Investigation on Human Rights Violations in Rwanda since October 1, 1990, were attacked and/or killed (Human Rights Watch 1994: 37-38).}

Additionally, restrictions on the freedom of the press continued to persist in both countries. As with the establishment of civic associations more generally, the creation of an independent media in Rwanda and Burundi was quite recent.\footnote{383 It is important to recognize the fact that Rwanda did have a small, but weak independent press prior to the revision of the constitution in 1991. Although the few independent papers that existed engaged in a practice of self-censorship, they were not completely silent on the subject of government corruption and other misdeeds. According to ARTICLE 19, even newspapers such as the official paper *Imvaho* censured officials of the Habyarimana government for mismanagement from time to time. However, there were certain subjects that remained strictly off limits to the press; notably the President, the MRND and the constitutional system. Journalists who strayed too far from acceptable topics were often the targets of harassment (ARTICLE 19 1988: 38-39; 1991: 38-39).}

However, similar to each country’s official broadcast and print media, the independent media at the time was also subject to significant censorship. In each country, the types of criticisms reporters could make against the government were very limited; reporters were also required to file copies of their stories with the government prior to release (ARTICLE 19 1996: 27-30, U.S. Department of State 1993-1994; Reporters sans Frontières 1993: 45-46, 253; see also Kirschke 1996: 27-31).

In the case of Rwanda, the civil war created additional problems for independent journalists. In the early 1990’s, the government of Juvénal Habyarimana used the ongoing civil war with the RPF as a pretext for placing further restrictions on the country’s nascent independent press. The National State of Emergency declared by the President in October 1990 led to a tightening of laws on freedom of movement within the country.\footnote{384 Even before the State of Emergency was established, the ability of citizens to move about freely in Rwanda was subject to a number of legal restrictions. All citizens were required to possess national identity cards, as well as work and residential permits at all times (U.S. Department of State 1992). Conditions in Burundi during the Second Republic were very similar; citizens were also forced to carry residential permits and identification cards with them (Lemarchand 1994a: 109-110). However, during the Third Republic in Burundi these restrictions were removed. What restrictions remained were limited to areas in which the rebel group PALIPEHUTU was operating (U.S. Department of State 1992-1993).}

These additional restrictions meant that the ability of independent
Suppression of the media was also justified by the Habyarimana government on the basis of national security (ARTICLE 19 1996: 29). Journalists critical of the President, the ruling party—the Mouvement Républicain National pour la Démocratie et le Développment (“MRND(D)”—or the extremist party—the Coalition pour la Défense de la République (“CDR”)—faced the risk of being labeled “accomplices of the RPF,” and/or “threats to national security.” Many independent journalists in Rwanda endured constant harassment from government officials, as well as from members of the MRND(D), the CDR, and their respective militias—harassment that included arbitrary arrest and detention, as well as imprisonment and death (Kirschke 1996: 28-31).

Journalists in Burundi also faced harassment and censorship if their reporting was met government disapproval. However, the absence of civil war in the country, in addition to the fact that the President and his supporters were intent on democratizing the political system, meant that independent journalists did not face the same types of pressures that were encountered by journalists in Rwanda. These relatively favorable conditions continued in the months immediately following the 1993 presidential and legislative elections.

385 Interestingly enough, the extremist newspaper Kangura did not face the same sorts of obstacles other papers faced in terms of distribution. ARTICLE 19 reports that Kangura was printed free of charge by a national printing company and was actually distributed in the major cities of the country by employees of the government (1996: 36).

386 By way of contrast, independent journalists affiliated with the MRND(D), the akazu, and other extremist groups in the country largely evaded prosecution for any wrongdoing or harm caused by their reporting (ARTICLE 19 1996: 35-36; as this applies to RTLM more specifically, see ARTICLE 19 1996: 58-60).

Scholars such as Snyder (2000: 56) argue more generally that the ability of elites to “hijack the media” is dependent on three factors: “their ability to control sources of information, the ease of dividing the public into segments that can be targeted with nationalistic messages, and the level of journalists’ independence and professionalism.” The result is the creation of a marketplace of ideas in which competition is highly imperfect (as this relates to the cases of Rwanda and Burundi more specifically see Snyder 2000: chap. 6).

387 In their yearly reports regarding the condition of the media in Burundi, Reporters sans Frontières reports a number of incidences in which journalists faced varying degrees of pressure and intimidation from the government. One of the more serious of these offenses concerns the 1991 disappearance and suspected murder of deputy editor of the Burundian News Agency, Renovat Ndikumana (Reporters sans Frontières 1992-1993).

388 According to Reporters sans Frontières “the Burundian press [had] never been as free as it was between July and October 1993,” (1993: 62). However, others would disagree with this statement. According to country reports for Burundi, issued by the U.S. Department of State, some observers in the country at the time felt that the
As the above discussion demonstrates, civil society in both countries can easily be described as weak. In the case of Rwanda, based on the above evidence, it is difficult to accept the suggestion made by Longman (1999) that the large number of civic associations that sprang up in the country during the 1980s and early 1990s was indicative of an “increasingly ‘strong’” civil society (343).\(^\text{389}\) According to Longman most of these associations were not political, although their activities had political implications; they provided a space in which citizens could voice their concerns on a variety of issues, and they offered citizens the opportunity to engage in activities outside the control of the government (1999: 342-343). However, other scholars—including Uvin (1998)—stress the point that what was most at issue in Rwanda was not the quantity of civil society associations created, but the quality of these associations. From this perspective, Rwanda only appeared to have a highly developed civil society (1998: 169-171).\(^\text{390}\)

What is more important to this dissertation is the way in which institutions of civil society were used by members of the ruling elite in both countries and for what purpose. This study recognizes the fact that in both countries—throughout much of the post-independence period—civil society associations were used as a means of social control. In the case of Burundi, for example, Lemarchand (1994a), Laely (1997) and others note that the creation of cooperatives during the Second Republic was not intended to promote greater economic development. Instead cooperatives were created to ensure greater control over the rural population.\(^\text{391}\) This is also a suggestion that has been offered with regard to the cooperatives created during the Habyarimana administration (see Verwimp 2000).

---

\(^\text{389}\) Longman suggests that the creation of civic associations in the 1980s in Rwanda was in large part due to the public’s growing dissatisfaction with the performance of Habyarimana regime. He writes: “Realizing that the state and the [ruling] party were exploiting them rather than providing benefits, people sought to limit their contact with the state and party structures and to instead organize other alternatives for social and economic life”(1999: 342).

\(^\text{390}\) This is also a suggestion that has also been made about civil society in Africa more generally (for more on this, see Chabal and Daloz 1999).

\(^\text{391}\) In this regard, Lemarchand states: “Institutional coherence and organization did in fact become the
Furthermore, Uvin (1998), and Prunier (1995) argue that the institutions of civil society in Rwanda—specifically the development NGOs—were primarily used by political leaders as a means to garner greater access to foreign aid. As indicated in Chapter 5, both Rwanda and Burundi experienced severe economic decline beginning in the mid-1980s; by the 1990s Rwanda also had the added costs associated with civil war. These circumstances left both countries heavily dependent on foreign aid for their economic survival, much of which was directed through these NGOs.\(^{392}\)

More relevant to the present study is the fact that institutions of civil society were also utilized by the ruling elite in both countries as a means to reinforce a particular political paradigm. Where Burundi and Rwanda diverge is with respect to the nature of the paradigm.

In Burundi, each of the post-independence governments of Michel Micombero (1966-1976), Jean-Baptiste Bagaza (1976-1987) and Pierre Buyoya (1987-1993) used certain aspects of civil society, notably the media, as a means to foster and promote National Unity in the country. This study readily admits to the fact that the ideal of National Unity was frequently used by political and religious leaders in the country as a means to downplay, gloss over and ignore the military’s commission of human rights abuses; at times National Unity was also used by the government to justify the repression of civil liberties (see above).\(^{393}\) However, for what it’s worth, there is also evidence that indicates that institutions of civil society have been used as a consensus building tool by the regimes of Presidents Buyoya and Ndadaye during the period of transition to multiparty rule.

---

\(^{392}\) As this issue applies to the African countries more generally, see Chabal and Daloz (1999: 22-24; see also Ottaway’s discussion on “free-floating NGOs” 2000: 83-84).

\(^{393}\) The response of church leaders to the 1972 genocide is a good illustration of the use of the National Unity paradigm as a justification for repression. Although Tutsi and Hutu clergymen were generally united in their opposition to the violence that occurred in 1972, leaders of the Catholic Church advocated the official explanation offered by the government for the massacres. According to this account, “foreign influences” (e.g. colonialism and Rwanda) were responsible for the violence, \textit{not} the military. The Hutu uprisings had been conducted by those who wished to destroy National Unity. From this perspective, the government’s response was necessary in order to restore unity to the country (for further information on the statements issued by church leaders and clergymen—both in support of and in protest to the government’s response to the 1972 massacres—see Weinstein 1976: 70, 92, 118, 122, 173-174, 218, 238, 245; also Barrett et al. 2001: 161; for information regarding the government’s official
With the establishment of the Third Republic, Buyoya immediately loosened the constraints that had been placed on civil society by the Bagaza government. One of the most important changes made by the President at this time involved the removal of the numerous restrictions that had been placed on the practice of religion in the country.\(^{394}\)

The reasons for these constraints have a great deal to do with the complex relationship that has existed between church and state in Burundi since the time of independence. It is important to acknowledge upfront that the Catholic Church in Burundi did not play a significant role in the events which led up to the country’s independence. Unlike Rwanda, the European clergy in Burundi largely supported the monarchy (Lemarchand 1970: 317). At the same time, the Catholic Church, as well as the other Christian churches in Burundi, has long been regarded with a great deal of suspicion by the Tutsi ruling elite.

With respect to the Catholic Church specifically, much of this apprehension has stemmed from the decisive contribution made by the Catholic Church of Rwanda in the late 1950s to the ‘emancipation’ of the Hutu masses...and in the more timid efforts made by some church-affiliated groups and individuals in Burundi to throw their weight behind Hutu-led parties and trade unions. (Lemarchand 1994a: 112)

Instead of being perceived by the Tutsi regimes of the First and Second Republics as a political ally, the Catholic Church and its foreign missionaries were viewed as instigators of political competition in the country.\(^{395}\)

---

\(^{394}\) During the years of the Second Republic, President Bagaza placed limitations on days of worship, expelled foreign missionaries from the country, placed secondary schools under government control and closed catechism schools (the yaga mukama). According to Lemarchand, the abolition of these latter facilities was especially damaging to the Hutu community as it deprived several hundred thousand Hutu children of an education (1994a: 112-114; also Kay 1987). The negative attitude the Bagaza government held towards religious associations was not unique, but was shared by the Micombero regime. For refusing to allow the yaga mukama to be placed under government control, the churches in Burundi were accused by the Micombero government of attempting to “[incite] the Hutu population against the regime” (Africa Contemporary Record 1975-1976, 1976: B17; see also Africa Contemporary Record 1979-1980 1981: B158, Africa Contemporary Record 1984-1985 1986: B183-184, Weinstein 1976: 173-174).

\(^{395}\) What had become a source of a great deal of suspicion in later years were the efforts made by the Catholic Church to promote literacy in the Hutu population, as well as the Church’s efforts to stimulate greater participation of Hutu parishioners in local community service activities. In this latter instance, it was the Church’s
As indicated previously, President Buyoya also modified the laws governing the press and assembly to allow the public greater freedom to voice dissent—although within acceptable boundaries. Newspapers could print what they wanted, and political and civic associations could say what they pleased, as long as it did not threaten National Unity.

The downside to these restrictions, of course, was that they eliminated the opportunity of many Hutu in the country to air their grievances. Scholars such as Lemarchand (1994a) have made the additional point that the emphasis Buyoya placed on the importance of maintaining National Unity in the country stemmed at least in part from the practical realization that if civic groups were allowed to play the “ethnic card,” the chances that the Tutsi would maintain power in future governments would be substantially diminished. At the same time, it is important to recognize that the National Unity paradigm was not challenged by the Ndadaye government when it officially came to power in July 1993. Instead, the speeches and statements made to the media by the President-elect and other officials of the majority party—the Front pour la Démocratie au Burundi (“FRODEBU”)—demonstrate a continued willingness on the part of Hutu political leaders to support the principle of National Unity. And, like Buyoya, these sentiments were also supported by action.

support of the local grass-roots organizations inama sahwaniya that heavily contributed to the decision of President Bagaza to curtail the influence of Christian churches in the country. The inama sahwaniya were informal discussion groups created “for the purpose of stimulating grass-roots participation in the affairs of local communities” (Lemarchand 1994a: 112). What was especially problematic for these associations was the fact that they were operating in the country at a time during which the ruling party UPRONA was attempting to garner greater support from the masses. In this context, the inama sahwaniya came to be perceived by the government as a competitor for public support; an “[obstacle] in the way of an effective political mobilization of the rural masses” (1994a: 112-113).

396 The paradigm of National Unity is premised on the belief that there are no legitimate ethnic differences in Burundi; ethnicity is the “creation” of the Belgian colonial powers. Lemarchand suggests that removing ethnicity from the accepted political discourse in Burundi has traditionally served a dual purpose: it has legitimized Tutsi rule and de-legitimized Hutu claims to power (1994a: 31, 30-33, chap. 9; see also Ndikumana 1998: 33-34). At the same time, however, it is important to recognize that the efforts of President Buyoya to maintain National Unity in the country were reinforced with institutional changes—including the establishment of a power-sharing government that included both Tutsi and Hutu.

The importance of National Unity is clearly demonstrated in Burundi’s 1992 constitution. Reyntjens remarks: “Certainly no other country’s constitutional engineering has resulted in such an insistence on the need for ‘a spirit of national unity’. Formulated as a principle in as many as 12 Articles, this objective is made operational by the obligation in several fields to take account of the ‘diverse component parts of the Burundian population’” (1993: 565-566).

397 The government formed in July 1993 included a Tutsi Prime Minister (Sylvie Kinigi) and seats in the cabinet were distributed proportionally between Hutu and Tutsi. Additionally, as indicated in Chapter 7, region was
By way of contrast, the evidence indicates that civil society associations in Rwanda have consistently been used by the ruling elite as a means to foster and reinforce group divisions. In this respect, perhaps no other segment of civil society had as much of a polarizing impact on group relations in Rwanda as did the domestic print and broadcast media. The official media and segments of the independent media in Rwanda were used by extremist Hutu not only as a means to strike fear among the country’s civilian population, but also to incite violence against Tutsi and members of the political opposition. These interrelated tasks were partially achieved through a suppression and/or manipulation of information concerning the source and scope of the human rights violations perpetrated against the civilian population by government forces and members of the conservative Hutu political parties.

Fear and hatred were also inspired through the use of propaganda. Much of what was broadcast on Radio Rwanda, and especially on the independent radio station RTLM, were half truths intended specifically to diminish support for the democratization process in general, and the Arusha Accords and the multiparty transitional government in particular. That RTLM and the “independent” newspaper

---

398 During the 1990s, extremist Hutu associated with the MRND(D) and the akazu were by no means the only ones to have used the media as a means of furthering their particular cause. Newspapers associated with, and advocating the viewpoints of, the opposition parties were also created. According to Reporters sans Frontières, these newspapers were referred to as “‘ibinyamatiku’ (echoes of the squabbles), in which libel rubs shoulders with propaganda and incitement to racial, ethnic or regional hatred” (1993: 253). In terms of the broadcast media, in 1992 Radio Muhabura—the RPF radio station broadcast out of Uganda—began operations. Similar to Radio Rwanda, Radio Muhabura was heavily biased in much of its reporting (ARTICLE 19 1996: 26-27; see also U.S. Department of State 1995).

399 At times the information broadcast to the public was completely false. For example, two communiqués that were broadcast on the official radio station in early March 1992 are believed to have contributed to the outbreak of violence in the Bugesera region that same month. The first communiqué, issued by a fictitious organization, the Commission Inter-Africaine de la Non-violence, falsely reported that the RPF intended to launch a campaign of terrorism in the country with the help of the opposition party, the PL. Part of this campaign allegedly involved a plan to assassinate 22 political leaders and businessmen. The second communiqué, issued by Ferdinand Nahimana who was then director of the Office Rwandais d’Information (“ORINFOR”), used inflammatory language to warn listeners of further violence and misdoings to be perpetrated at the hands of the RPF. After the broadcast of this second communiqué, violence broke out in the Bugesera region and resulted in the deaths of over 200 persons and the displacement of thousands more (ARTICLE 19 1996: 16-17), (African Rights 1995: 53-54, 77-78), (Des Forges 1999: 68, 88-89), (Reporters sans Frontières 1993: 254).

400 Whereas the propaganda messages broadcast on Radio Rwanda tended to be more ambiguous and veiled, those transmitted on RTLM did not mince words, but cut directly to the point. RTLM used a programming format that was far less formal than that used by the official radio station. Humor, vulgarity, and innuendo were its trademarks and as such it appealed to a wider audience. Those who supported the democratization process in Rwanda were falsely accused by RTLM, as well as by extremist publications, of being in collusion with the RPF and

---
Kangura served as a mouthpiece for the Hutu extremists is not surprising given that both were created, supported and staffed by individuals closely associated with the President, the MRND(D), the CDR, and the akazu. As discussed in Chapter 8, the information conveyed to the public by these and other news sources—including another extremist newspaper Umurava—clearly reflected the perception that multiparty democracy was a complete and total loss relative to the previous system of single party rule.

by extension the entire Tutsi civilian population. Threats were frequently issued against members of the opposition, as well as journalists, human rights activists and others who had been openly critical of the Hutu extremists. Incidentally, in the early days of the genocide, members of these same groups were among the first to be targeted for assassination. Finally, as a harbinger of things to come, in the months immediately prior to the genocide, the extremist media warned the public that massacres and excessive violence were going to occur in Rwanda. However, the source of this violence they falsely attributed to the RPF (ARTICLE 19 1996: chaps. 4-5), (Chrétien et al. 1995), (African Rights 1995: 69-85), (Prunier 1995: 210-211, 222-223), (Des Forges 1999: 4-5, 65-95, also 143-172), (Reporters sans Frontières 1992-1994), (Kirschke 1996).

Many of these same individuals were later directly (or indirectly) involved in the genocide. An especially salient indicator of the close association Kangura enjoyed with powerful segments of the conservative Hutu elite is demonstrated by the harassment and persecution incurred by those unfortunate enough to be targeted by the newspaper as “enemies” and “traitors.” ARTICLE 19 writes: “Whatever Kangura called for usually occurred, when it related to specific individuals, and this added to the fear, which the newspaper inspired. This correlation between what was publicized and what later followed, appears to have stemmed from the newspaper’s relationship with Akazu members, rather than from any independent influence which the newspaper actually enjoyed” (1996: 38, 36-37; see also Kirschke 1996: 35-39). A similar power was held by the RTLM who, like Kangura, was also the recipient of preferential treatment from high-ranking government officials and members of the MRND(D), akazu and the like (ARTICLE 19 1996: 40-45, 56-60). In terms of its affiliation with the President, Prunier (1995) asserts that RTLM was only “conditionally loyal” to Habyarimana. Much of the former’s support depended on the latter’s level of support for the Arusha peace process (1995: 189; for a fuller discussion on the nature of the relationship between the government, extremist groups, and the media—particularly RTLM and Kangura—see ARTICLE 19 1996: chap. 4, Kirschke 1996: 40-44, Des Forges 1999: 66-69, African Rights 1995: 70-75, 78-84, Prunier 1995: 129, 188-189, and the study by Chrétien et al. 1995).

It is fair to say that in Burundi there were some newspapers that clearly exhibited a pro-Tutsi bias, including L’Indépendent and Le Carrefour des Idées, both of which were closely connected to the former ruling party the UPRONA. President Ndadaye, in a speech given 23 August 1993, went as far as to accuse both publications of “poisoning people’s minds,” and “rekindling divisions,” within society (Reporters sans Frontières 1994: 63). Also in that same month, the Minister of Information filed a complaint against the L’Indépendent, as well as a second publication, Panafrika, for publishing inflammatory articles about political leaders (for more on this point, see Reyntjens 1995: 13). At the same time, by the summer of 1993, the influence of these and other biased publications in Burundi was countered by the fact that control of the official media was now in the hands of a moderate Hutu-led government. In their 1995, report Reporters sans Frontières indicates that many of those who worked in the media in 1993 were of the opinion that they were helping to establish pluralism...and strengthen democracy” (1995: 50). It is also somewhat telling that, after the assassination of Melchoir Ndadaye and other high-ranking members of FRODEBU in October 1993, Radio Burundi called for a halt in the violence and made “appeals for people to ‘forgive one another, be reconciled with each other and try to live peacefully with one another despite past history of inter-ethnic massacres,”” (IPS 29.10.93).

However, as a final note, in the years following the October 1993 coup d’état, the character of the media in Burundi drastically changed. Similar to Rwanda in the months prior to the genocide in 1994, the media in Burundi became a tool used by both sides in the conflict to incite the masses (Human Rights Watch 1996: 15-16), (Amnesty International 1995: 85-86), (Reporters sans Frontières 1995, 1996).
The Catholic Church is another element of civil society in Rwanda that has traditionally been a source of division. Based on extensive historical evidence, several studies strongly suggest that the Catholic Church in Rwanda contributed heavily to the creation of the ethnic ideologies and myths that eventually dominated not only political discourse, but the consciousness of the people (see for example studies by Lemarchand 1970, 1994a, Linden 1977, Longman 1998, 2001, Prunier 1995, de Lespinay 2001, Mamdani 2001, and Hoyweghen 1996).

During the period of colonial rule the Catholic Church acted as “the generator and stabiliser of class structures” within the country through its advocacy and promotion of the doctrine of Tutsi supremacy (Hoyweghen 1996: 380-381). For a variety of reasons, in the years preceding independence the Church drastically altered its position to one that both supported and legitimised the Hutu revolutionary movement, and the authoritarian systems of government the movement spawned. Toward this end, the European missionaries “promoted an ideology of exploitation that identified the Tutsi as culprits in Rwandan history” (Longman 2001: 147).

In the ensuing years, and with little exception, the indigenous leaders of the Catholic Church in Rwanda were most often silent with respect to the socio-economic inequalities that prevailed in the country. They and other church leaders did not speak out regarding the human rights abuses conducted

---

403 As this applies to the promotion of the infamous “Hamitic hypothesis,” see specifically the studies by Linden (1977: 4-5, 164-165), Prunier (1995: 5-23), Mamdani (2001:80-87), and Longman (2001: 144-147). According to Lemarchand, one of the reasons why the Catholic Church—during the first half of the 20th century—placed such a strong emphasis on the Tutsi’s inherent right to rule was that it believed a revolution would likely produce a system of Communist rule. The Church warned the colonial administration that the Tutsi were the best defense against such an event occurring, as there were none “‘who [were] better qualified, more intelligent, more active, more capable of appreciating progress and more fully accepted by the people’” (Classe 1930 quoted in Lemarchand 1970: 73; see also Lemarchand 1974: 144).

404 To explain the Church’s change of heart with respect to the Tutsi, Hoyweghen points to the two different strands of Catholicism preached in Rwanda in the years after World War II. The first stressed the importance of collective rights and social justice (a “social Catholicism”); the other an older more conservative variety of Catholicism that considered “society and structure as neutral and the individual as the safeguarder of morality” (1996: 381). Given their history of political, social, and economic disenfranchisement, the former strand obviously held greater appeal for many Hutu in the country (1996: 385, see also ff 29; also Lemarchand 1970: 106-109). Another reason given for the Church’s attitudinal change was the posture of the Tutsi clergy—many of whom had become strong advocates of self-rule (for more information on this last point, see Prunier 1995: 44, also Lemarchand 1970: 136-137).
by the Kayibanda (1961-1973) and Habyarimana (1973-1994) regimes. During the civil war, many church leaders blamed the international community—or the process of democratization itself—for the violence that was occurring in the country, instead of those actually responsible. Furthermore, during the months of April and May 1994, the statements issued by leaders of the Catholic and Protestant churches failed to either categorize the violence that was occurring as genocide, or to identify its perpetrators.

This behavior certainly displays a degree of negligence on the part of the churches in Rwanda. Yet, it is the active participation of church leaders, employees and members in the genocide that most clearly represents the attitude held by many within the churches. Many assisted in the actual killing. Others helped to organize the slaughters. Still others refused shelter to the victims or actively assisted in

---

405 This is a point that has been made by a number of scholars including Longman (2001: 147-152) and Hoyweghen (1996: 385-387). In the 1980’s and early 1990’s, however, there were some in the Catholic Church, or associated with the Church, who openly criticized the Habyarimana government, as well as the Catholic Church for the latter’s corruption and collusion with the government. One of the more vocal critics was Abbé Silvio Sindambiwe, editor-in-chief of the Catholic paper Kinyamateka. Beginning in 1992, many leaders of the Catholic and Protestant churches were also actively involved in the peace negotiations with the RPF. However, Hoyweghen writes that the motivation for the participation of church leaders in the democratization and peace processes was questioned by those who suggested that these leaders became involved only for the purpose of re-establishing their credibility among with the masses (1996: 385-390; for additional information on the role of churches in the peace process in Rwanda, see African Rights 1995: 872-873).

406 According to Hoyweghen, given their close association with the Habyarimana government, it is likely that the leaders of the major churches in Rwanda knew that the real perpetrators of the violence were those connected with the MRND(D), and the akazu (1996: 391-392). Once the civil war started in 1990, only one of the eight Catholic Bishops in the country at the time, Mgr. Thaddée Nsengiyumva, took an active stance against the activities of the government. The other remaining Bishops either supported the regime, or were completely silent on the matter. Much the same attitude was held by the other churches in Rwanda. It is telling that André Louis, the Secretary-General of the Internationale Démocrate-Chrétienne in Rwanda, suggested that the “[opposition] parties had no serious programmes, that democratization promised to be destabilizing, and that the RPF was operating on behalf of the Ugandan government with the aim of installing a sympathetic government in Kigali” (African Rights 1995: 871-872).

407 Instead the signatories of the statement issued by church leaders on 13 May 1994 recommended that “all Christians of goodwill refuse [to participate] in acts of massacres and to distance themselves from those responsible for acts of pillage and vandalism. Rather they should devote themselves more to prayer to ask God for peace for Rwanda and they should commit themselves to concrete acts of charity, forgiveness and atonement for all wrongs caused” (African Rights 1995: 897).

408 The complicity of the Rwandan churches in the genocide is documented in numerous studies and articles, most notably the work of Longman (1998), (2001), African Rights (1995: chap. 12), and Des Forges (1999: 245-248). For an extensive list of newspaper articles that also address the behavior of the Christian churches in Rwanda, see Longman (2001: 158). It is somewhat ironic that the section of the World Christian Encyclopedia devoted to Rwanda, includes no mention of the complicity of the churches, or their employees, in the genocide (Barrett et al. 2001: 630-631).

On a separate note, it is important to recognize that there were many priests, pastors, nuns and lay staff who did make an effort to protect the victims of the genocide; many of these same individuals were also killed by the
their capture. Given the degree of their complicity in the genocide, it is difficult to consider the Christian churches in Rwanda as anything other than a source of bonding social capital.\footnote{Even the human rights organizations in Rwanda cannot escape blame in this regard. According to the U.S. Department of State, four of the nine human rights NGO’s in Rwanda supported the position of the President and the former ruling party concerning the source of the violence in the country (U.S. Department of State 1994). Additionally, members of the human rights NGO’s also participated in the genocide (on this latter point, see Uvin 1998: 172; also African Rights 1995: chap. 3).}

Longman suggests that, instead of acting to challenge the government in the name of the people, “[t]he churches [in Rwanda]…worked with the state to preserve existing configurations of power” (2001: 151).\footnote{Contrary to scholars such as Hoyweghen (1996), Longman strongly suggests that the churches in Rwanda were by no means weak institutions. The Christian churches commanded large numbers of followers and had access to vast amounts of resources. As such, they had the power to influence social, political and economic affairs in the country. Yet, because so many looked to the churches as a source of individual wealth and prestige, the churches largely refrained from challenging the status quo (2001: 149-150).} In the post-independence era (as in the colonial period which preceded it) the close association between church and state in Rwanda stemmed primarily from the fact that the majority of religious leaders were members of the dominant group in power.\footnote{This was also the case in Burundi, although to a lesser extent. By the early 1990s, four of the eight Catholic bishops in Burundi were Hutu, as were the leaders of both the Methodist and Free Methodist Churches (Guichaoua 1995: 750). In the case of Rwanda, by the early 1990’s, only one out of nine Catholic bishops in the country was a Tutsi; by the time the genocide began this number was only two. In terms of Tutsi involvement in leadership positions in the Protestant churches, according to Longman, they were frequently “relegated to obscure parishes and less influential positions” (2001: 152; see also Hoyweghen 1996: 382, Des Forges 1999: 43-44, Guichaoua 1995: 774-775, and Theunis 1995: 293). Under the reign of Juvénal Habyarimana, the government’s relationship with the Catholic Church, as well as the other Christian churches in the country, became especially close. National church leaders were regularly consulted by Habyarimana on issues relating to development and other aspects of policy-making. The Archbishop of the Catholic Church—Mgr. Vincent Nsengiyunma—was even made a member of the Central Committee of the MRND (Hoyweghen 1996: 383, 392; see also Longman 2001: 147-}

Due to their similar backgrounds and interests, most church leaders worked alongside their wealthy and powerful counterparts in government and industry to preserve the existing power structure against the growing demands for change. According to Longman (1998: 55-57, 2001) and others, all three groups resisted political change in Rwanda for the obvious reason that their power, wealth, and prestige derived from the system as is (see also Hoyweghen 1996: 386).

This study in no way denies the fact that religious institutions in Burundi—particularly the Catholic Church—showed a great deal of favoritism towards the Tutsi in terms of both education and employment opportunities. It was in this way that “the church...contributed to the social and political...
cleavage of the country and to the fact that at independence, the intellectual and political elite were for the most part Tutsi” (Barrett et al. 2001: 161). At the same time, however, and for of the reasons outlined above, the relationship between church and state in Burundi has most often been less than cordial. Additionally, there is little evidence that suggests church leaders or their employees rendered support to, or were in any way actively participated in, the unrest that followed the assassination of the President and other government leaders in 1993. Instead, church leaders in Burundi immediately called for a restoration of the multiparty government and a cessation of hostilities. They were joined in their condemnation of the October coup d’état by other institutions of civil society, as well as political parties (Reyntjens 1995: 14), (Guichaoua 1995: 27).412

Kinship Groups

Another way in which social structures is measured by this dissertation is the different ways in which groups have traditionally been ranked socially in each country. As a general reminder, the decision to focus on kinship groups, patron-client systems and informal institutions of mediation as alternative measures of social structures stems from the suggestion made by Karlström (1999), Lemarchand (1992a), and other scholars that a strict concentration on western-style institutions of civil society (e.g. the media, NGOs etc.) overlooks the important role that other informal institutions have as a cohesive force in African society, as well as their potential for creating “a more productive engagement between state and society” (Karlström 1999: 106).


412 For further information on the role of the Catholic Church in Burundi in the 1993 conflict and afterward, including its promotion of the formation of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission, see Weinberger (2005). To determine whether or not the churches in Burundi were involved in the violence that occurred in the months and years following the 1993 coup, this dissertation consulted a variety of sources including the annual reports by Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch (Africa Watch), the United States Department of State, and Africa Contemporary Record. This study also conducted a search for articles on Lexis-Nexis that specifically addressed the activities of the churches in Burundi during this time. The only information this study was able to obtain on this particular subject is a brief entry in the 1994 U.S. Department of State Human Rights Report for Burundi which states that, “ethnic alignments by religious affiliation led to polarization, violence, and to mutual attacks on one another's churches by representatives of the Catholic Majority and of various Protestant denominations.”
In Burundi and Rwanda the two main types of familial groupings are lineage and clan. Although in both countries different social status is attached to different lineage groups, Lemarchand has made frequent reference to the fact that a far more complex system of ranking has traditionally existed in Burundi (Lemarchand 1970, 1974, 1994a). For example, with respect to the Tutsi subgroup, the Banyaruguru, Lemarchand (1970: 24) notes that

the usual distinctions made by the Barundi are between the very good families (*imiryango myiza*), those that are rather good (*imiryango myiza cone*), neither good nor bad (*imiryango si myiza si mibi*) and bad (*imiryango mibi*) [italics in original]. No less than forty-four different patrilineages thus enter into the Tutsi- Banyaruguru segment, each in turn falling into a specific social category. Very much the same type of classification and terminology applies to the Hutu.

According to Weinstein (1976: 146), the 30 or so lineages within the Tutsi-Hima subgroup were ranked in a similar manner. What is most important about lineage status in Burundi is the fact that traditionally the status of one’s lineage had nothing whatsoever to do with his or her “ethnic” identity. In many instances, a Hutu could “outrank” a Tutsi by virtue of the family group he belonged to (Lemarchand 1994a: 11).

As indicated above, there is a distinction made in Burundian society between the Tutsi-Banyaruguru and the Tutsi-Hima. The former group is ranked considerably higher socially than the latter. The name Banyaruguru itself means “people from above” in Kirundi. By comparison, the Hima

---

413 A lineage is a kinship group comprised of individuals who are believed to have descended from a common ancestor. Membership in a lineage is mutually exclusive. A clan, on the other hand, is a heterogeneous social category that includes several different lineages. Unlike the lineage groups, clans do not have specific leaders (C. Newbury 1988: 95-96; for studies that address various aspects relating to the role and influence of clans and lineages in Rwanda and/or Burundi, see Trouwborst 1962: 133-136, d’Hertefelt 1962, Maquet 1970, Lemarchand 1970, 1974, 1994a: chap. 1, Linden 1977: 10-11, D. Newbury 1980, C. Newbury 1978, 1988, Prunier 1995, and Scherrer 2002: 24-25).

414 This particular view is contrary to the position taken by scholars such as Horowitz who suggests that the societies of Burundi and Rwanda are “ranked”; in other words ethnicity and social status coincide. Horowitz argues that in these types of societies, communal groups are ranked hierarchically with social mobility difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. There is an “unequal distribution of worth between superiors and subordinates [that] is acknowledged and reinforced by an elaborate set of behavioral prescriptions and prohibitions” (1985: 24). When conflict does occur, it is a conflict between different ethnic *classes* (1985: 21-36). Horowitz’s categorization of Burundi as a ranked society is contrary to a great deal of historical evidence which indicates that traditional social cleavages in Burundi were cross-cutting, not reinforcing.

415 Seven of these lineages are highly ranked, 10 ranked as “good,” and 14 to 15 ranked as “bad.”

416 There are no similar status divisions among the Hutu in Burundi.

417 Evidence of the Tutsi-Banyaruguru’s higher social status is detected from the fact that members of this group could traditionally intermarry with the *ganwa* (see Trouwborst 1962: 134).
are described as having traditionally been a group that “[evoked] disdain if not outright contempt” (Lemarchand 1994a: 11; see also 1970: 23-24, 1974: 139). During the period of single party rule the social distinction between these two groups became the source of a great deal of animosity and contempt.418

One of the most important characteristics that distinguish Burundian society from that in Rwanda is the fact that, prior to independence, the group with the highest social status was the ganwa, not the Tutsi. The ganwa (or “princes of the blood”) was a social category that consisted of a number of corporate descent groups, all of whom were related by blood to the mwami, or king. Lemarchand, Reyntjens and numerous other scholars contend that it was the actions of the ganwa—their struggles for power within Burundi—that created a certain sense of social cohesion among the other groups in society.419 As has been stated in previous chapters, it was not until the period immediately before and immediately after independence that identities in Burundi polarized along Hutu-Tutsi lines.420

It is important to reiterate the fact that many scholars who have studied one or both countries contend that the identities “Hutu” and “Tutsi” are social constructs; the political salience of each a function of context (see for example Lemarchand 1970: 344-350, 1994a: 18-30, C. Newbury 1978, 1988, Uvin 1998, and Mamdani 2001). As this applies to Burundi specifically, group identities were understandably shaped and hardened by events such as the 1959 Hutu Revolution in Rwanda, the 1965 assassination of Prime Minister Pierre Ngendadumwe (a Hutu), and the 1972 partial genocide of the Hutu

---

418 Throughout most of the country’s post-independence history, the Hima have controlled the governing system. All of the first three Presidents of the Republic of Burundi—Michel Micombero, Jean-Baptiste Bagaza and Pierre Buyoya—were of Hima social origins. In July 1971 the bad blood between the Hima and Banyaruguru resulted in a purge of all Banyaruguru from positions of power in the country (see Table 5.1).  
419 On this point, Lemarchand writes: “Just as the degrees of social distance within the Tutsi stratum were at times more perceptible than between Tutsi and Hutu, the distance between them and the princely families was equally if not more conspicuous” (1970: 24). Added to this was the fact that the constant battle for power between the different ganwa groups, as well as between the ganwa and mwami, prompted both to adopt a more conciliatory attitude towards the lower class Hutu and Tutsi, all in the pursuit of “relative gains.” By way of contrast, because of their strength and power, the Tutsi monarchy in Rwanda did not feel the need to “pander to the masses” (Lemarchand 1970: 24; see also Laely 1997: 699).
420 In the years after independence, the ganwa were assimilated into the Tutsi social group (Lemarchand 1994a: 15).
in Burundi. The latter event in particular contributed to the “Hutu’s shared consciousness of being a martyred community,” and their perception of the Tutsi as a “foreign, unnatural, evil element” (Lemarchand 1994a: 103).

Identities in Burundi have also been manipulated by political actors in order to further a particular political agenda. As discussed previously, the Tutsi political elite in Burundi has traditionally maintained the perspective that there are no differences between Hutu and Tutsi; any references made to ethnic distinctions they consider to be “at best, a figment of the colonial imagination and, at worst, part of a neoimperialist plot aimed at pitting one group of citizens against another” (Lemarchand 1994a: 9; see also 22-33). On the other hand, many political leaders in the Hutu community have argued that ethnicity does in fact exist and is the source of past injustices perpetrated against the Hutu people.

In contrast to Burundi, the traditional social structure in Rwanda has been described by scholars as far less variegated, with fewer social rankings and cross-cutting cleavages. For instance there are no distinct sub-groupings of Tutsi or Hutu. There are also fewer clans in Rwanda than in Burundi (18 compared to approximately 200) (Weinstein 1976: 272), (Trouwborst 1962: 133), (D. Newbury 1980), (d’Hartefelt 1971). Unlike Burundi, Rwanda has never had a separate ruling class. The primary social, economic and political divisions in the country have always been between Hutu and Tutsi. During the period of monarchical rule, the mwami of Rwanda stood at the top of a social system in which, “the allocation of power, wealth and privilege tended to coincide with, and reinforce, ethnic distinctions” (Lemarchand 1977: 69).

421 Furthermore, Laely (1997) has made the point that, during periods in which no serious conflict occurred, the main sources of discord have largely been based on economic or social inequalities. It is only during times of “overt hostilities” that Tutsi-Hutu identities have come to the fore (1997: 701; this point has also been made by Lemarchand 1994a: 14-15).

422 A good example of the Hutu’s perception of being an oppressed group can be seen in the “Manifeste des Etudiants Hutu du Burundi” issued on 17 December 1969. The Manifesto mistakenly charged that the Tutsi for years had subjugated the Hutu and Twa (with the assistance of the Belgians), and that the government’s goal was to exterminate the Hutu (Weinstein 1976: 178).

423 A good example of this particular view can be seen in the “White Book” issued by the Micombero government following the 1972 genocide. According to the document, the episodes of ethnic violence that occurred in the country in 1972 were inspired by foreign parties (e.g. Belgium) (Weinstein 1976: 74).

424 For an excellent discussion on the “meta-conflict” in Burundi, see Lemarchand (1994a: chap. 2).

425 There are Hima in Rwanda although they are not considered to be a sub-group of the Tutsi (Scherrer
The traditional social system in place within both countries has been described as a caste system. According to Maquet (1970: 109-110), a caste system is a closed social system in which one’s social status is primarily determined by birth (see also Lemarchand 1970: 5-6, d’Hertefelt 1962, and Trouwborst 1962). In the case of Rwanda, the author suggests that the stratification system in place allowed for only a very limited degree of social mobility—largely through marriage. The other form of social mobility was kwihutura, a form of ennoblement by which a Hutu was granted Tutsi status. In Burundi this particular process was kihutura.

It has been suggested that Maquet’s view of Rwandan society as a closed social system is overly simplistic. Critics contend that Maquet’s perspective overlooks some subtle, albeit important, differences between the social system that existed in the southern and central regions of the country and that which existed in the north. The system in place in the north has been categorized as one in which caste and class coexisted. In other words, a parallel set of social structures existed which allowed the Hutu in the north—

---

426 This particular categorization is similar to Horowitz’s classification of Rwanda and Burundi as ranked societies (see above). Both Maquet and Lemarchand make a distinction between “caste” and “class,” the latter of which is described by Maquet as an “open” type of social system. A social system is considered to be “open,” “when it is possible for an individual to climb into it during his lifetime, and when a large number of social relations admit actors belonging to different strata” (1970: 110). This particular distinction is one for which the author was originally criticized by Lemarchand for not making. In this regard, Maquet’s earlier work (1964) was criticized for its categorization of the Hutu and Tutsi of Rwanda as “social classes” (see Lemarchand 1970: 6, 1974: 140). Without going into too much detail, it is worth mentioning that, in a number of his studies, Lemarchand provides several reasons why these social groupings should not be categorized as social classes. In the case of the Hutu of Rwanda, for example, he refers to the fact that the group as a whole did not possess a consciousness of themselves as a class with a unified set of interests (1970: 5-9; also 1974: 140-144).

427 Maquet is also firm in his suggestion that the two castes were primarily endogamous; intermarriage was very rare and usually the result of very special circumstances (1970: 111-112; see also d’Hertefelt 1962: 49-50). Other authors, however, suggest that marriages between Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda were more common, see for instance C. Newbury (1995: 13), Mamdani (2001), and Scherrer (2002). In the case of Burundi, Trouwborst (1962) states that the Tutsi-Hima, and Hutu were traditionally endogamous, although restrictions on intermarriage were not strictly observed (134; as it pertains to the frequency of intermarriage in Burundi, see also Lemarchand 1990: 93, 1994a: 8-9).

428 According to Gravel, however, the absorption of Hutu into the Tutsi caste can be interpreted as a strategy on the part of the latter to check the power of the former. In other words, in situations in which a Hutu lineage was perceived by a Tutsi chief as having become too powerful, the lineage would be “tutsified” in order to eliminate any future competitors for power ((1962: 229) Lemarchand 1970: 38-39; see also Prunier 1995: 13-14, 21-22, C. Newbury 1988: 52). Regardless of the intent behind the kwihutura, all of these scholars agree that social advancement for the Hutu became virtually impossible in later years.

429 While it was seldom the case that a Tutsi was demoted to the status of Hutu, in the case of the ganwa, the threat of demotion was always an issue; in this context, “[the ganwa] lost their princely status and became a Tutsi whenever a king bearing their dynastic name ascended to the throne—a phenomenon known as gutahira.
the Kiga—to continue to “consider their honor as the highest one” (Gerth and Mills 1958: 189, quoted in Lemarchand 1970: 476). Because the northern region was annexed by the Tutsi rather late compared to other areas, it is suggested that the Hutu-Kiga’s indigenous institutions, their culture and way of life prevailed, despite attempts made by the Tutsi to absorb the group into the caste structure (Lemarchand 1970: 99-101). The tenuous relationship between the Kiga and the central government of Rwanda came to play an especially important role in the course of future events in the country.

The case of the Kiga provides another good illustration of the influence that institutions and context have on the formation of social identities. In this respect, the political salience of the identities “Hutu” and “Tutsi” in Rwanda was impacted by the degree to which the institutions of the Tutsi monarchy were able to become embedded within society.

From her research into the importance that lineages and clans once held for the people of the Kinyaga province of southwest Rwanda, C. Newbury (1978), (1988) demonstrates that a more flexible social system once existed in Rwanda. However, similar to the way in which the process occurred elsewhere in the country, the expansion of the Tutsi Kingdom into Kinyaga led to a decisive weakening of the political power of lineages and to the emergence of “ethnicity” as the more relevant form of identity. In this regard,

the category ‘Tutsi’ assumed hierarchical overtones which heretofore...had been of minor significance. As the political arena widened and the intensity of political activity increased, these classifications [of Hutu and Tutsi] became stratified and rigidified. Rather than simply

[italics in original], loosely translated as ‘social demotion’” (Lemarchand 1994a: 8).

430 This particular phenomenon relates directly to Max Weber’s concept of “ethnic coexistence.” In essence he argues that when vertical and horizontal system coexist the potential for conflict is greater (on this point see Lemarchand 1970: 97-99; also 1974: 138-142).

431 For a contrasting opinion regarding the extent to which the Kiga were integrated into the Tutsi Kingdom, see Maquet (1970: 122).

432 Much of the bitterness and resentment felt on the part of the Kiga towards the Tutsi stemmed from the latter’s imposition of their own form of land tenure in place of the existing Kiga system. The ubukonde was a clientage agreement in which a Hutu client (a bagererwa) leased land from a Hutu patron (a bakonde). Under the new system put into place by the Tutsi rulers, Hutu lands were confiscated by Tutsi chiefs and allocated to a new set of Tutsi clients—the bagererwa politiques (for a full discussion, see Lemarchand 1970: 230-233). During the years that led up to the country’s independence, the anti-monarchical, anti-Tutsi attitude of the Hutu counter-elite from the north gave the revolutionary movement a decidedly xenophobic quality. Lemarchand makes the additional point that the northern Hutu did not desire a reform of the monarchy per se. Instead, they sought to replace the existing hierarchical institutions with their own (1970: chap. 3).
conveying the connotation of cultural difference from Tuutsi, Hutu came to be associated with and eventually defined by inferior status (C. Newbury 1978: 21).433

As discussed in greater detail below, as well as in the Chapter 7 of this study, the system of social stratification in Rwanda (and to a lesser extent in Burundi) became even less flexible as a result of the policies enacted by the Belgian Trust Authority.

In addition to the influence that formal institutions had on the formation of reinforcing social cleavages in Rwanda, the informal institutions embodied by the patron-client system also had a significant impact on social relations. However, before discussing the difference between Rwanda and Burundi in terms of their traditional clientage systems, it is necessary to focus first on another measurement of social structures: region.

Regional Identities

Regional identities have been the source of a great deal of intra-group friction in Rwanda and Burundi. In Rwanda, these tensions have traditionally been between conservative Hutu from the northern region of the country and the more moderate Hutu from the southern and central regions. As stated above, the difference in perspective associated with these regional groups stems primarily from the fact that the northern region was annexed by the Tutsi far later than the southern and central regions. As a result, the institutions of Tutsi rule, including those associated with the patron-client system were never fully embedded in Kiga society. Throughout the entire post-independence period the discord between these groups was played out in the political arena.434

433 D. Newbury (1980) offers a similar argument with respect to the clans in Rwanda.
434 Grégoire Kayibanda, the first President of Rwanda, was from central Rwanda. During his rule, positions of power were distributed to the Hutu from the central and northern regions of the country as per party membership in the Parti du Mouvement de l’Émancipation Hutu (“PARMEHUTU”). Southern Hutu, who where primarily members of the moderate Association pour la Promotion Sociale de la Masse (“APROSOMA”), were eased out of positions of power between 1964 and 1967. Kayibanda was eventually overthrown in 1973 by Maj.-General Juvénal Habyarimana who was from the Gisenyi préfecture in the northwest part of the country. Once in power, many positions of importance in government and the ruling party were awarded to Hutu from the north, specifically those from the Gisenyi and Ruhengeri préfectures (Prunier 1995: 57-58, 60-61, 85-87) (Lemarchand 1970: 233-237; 279-283).

On a related note, regional identity also factored into the formation of political parties in the early 1990s. For instance, the leadership and the rank and file of the MRND(D) were primarily from the north. Membership in
In Burundi, regional differences have also played an important role in political affairs. The primary contest for power in the late 1960s and early 1970s was between Tutsi from the southern part of the country—specifically the province of Bururi—and those from the Muramvya province in the north. Like the Hutu from the northern regions of Rwanda, the Tutsi from the south have traditionally been more conservative in their political perspectives; they also suspected the Muramvya faction of harboring monarchical sympathies.435

More generally Lemarchand (1994a) makes the point that intra-ethnic divisions in Burundi—between the Hima and Banyaruguru or the Bururi and Muramvya—are not necessarily reinforcing.436 In practice, however, regional identities in both countries have not been conducive to political moderation. As indicated in Chapter 5 of this study, several of the purges and episodes of intra-group violence that have occurred in Rwanda and Burundi since independence have been based in part on the regional identities of the groups involved.

**Patron-Client Systems**

Lemarchand has frequently suggested that the type of patron-client systems that traditionally existed in Rwanda and Burundi heavily influenced relations between Hutu and Tutsi. In accordance with democratization studies that address the nexus between patron-client systems—or neo-patrimonial regimes—and the success of democratic transition, this dissertation posits that the clientage systems of Rwanda and Burundi also influenced the willingness of political leaders in both countries to accept the prospect of multiparty rule.

the MDR (formerly PARMEHUTU-MDR) largely consisted of Hutu from central Rwanda, although it also included a northern element. The more moderate Parti Social Démocratique (“PSD”) was also based in central Rwanda (Prunier 1995: 123-124; 180-183, 199-206; also African Rights 1995 and Des Forges 1999).

435 Once the Muramvya faction was effectively purged from positions of power in government in the early 1970s, the “Bururi lobby,” as they are referred to by Lemarchand, was able to consolidate its grip on the political system for the years to come (1994a: 84-89).

436 The author points to the fact that historically some of the Hima who were very influential in government, including Jean Ntiruhwama, were from Muramvya. Ntiruhwama was a strong advocate for greater Hima participation in government and the ruling party. However, because he was from Muramvya, he was suspected by members of the Bururi faction of being sympathetic to the cause of the monarchists and was removed from government in November 1967 (Lemarchand 1994a: 81-82; 84-89).
Historically the main form of patron-client agreement in Rwanda was the *ubuhake* or “cattle contract.” According to the terms of the agreement, in exchange for a cow, a client was expected to perform certain services for his patron.\(^{437}\) An important part of the *ubuhake* contract was the patron’s agreement to provide protection to his client “in every circumstance of life” (Lemarchand 1970: 36).\(^{438}\) This latter component of the contract is considered by some scholars to have been essential in a country marked by stark inequalities between groups; it offered a way for the Hutu to mitigate the harsh consequences of Tutsi rule.\(^{439}\)

In this respect, Maquet (1954), (1970) suggests that the system provided a form of social cohesion for different groups in Rwandan society. However, scholars such as C. Newbury (1988) contend that this particular view fails to consider the various other types of clientage agreements that existed throughout Rwanda, many of which had especially negative repercussions for Hutu-Tutsi relations. Additionally, the impact that the clientage system had on Rwandan society varied by region, as well as by time period. Similar to indigenous political institutions in Rwanda, the informal institutions of the patron-client system were also shaped by the consolidation of Tutsi rule, and the advent of colonial rule.

\(^{437}\) The services performed by the client (*garagu*) for his patron (*shebuja*) varied depending on whether the client was Hutu or a Tutsi. For example, both Hutu and Tutsi clients were expected to provide certain products to the patron (e.g. beer, produce etc.), as well as to accompany the patron on his travels. For the Hutu clients, however, an additional obligation was the provision of manual labor in the patron’s fields (discussed in greater detail below) (Maquet 1970: 118-119). The duties and obligations associated with another type of social contract in Rwanda, the *umuheto*, were similar in some respects to those of the *ubuhake* (for further discussion on this latter point, see C. Newbury 1988: 77-78).

\(^{438}\) These protections included protection in lawsuits and assistance for a client’s family should they fall on hard times. The patron was also expected to “bail out” or defend his client if the client committed an offense (Maquet 1970: 118).

\(^{439}\) Or, as stated by Lemarchand (1970: 36), the patron-client system was a way for the Hutu to obtain protection in a society in which “centralisation of [Tutsi] authority was carried to an extreme.” Generally, for the Hutu peasant, an agreement with a patron was not made for economic advantage, but to avoid overexploitation. Because a Hutu’s subordinate status in Rwandan society left him defenseless, he sought protection from persons “who [were] equal to those who pushed him around” (Maquet 1970: 120). For the Tutsi, on the other hand, the patron-client system was simply another social advantage to which they were privy as a group; other social advantages included the possibility of political advancement (Maquet 1970: 115-117, 120-121).

C. Newbury demonstrates in her analysis that, in the Kinyaga region of Rwanda, the acquisition of a patron was one of a number of different ways in which an individual could achieve economic and political protection. Other strategies included ownership of cattle (by way of marriage, gift or purchase), as well as membership in a wealthy kinship group (1988: 81-82). C. Newbury’s basic point is that clientage contracts, such as the *ubuhake*, were by no means universal in Rwanda, at least not in the period prior the reign of Mwami Rwambigiri in the 19th century.
One of the characteristics that most clearly distinguish the clientage system in Rwanda from that which existed in Burundi is the fact that in Rwanda the patron-client system and the political system were closely connected. In other words, the position of chief and hill chief coincided with that of economic patron.\textsuperscript{440} What became problematic for clients under this system was the fact that they were both politically and economically bound to the same person. With little exception, the system provided few remedies for clients who had been mistreated or exploited by a patron.\textsuperscript{441}

The case of Kinyaga in southwest Rwanda provides a good illustration of the ways in which the clientage system became more oppressive over time. C. Newbury (1988) attributes much of this trend to the loss of political autonomy and strength on the part of lineage groups vis-à-vis the Tutsi monarchy.\textsuperscript{442} The weakening of lineages occurred in large part as a result of the introduction of new types of patron-client agreements—such as the \textit{ubuhake} cattle contract—that bound individual clients to a patron-chief instead of whole lineages. What this meant for the residents of Kinyaga was that individual members of one lineage now owed their political and economic allegiances to different Tutsi patrons.\textsuperscript{443} These

\textsuperscript{440} Additionally, chiefs and hill chiefs were themselves also clients. The hill chief was the political client of the chief from whom he received his appointment; the chief, in turn, was the political client of the \textit{mwami} (to whom he owed his appointment). The relationship between the \textit{mwami} and the chiefs (and between the chiefs and hill chiefs) was that of lord and vassal. In return for his appointment, a chief or hill chief was obliged to perform certain duties for his particular patron. These duties included the collection of tribute and taxes for the patron (Lemarchand 1970: 37-39), (C. Newbury 1988: chaps. 5-7).

\textsuperscript{441} One of the few remedies available to the average peasant was the protections offered by the army chief. As discussed in the next chapter of this study, there were three types of chiefs in Rwanda. The army chief, who was responsible for the administration of the provinces, also traditionally served as the chief advocate for all those who resided in his territory of jurisdiction (for further discussion on this point, see Lemarchand 1970: 72; also Kagame 1952: 7).

\textsuperscript{442} In her analysis she discusses three types of clientage agreements that historically existed in 19\textsuperscript{th} century Kinyaga. All three agreements—clientage to the \textit{mwami}, the \textit{umuheto} and the contracts of land tenure (the \textit{igikingi} and the \textit{ubukonde})—originally bound whole lineages to a particular patron. What is especially unique about the \textit{umuheto} social contract is that it initially encompassed the transfer of a cow from a client lineage to a patron. This of course is the exact opposite of the terms of the \textit{ubuhake} agreement discussed above. To C. Newbury, this distinction is an important one for it meant that clients who partook of the \textit{umuheto} were cattle-owners (usually but not always Tutsi). This agreement was perceived by clients as an avenue for social advancement; for the patrons (who were \textit{umuheto} chiefs appointed by the Tutsi monarchy) the \textit{umuheto} was a way to garner greater support for the monarchy within a local population. The original \textit{umuheto} was thus less exploitative than the \textit{ubuhake} (introduced into the region later) (1988: 74-81).

\textsuperscript{443} This same principle also applied to the land prestation collected by the hill chiefs (C. Newbury 1988: 110-111, 135-136).
divided loyalties allowed the monarchy to obtain greater control and power within the region (1988: chaps. 5-7).

More importantly in Kinyaga, and elsewhere in Rwanda, contracts like the *ubuhake* were premised on a relationship of dependence—dependence of a client on his patron(s). This particular quality of the system contributed to a substantial alteration in the “balance of exchange” between clients and their patrons, paving the way for greater mistreatment of the former by the latter.\(^{444}\)

One of the more exploitative clientage agreements was the *ubureetwa*. The *ubureetwa* was a social contract in which the use of land was exchanged for the performance of certain menial services.\(^{445}\) Unlike other types of clientage agreements, the *ubureetwa* was originally an agreement made between local chiefs and the poor, or those who did not possess cattle. Because wealth in Rwanda rested almost exclusively in the hands of the Tutsi, this meant that those who participated in the *uburweetwa* were Hutu. During the period of Belgian rule the *ubureetwa* contract was incorporated into colonial law and made mandatory for *all* Hutu males in the country.\(^{446}\) Prior to its abolition in 1949, the *ubureetwa* was highly valued by both colonial and domestic authorities as an indispensable source of cheap labor.\(^{447}\)

A number of additional changes to the patron-client system in Rwanda were enacted by the Belgian administration in the 1920s and 1930s. Each of these changes increased the already heavy burden placed on the country’s Hutu residents. One of the more substantial alterations made by the Belgians during this time was the substitution of money payments for the traditional prestations imposed

\(^{444}\) With respect to the *ubuhake*, C. Newbury is clear on the fact that originally the contract was an agreement between elites (e.g. members of wealthy lineages and the chiefs). It was not until the contract was extended to the *less powerful* in Kinyaga that it became especially exploitative (1988: 87-90, 98, 135-136).

\(^{445}\) These duties, particularly the duty of night watchman, are described by scholars on Rwanda as especially degrading for those who were obligated to perform them. Often times, while performing these tasks, clients were subjected to various forms of mistreatment for which there was little recourse; a refusal to comply with the obligations imposed by the *ubureetwa* most often entailed a loss of land (C. Newbury 1988: 141, 143; see also 1978: 23, Lemarchand 1970: 59, Prunier 1995: 27, and Vansina 2004: 134-136). Vansina considers the *ubureetwa* to have been “the straw that broke the camel’s back” in terms of the process of group polarization in Rwanda (2004: 134).

\(^{446}\) Initially in Kinyaga, and elsewhere in Rwanda, the *ubureetwa* was an obligation imposed on lineage groups (C. Newbury 1988: 111, 1980: 103-106), (Prunier 1995: 27).

\(^{447}\) For this reason—unlike the other types of clientage agreements in Rwanda—money was not allowed as a substitute. It was believed by the Belgian administration that “to do so would undermine the chief’s authority over the population” (C. Newbury 1988: 112; see also 140-144 and 1980: 104).
on clients. These money payments, which came primarily in the form of a tax, were imposed on all adult males in Rwanda.\textsuperscript{448} The residents of Rwanda also had to contend with new labor exactions imposed by the Residency for development and agricultural projects.\textsuperscript{449} Because decisions made with respect to the assignment of duties fell to the local chiefs, those with lower social status (e.g. the Hutu) ended up having to perform the more burdensome and less desirable tasks. As C. Newbury (1988: 131) writes:

> Political authorities [the chiefs and hill chiefs]... gained additional power; as the demands of the administration increased, so too did the chiefs’ coercive capacity; what were intended as administrative tools by the Belgians were all too easily and frequently turned into political weapons in the hands of the Tuutsi chiefs.\textsuperscript{450}

As part of the joint territory of Rwanda-Urundi, the changes made by the Belgian Trust Authority to the traditional patron-client system in Rwanda also applied to the system that existed in Burundi.\textsuperscript{451} The systems in both countries were similar in certain respects. For instance, Burundi had its own system of compulsory labor that was similar to the \textit{ubureetwa} in Rwanda, and patron-client relations in Burundi were also based on economic inequality between groups.\textsuperscript{452}

\textsuperscript{448} A head tax was also instituted in 1917. While other types of clientage agreements, such as the \textit{umuheto}, were abolished completely by the Belgian colonial authorities during the first decades of colonial rule, it is somewhat telling that the more exploitative clientage agreements—the \textit{ubureetwa} and the \textit{ubuhake}—were not eradicated until much later (1949 and 1954, respectively). Even with the abolition of these latter two contracts, C. Newbury contends that the position of the former clients did not vastly improve; although clients could own their own cattle following the abolition of the \textit{ubuhake}, they no longer had land on which to graze the cattle, nor did they have the benefit of a patron’s protection. Additionally, the abolition of the \textit{ubureetwa} in 1949 did not necessarily end the practice of forced labor in Rwanda (1988: 112, 144-147; for more on the negative repercussions associated with the abolition of the \textit{ubuhake}, see Lemarchand 1970: 128-133).

\textsuperscript{449} This labor corvée was known as the \textit{akazi} and was imposed on individual adult males in Rwanda (Tutsi and Hutu alike). The Hutu were thus forced to deal with two forms of compulsory labor—the \textit{ubureetwa} and the \textit{akazi} (C. Newbury 1988: 112; for a full discussion regarding the economic reforms enacted by the Belgian Authority in Rwanda, see C. Newbury 1988: chap. 8, 1980: 105; also Lemarchand 1970: 122 and Linden 1977: 87).

\textsuperscript{450} C. Newbury concludes that the abolition of past patron-client agreements and the imposition of new obligations on individuals instead of on lineages effectively eliminated “the role of kin groups as intermediary between an individual and the state” (1988: 112; for her full discussion on the changes made to the traditional patron-client system in Rwanda by the Belgian authorities, as well as information regarding the economic policies pursued by the Belgian administration in the joint territory of Rwanda-Burundi, see C. Newbury 1988: chaps. 7-8).

\textsuperscript{451} Burundi also had to contend with labor corvées and various forms of monetary taxation (e.g. the \textit{ikoro}). Additionally, traditional patron-client agreements were also abolished (Weinstein 1976: 150, 153, 269), (Lemarchand 1970: 122), (Laely 1997: 707).

It is worth mentioning that the Belgians were not the first colonial power to impose taxes in the territories of Rwanda and Burundi. Under the German Residency, a head tax was introduced in 1914. The intent of this tax was to stimulate economic growth in both countries by injecting more currency into their economies (Louis 1963: 159-160).

\textsuperscript{452} In Burundi, the system of compulsory labor was the \textit{ibiletwa} and was performed by Hutu who were too poor to engage in the \textit{ubugabire} (Weinstein 1976: 147). In terms of the second characteristic—the premise of
However, the clientage system in Burundi is generally characterized by scholars as having been far more flexible than its counterpart in Rwanda. Under the basic clientage agreement—the *ubugabire*—there were *no* distinct obligations reserved for Hutu clients. The obligations that were imposed on Hutu and Tutsi clients were also less severe and more limited in scope than those imposed under the *ubuhake* contract in Rwanda.

More important than this was the fact that in Burundian society, both Tutsi and Hutu could be patrons. For many years this particular feature of the system had important implications for Hutu-Tutsi relations as it meant that economic power in the country *did not* rest solely in the hands of one group.

economic inequality—similar to the way the system worked in Rwanda, clients in need of economic protection in Burundi would seek out a wealthy patron. In return for his protection, the client would perform various services for the patron. According to Weinstein (1976), the traditional *ubugabire* (or cattle contract) was an agreement between social equals. Although the recipient of a cow was called “bahutu,” this was not meant as a social distinction; it merely reflected the client’s dependence on his patron. In later years, the *ubugabire* is said to have become the “basis for subjugating recipients, especially Hutu” (269).

On the other hand, scholars such as Lemarchand suggest that the patron-client system in Burundi was widely considered by members of Burundian society to be mutually beneficial for all parties involved. In the Kirundi language, for instance, the words and phrases that refer to the clientage agreement depict it as a type of gift (from the wealthy and powerful to the poor). The essence of the agreement was that of a voluntary contract, the terms of which were open to negotiation. As Lemarchand (1994a) writes: “Inequality...was the precondition of social exchange and the prime motive for seeking the protection of a superior, yet the basis of the relationship between patron and client...was both utilitarian and sentimental, jural and moral” (13; for his full discussion on the patron-client system in Burundi, see Lemarchand 1994a: 12-13; see also Laely 1997: 704-705).

There were also patron-client agreements in Burundi that had to do with the usufruct of land. The *ubukeberwa* is described by Weinstein (1976: 269) as a “[f]orm of land clientship involving freemen who receive lands in return for service but are free, in theory, to leave at will.” Unlike other types of land tenancy agreements, traditionally the clients under an *ubukeberwa* agreement owned all that they produced on the land and they enjoyed a close relationship with their patron. The *ubujeberwa* can be compared to another type of land agreement in Burundi, the *kugerera*. The *kugerera* also entailed an exchange of services for land. With this agreement, however, the services provided by Hutu sharecroppers tended to be more demeaning than those expected from the Tutsi, and the position of *abagererwa* (or client) under this type of agreement was far less secure (Weinstein 1976: 171, 269).

Lemarchand refers to a 1947 report which states that the obligations of Hutu clients toward their patrons “‘amount to precious little—to pay court from time to time, to bring gifts of beer on even rarer occasions, and that is all’” (1970: 40; on this point, see also Louis 1963: 111 and Vansina 2004: 47-48).

As Lemarchand states, the only limits to the system “were the mwami at the top, who was the sole proprietor of cattle and land and hence supreme patron, and, at the other extreme, the ordinary Hutu peasant who was too poor to impose his vassalage upon anyone but the members of his own family” (1970: 37; see also 1994a: 12-13).

In Rwanda, the existence of a Hutu patron was an extremely rare occurrence. Maquet contends that the exception to this rule is provided by the few instances in which a Hutu client obtained enough cattle from a Tutsi patron to create a clientage relationship with another Hutu (1970: 119). However, Lemarchand (1970), Prunier (1995: 13-14) and others emphasize the fact that once a Hutu lineage in Rwanda gained substantial wealth it was “tutsified,” or incorporated into the larger Tutsi caste.

Another exception is the Kiga-Hutu of northern Rwanda. As indicated previously, despite the annexation of their territory into the Tutsi Kingdom, many of the Kiga institutions persisted, one of which was a unique patron-client agreement known as *ubukonde*. The *ubukonde* was a social contract based not on the exchange of cattle, but
Furthermore, as Lemarchand (1994a: 12) states, “that ethnic identities did not necessarily correlate with the status of client and patron added immeasurably to the legitimacy of the institution [as a whole].”

In addition to this was the fact that the clientage system was separate and distinct from the governing system. As discussed in greater detail in Chapter 7, the authority of the ganwa chiefs in Burundi was based on hereditary, not political favor. Their authority thus superseded that of the wealthy and powerful patrons in society. This meant that a client could owe his political allegiance to one authority, and his economic allegiance to another.\footnote{Furthermore, Lemarchand points to the fact that there were jurisdictional limitations placed on the powers of the chiefs. These limitations, however, were not placed on the power of the patrons. As a result: “A man could be the client of a wealthy chief and yet evade all political allegiance to him; conversely, within the limits of his jurisdiction a chief exercised authority over a number of individuals who were not treated as his clients but only as his subjects, although some could be treated as both” (Lemarchand 1970: 40).} What is especially relevant to the present study is the fact that a client could always turn to his chief in order to resolve a dispute with a patron. As the “ultimate arbiter,” the ganwa provided a safeguard against the patron’s abuse of authority.\footnote{For a more complete discussion on the qualities that differentiate the patron-client system in Burundi from that in Rwanda, see Lemarchand (1970: 36-41).}

It is worth noting that the polarization of Tutsi-Hutu identities in post-independence Burundi contributed to a sharp decline in the belief that the patron-client system was a mutually beneficial system for all involved. In more recent times, it has been suggested that inequality [the basis of the patron-client system] has taken on a radically different connotation, not only because the Hutu masses see it as morally objectionable, but also because social actors view it primarily through an ethnic lens. Social inequality is thus increasingly correlated to ethnic identity. This is an unprecedented phenomenon in the history of the country. (Lemarchand 1994a: 16)

Much of this change in perspective stems from the economic disenfranchisement sustained by the Hutu under the First through Third Republics, in addition to the abuses inflicted on the Hutu by the Tutsi-led military. Factors such as these have led many in Burundi to perceive the patron-client system as having always been a form of oppression and exploitation, overlooking the fact that the Hutu were once patrons under this system (Lemarchand 1994a: chap. 1).
Informal Institutions of Conflict Resolution

The last measure of social structures this study considers is a type of informal institution known as the bashingantahe in Burundi, and the batware w’intebe in Rwanda. Traditionally, the bashingantahe was a multi-level advisory body composed of both Hutu and Tutsi. One of its primary purposes was to mediate conflicts and to settle disputes between families and individuals (the bashingantahe bo ku minga); between the ganwa (the bashingantahe bo ku nama), and between various members of the royal court (the bashingantahe bo mu rulimbi) (Lemarchand 1970: 28; see also Weinstein 1976: 66).

Because each member of the bashingantahe was a respected member of his community, the institution as a whole was perceived by the public at large as legitimate and valuable.

The traditional bashingantahe was an institution based on “horizontal and symmetrical” relationships that extended beyond ethnicity, lineage and other types of groupings. As such, it has been considered by some to have constituted the “democratic core of Burundi”; the prototype of a parliamentary body which could serve as a check on the power of local authorities and which was also “accessible to all capable subjects regardless of their social background” (Makarakiza 1959: 38-39 quoted. in Lemarchand 1970: 28-29).

For these reasons, scholars in more recent times have examined whether or not the institution is an appropriate body for resolving disputes and maintaining peace and stability in war-torn Burundi. According to Nindorera (1998) the attempts made by the second government of Buyoya (1996-2003) to

---

458 The bashingantahe existed for over two centuries until it was severely weakened during the period of colonial rule. Although President Bagaza made some attempts towards restoring the institution, under the version he created, the powers of the bashingantahe were restricted and its members were chosen largely on the basis of political affiliation (Nindorera 1998: 2-3), (Laely 1997: 707-708), (Lemarchand 1970: 76).

459 Some of the other services provided by the traditional bashingantahe included authentification of contracts, and “[provision of] guidance and balance to politicians in the exercise of their mandates.” The institution was also charged with the duty “to emphasise respect for human rights and the common good, whenever the need arose” (Ntabona 1995 quoted. in Nindorera 1998: 1).

460 Much of this had to do with the fact that members were frequently selected on the grounds of merit and not by virtue of political loyalties or affiliation. A person could be chosen to be a mushingantahe based on a variety of factors, among which included judgment and sense of justice (Lemarchand 1970: 28), (Nindorera 1998: 1), (Laely 1997: 706).

461 On this point, see also Laely (1997: 706). The bashingantahe has been categorized by Reyntjens and Vandeginste (2001: 132) as a “major constitutive element of civil society and a counterbalance for the power of the central state.” The bashingantahe was considered democratic in spite of the fact that traditionally the Twa, women,
restore the *bashingantahe* stemmed from a widely-held desire to reinstate the former method of conflict resolution at a local grass-roots level.462

The level of legitimacy associated with the traditional *bashingantahe* differs substantially from that associated with the advisory body that existed in traditional Rwanda—the *batware w’intebe*. Comprised of chiefs of the realm, the *batware w’intebe* is described as having been “little more than a coterie of self-seeking sycophantic courtiers” who strictly served at the pleasure of the *mwami* (Lemarchand 1970: 29).463

In recent years, another traditional institution of mediation—*gacaca*—has been reinstated in Rwanda. In pre-colonial times, the *gacaca* was an institution whose purpose was to mediate conflicts between members of a local community; participation in *gacaca* was voluntary and judges (e.g. village elders, community leaders) had substantial leeway in the types of punishments or damages they could award (Corey and Joireman 2004: 82-83; see also Mukankusi and Osman 2006). The present *gacaca* courts are concerned solely with adjudicating cases that involve crimes perpetrated during the country’s civil war and, unlike the *gacaca* of pre-colonial times, participation is no longer voluntary and the courts are controlled directly by the state.464

---

462 The desired functions of a restored *bashingantahe* include “defining the responsibilities of the authorities and the population at large,” and “to enlighten and guide civil society” (Nindorera 1998: 2). According to Nindorera, the idea to revive the *bashingantahe* is not a new one. In the wake of the 1988 massacres in Burundi, the commission established by President Buyoya to examine ethnic relations in the country recommended that the institution be reinstated. After seizing power in 1996, Buyoya accomplished this task with the formation of the National Council of *Bashingantahe* in March 1977. Unlike the original institution, women can now be members. In its current form, however, the *bashingantahe* is said to lack the same level of legitimacy that the traditional institution enjoyed due in large part to a difference in the ways in which members are selected (e.g. nomination by Presidential decree) (Nindorera 1998: 2-4), (Laely 1997: 709-710), (Lemarchand 1994a: 167-168, 167n).

463 The term *batware w’intebe* translates to “chiefs of the stool.” The members of the body were not chiefs based on heredity, but were instead clients of the *mwami* (Lemarchand 1970: 29).

464 The modern-day *gacaca* courts were established on 26 January 2001 by Organic Law number 40/2000. The courts currently try cases that fall under three of the four categories of crimes dealt with by the domestic courts in Rwanda, specifically Categories 2 through 4 which pertain to lesser crimes (e.g. property damage, murder) perpetrated between 01 October 1990 and 31 December 1994. Category 1 crimes involve those who planned, organized and initiated the genocide, or who were involved in sexual torture and violence (see Corey and Joireman 2004: 82 at ff. 28). Category 1 crimes are akin to those currently being tried by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda.
While there are certainly a number of difficulties associated with the current gacaca courts in Rwanda, this dissertation is concerned primarily with the effect the pre-colonial gacaca had on group relations—specifically whether or not gacaca was a source of cross-cutting cleavages or bonding social capital for Rwanda. Historical evidence indicates that this was not the case (Reyntjens and Vandeginste 2001). Although Hutu could take part in gacaca, similar to the tontines discussed previously in this chapter, the impact of the gacaca did not extend beyond the local level. The gacaca largely did not deal with criminal disputes, but smaller scale civil matters between family members or neighbors within a village and was concerned more with “achieving harmony and social order” and less with determining guilt or accountability. Given the asymmetrical distribution of power in Rwanda, gacaca could therefore not serve as an effective check on the abuse of power by Tutsi chiefs and sub-chiefs.

**Conclusion**

As the above evidence indicates, on most of the measures of social structures used by this study, Rwanda and Burundi differ from one another in some very significant ways. Firstly, data obtained from the qualitative studies demonstrate that the system of social ranking that traditionally existed in Burundi was a far more complex system than the system in Rwanda—both in terms of familial groupings, as well subgroup distinctions made between Tutsi-Hima and Tutsi-Bayaruguru. Burundi has also historically had the benefit of having a fourth socio-ethnic category—the ganwa. The competition for power between the ganwa effectively prevented conflict in Burundi from assuming a Hutu-Tutsi quality—at least until the second half of the twentieth century.

---

465 Some of the problems associated with the current gacaca courts include the lack of due process afforded the accused, the lack of legal training provided the judges, and more importantly the fact that the courts do not hear cases involving human rights abuses perpetrated by the RPF. For all of these reasons, Corey and Joireman argue that the likelihood gacaca will achieve group reconciliation in Rwanda is minimal (for an opposing view, see Mukankusi and Osman 2006).

466 According to Reyntjens and Vandeginste (2001: 120), “the types of conflict dealt with by the gacaca [italics in original] are related to land use, land rights, cattle, marriage, inheritance rights, loans, and damage to properties caused by one of the parties or animals. Most conflicts would thus be considered to be of a civil nature when brought before a court of law. However, conflicts amounting to criminal offenses—generally of a minor kind, such as theft, but sometimes even murder—may also be settled, though they will not result in a typically criminal sanction (imprisonment) but in some sort of civil settlement.”
This study readily admits to the fact that group identities in Burundi eventually polarized along “ethnic” lines. At the same time, however, based on the pattern that inter-group conflict assumed in the post-independence period, this study accepts the argument made by Lemarchand, Laely, and other scholars who have written on Burundi, that the degree to which ethnic identity was the salient form of communal identity was contingent on the circumstances.\(^{467}\)

In the case of Rwanda, there have traditionally been far fewer intra-group status distinctions. In terms of the number of clans and lineage rankings, Rwandan society has been less variegated, with fewer cross-cutting cleavages. The major form of group identity in the country has been, and continues to be, distinguished along Hutu-Tutsi lines. Much of this has to do with the fact that the traditionally rigid system of social stratification in the country was closely affiliated with, and reinforced by, the system of absolute Tutsi rule. In this context, communal identities were not merely social, but political and economic as well. This was a feature of Rwandan society that was traditionally absent in Burundi.

In terms of regional identity, the evidence indicates that both countries share a similar history of intra-group discord based on region. In this respect, regional identity has not been a source of cross-cutting cleavages for either country. Instead, intra-group factions that historically developed along regional lines contributed to political instability and violence in both cases (see also Chapter 5).

The informal institutions of the patron-client system and the bashingantahe in Burundi further contributed to the maintenance of cross-cutting cleavages in society. In both types of institutions Hutu as well as Tutsi were allowed to participate and on somewhat equal footing. In Rwanda, the traditional clientage system and traditional systems of mediation only reinforced the social status quo, or in the case of gacaca, could not effectively challenge the status quo. Furthermore the fact that the patron-client system was heavily associated with the political system meant that economic and political power was not dispersed throughout society, but rested in the hand of one group. As discussed in the next chapter, the

\(^{467}\) For example, Lemarchand argues that the 1972 Hutu uprising occurred during a period in which the government was perceived to have been weakened by the factional in-fighting between Tutsi political leaders. With the corporate identity of the Tutsi fractured, the Hutu insurgents believed the time was ripe for revolution. In this respect, the significance of Hutu identity is interpreted as being a function of the significance of Tutsi communal
fact that the Tutsi dominated all strata of Rwandan society led the competition for power in later years to assume a zero-sum quality.

In terms of civil society, the lack of available data on the character of group membership in civic associations in Rwanda and Burundi prevents this study from reaching definitive conclusions regarding the extent to which associational membership was a reflection of reinforcing or cross-cutting cleavages. However, the evidence does permit some conclusions to be drawn concerning the manner in which the institutions of civil society were used by the political elite in each country.

It is safe to say at the outset that, with few exceptions, the various civic associations that existed within each country during the initial stages of democratization had weak support at the grass-roots level, and were subject to varying amounts of government control. In Rwanda, the institutions of civil society appear to have been used by the Hutu ruling elite as a means to foster greater divisions within society. In their efforts to make absolute Hutu rule appear to be the more attractive option relative to a power-sharing system, the Hutu conservatives used the institutions of the media, and the Christian churches, to stir up fear and to incite hatred on the part of the public.\footnote{468}

In Burundi, in the years leading to the transition to multiparty rule, the evidence indicates that civil society was used to garner greater consensus between Hutu and Tutsi. The Buyoya governments, and the Ndadaye government established in July 1993, both emphasized the importance of ethnic reconciliation and the principle of National Unity. From the conditions that prevailed at the time one can easily make the argument that both leaders understood that, in order to maintain political stability some degree of national consensus was mandatory; during the final years of his presidency, Buyoya had to contend with an increase in insurgency activity by the rebel group PALIPEHUTU; once in office Ndadaye had to deal with the fact that control of the army was still in Tutsi hands. In this respect, the identity (Lemarchand 1994a: chap. 5; on this point, see also Mann 2005: 435).

468 The fact that the institutions of civil society were used in this particular manner is problematic for those studies that assume a greater number of newspapers or trade unions are conducive to stronger democracy. An example of a study that makes this type of argument is the study by Bratton and van de Walle (1997: 147-149).
alternative to political consensus in both instances was political chaos. This is a theme to which this study returns in upcoming chapters.

The present chapter has provided a partial test of the hypothesis that traditional indigenous institutions influenced whether or not institutional transfer ended in stability or violence in the cases of Rwanda and Burundi. This chapter can also be seen as having presented an additional test of the core assumption of historical institutionalism that institutional legacies impact the course of institutional change and development. All of the evidence presented in this chapter supports both of these contentions.

One can certainly make the case that the bloodshed that occurred in Burundi in the years since the 1993 coup d’état is evidence that the country did not have the appropriate foundations necessary for democratic success. At the same time, however, this type of argument cannot explain why the concept of ethnic reconciliation, or the need to achieve some degree of ethnic parity in government, remains to this day. In comparison to Burundi, this ethos of cooperation is largely absent in Rwanda.

As stated previously, it is difficult to fully assess the impact that social structures had on the process of democratization absent an analysis of the second independent variable—traditional political institutions. Although the current chapter has touched on this interactive relationship, it is more fully explored in Chapter 7 of this dissertation. To demonstrate the impact that both independent variables had on the success of institutional change in each country, the next chapter includes an in-depth analysis and discussion of the different ways in which the democratization process was conducted by the political elite in Rwanda and Burundi.
Table 6.1. Cultural Differentials Index, Burundi and Rwanda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Burundi-Hutus</th>
<th>Burundi-Tutsi</th>
<th>Rwanda-Tutsi</th>
<th>Rwanda-Hutu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data for Tables 6.1 through 6.6 were obtained from Minorities at Risk Project (2005) College Park, MD: Center for International Development and Conflict Management (retrieved from http://www.cidem.umd.edu/inscr/mar/, 12 December 2006).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hutus</th>
<th>Tutsi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table 6.3. Cultural Differentials Indicators, Rwanda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hutus</th>
<th>Tutsi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Significant differential in historical origin and residence.</td>
<td>Significant differential in ethnicity and historical origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Significant differential in historical origin and residence.</td>
<td>Significant differential in ethnicity and historical origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Significant differential in historical origin and residence.</td>
<td>Significant differential in ethnicity and historical origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Significant differential in historical origin and residence.</td>
<td>Significant differential in ethnicity and historical origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Significant differential in historical origin and residence.</td>
<td>Significant differential in ethnicity and historical origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Significant differential in historical origin and residence.</td>
<td>Significant differential in ethnicity and historical origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Significant differential in historical origin and residence.</td>
<td>Significant differential in ethnicity and historical origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Significant differential in historical origin and residence.</td>
<td>Significant differential in ethnicity and historical origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Significant differential in historical origin and residence.</td>
<td>Significant differential in ethnicity and historical origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Significant differential in historical origin and residence.</td>
<td>Significant differential in ethnicity and historical origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Significant differential in historical origin and residence.</td>
<td>Significant differential in ethnicity and historical origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Significant differential in historical origin and residence.</td>
<td>Significant differential in ethnicity and historical origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Significant differential in historical origin and residence.</td>
<td>Significant differential in ethnicity and historical origin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.4. Economic Differentials Index, Burundi and Rwanda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Burundi-Hutus</th>
<th>Burundi-Tutsi</th>
<th>Rwanda-Tutsi</th>
<th>Rwanda-Hutu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.5. Economic Differentials Indicators, Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hutsu</th>
<th>Tutsi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Significant difference in access to higher education, commerce, the professions and government.</td>
<td>Economically advantaged on all indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Significant difference in access to higher education, commerce, the professions and government.</td>
<td>Economically advantaged on all indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Significant difference in access to higher education, commerce, the professions and government.</td>
<td>Economically advantaged on all indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Significant difference in access to higher education, commerce, the professions and government.</td>
<td>Economically advantaged on all indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Significant difference in access to higher education, commerce, the professions and government.</td>
<td>Economically advantaged on all indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Significant difference in access to higher education, commerce, the professions and government.</td>
<td>Economically advantaged on all indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Significant difference in access to higher education, commerce, the professions and government.</td>
<td>Economically advantaged on all indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Significant difference in access to higher education, commerce, the professions and government.</td>
<td>Economically advantaged on all indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Significant difference in access to higher education, commerce, the professions and government.</td>
<td>Economically advantaged on all indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Significant difference in access to higher education, commerce, the professions and government.</td>
<td>Economically advantaged on all indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Significant difference in access to higher education, commerce, the professions and government.</td>
<td>Economically advantaged on all indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Significant difference in access to higher education, commerce, the professions and government.</td>
<td>Economically advantaged on all indicators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.6. Economic Differentials Indicators, Rwanda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hutus</th>
<th>Tutsi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>No differences</td>
<td>Significant advantage in income, property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>No differences</td>
<td>Significant advantage in income, property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>No differences</td>
<td>Significant advantage in income, property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>No differences</td>
<td>Significant advantage in income, property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>No differences</td>
<td>Significant advantage in income, property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>No differences</td>
<td>Significant advantage in income, property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>No differences</td>
<td>Significant advantage in income, property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>No differences</td>
<td>Significant advantage in income, property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>No differences</td>
<td>Significant advantage in income, property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>No differences</td>
<td>Significantly advantage in income, property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>No differences</td>
<td>Significant advantage in income, property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>No differences</td>
<td>Significant advantage in income, property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>No differences</td>
<td>Significant advantage in income, property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ownership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence was presented in Chapter 6 which detailed a number of similarities and differences in the types of social systems that have traditionally existed in Burundi and Rwanda. In terms of similarities, each country had a system of social stratification that limited opportunities for the economic and social advancement of certain groups. Both possessed patron-client systems that were premised on relationships of social and economic inequality. Lastly, the ability of civil society to effectively contribute to the process of democratization in both was hampered by government intervention and control.

At the same time, this evidence strongly suggests that the above similarities are superficial and mask some very fundamental institutional differences between the two countries. On the one hand, the qualitative evidence indicates that Burundian society has historically been far more variegated than Rwandan society. Additionally, the fact that the patron-client system in Burundi was separate from the country’s political system meant that political and economic power did not rest exclusively in the hands of one group. All of these factors—in addition to informal institutions of conflict resolution such as the bashingantahe—contributed to the creation of cross-cutting cleavages in Burundi and helped foster a tradition of cooperation and compromise. The evidence presented in Chapter 6 indicates that in Rwanda the conditions favorable to group cooperation were largely absent.

As indicated in Chapter 6, the social systems within each country have traditionally been reinforced by the ruling systems in place. In order to fully appreciate the impact social structures had on the democratization process in both countries, it is therefore necessary to examine the influence pre-
existing systems of monarchical and single party rule had on the ability of multiparty democracy to gain acceptance among political actors in Rwanda and Burundi. To this end, the current chapter focuses on the second of the two primary explanatory variables—*traditional political institutions*. Similar to *social structures*, *traditional political institutions* is also assessed with the use of quantitative and qualitative data.\(^{469}\)

The first section of the present chapter is organized into sections consistent with each of the different ways in which *traditional political institutions* is measured. Data for each of these measures are presented and analyzed. The second section provides a general assessment of the democratization process in Rwanda and Burundi. Close attention is given to the problems political liberalization posed for both countries. The purpose of this second analysis is twofold: firstly, a cross-case comparison of the behavior of political actors will demonstrate the joint implications *social structures* and *traditional political institutions* had on the ability of political leaders in both cases to adjust to multiparty rule. Secondly, an analysis of the events which surrounded institutional change is essential to fully understand the context in which decisions were made by political actors in both countries during the period in question.

This chapter concludes with a summation of the findings of both Chapters 6 and 7. Emphasis is placed on the ways in which these findings support the core assumptions of historical institutionalism more generally, and the hypothesis made by this dissertation regarding the nexus between *social structures*, *traditional political institutions* and *total genocide* more specifically. Next, attention is given to the particular limitations historical institutionalism encounters as a means of explaining the unintended consequences of regime change, in particular the theory’s inability to fully explicate the relationship

---

\(^{469}\) Although the data obtained from the *MAR* and *Polity IV* databases are certainly helpful to the present analysis, they fail to capture a number of institutional distinctions between the two countries that, although subtle, go a long way towards explaining the divergence in outcome that ensued in each following the collapse of multiparty democracy in the early 1990s. *MAR* and *Polity IV* data also cover a period of time that is fairly limited in scope. Because one of the major arguments of this study is that past institutions impact future institutional development, to provide a fuller assessment of *traditional political institutions*, it was necessary for this dissertation to consult a number of qualitative analyses of the history of political development in both countries, including the studies by Lemarchand (1970, 1989b, 1994a, 1994b), C. Newbury (1978, 1988), Reyntjens (1993, 1995), and
between democratization and the occurrence of total genocide. The present chapter ends with a few brief remarks regarding the subject matter addressed in Chapter 8 of this study.

**Political Differentials Index**

The first measure of *traditional political institutions* this study considers is the *Political Differentials Index* (“PDI”) available from the *MAR* database. The basis for this dissertation’s use of the PDI is the assumption that greater political differences between Hutu and Tutsi reflect the presence of greater political inequality; the greater the inequality, the less inclusive the political institutions.

For the period 1965 and 1992, the PDI depicts the Hutu in Burundi as differing quite significantly from the Tutsi in terms of political power (see Table 7.1).\(^{470}\) It is not surprising to find that the Tutsi of Burundi are coded by *MAR* as politically advantaged relative to the Hutu (or a “-2”).\(^{471}\)

In Rwanda, a picture emerges that is less than clear. As Table 7.1 shows, according to the PDI the Tutsi minority differed only *slightly* from the dominant Hutu group in terms of their political power. The Hutu, on the other hand, are coded by *MAR* as being extremely different from the Tutsi, but not advantaged.\(^{472}\)

To more fully comprehend these particular findings, this study looked specifically at each of the separate differentials indices for Rwanda and found that the Tutsi are coded by *MAR* as differing significantly from the Hutu in terms of their access to political power and their ability to organize.

---

\(^{470}\) As a reminder, the PDI is a composite index of six separate measures of political differentiation: access to power, access to employment in the civil service, political recruitment, voting rights, the right to organize and equality of legal protection (or indices POLDFIX1 through POLDFIX6) (*MAR* 2005: 29-30; also Gurr 1993: 40).

\(^{471}\) The Hutu of Burundi are coded “3,” which means that they differ from the Tutsi on four of the six differentials indicators. To determine more specifically the ways in which the Hutu were politically disadvantaged relative to the Tutsi, this study consulted the individual indices of the PDI. For the time period in question, the Hutu are listed as lacking adequate access to civil service employment and positions of power within government. They are also coded as lacking the ability to organize politically, as well as lacking equal protection under the law. The Tutsi are coded by *MAR* as being advantaged relative to the Hutu on three separate measures: access to power, the right to organize politically and legal protection (see Table 7.2).

\(^{472}\) In other words, the Hutu are coded “4,” which means that an “extreme” differential exists between the Hutu and the Tutsi for the time period considered. The Tutsi are coded “1,” which indicates a “slight” differential between the Tutsi and the Hutu.
politically (see Table 7.3). Oddly enough, the database also indicates that the Tutsi were not disadvantaged with respect to equal protection under the law. This particular finding contradicts many of the qualitative studies and reports written on conditions in Rwanda especially after the 1990 RPF invasion and also contradicts \textit{MAR PDI} data with respect to the Hutu.\footnote{See for instance the reports by Amnesty International (1991: 193-194) and U.S. Department of State (1990-1995) which document conditions in the country after the civil war began in 1990; see also Des Forges (1999) and African Rights (1995).} Relative to the Tutsi, the Hutu are coded as differing significantly on \textit{all} measures of political difference except one—voting rights. Although most of the literature written on Rwanda indicates that the Hutu enjoyed preferential political status under the First and Second Republics, they are not depicted as such by \textit{MAR}.

\textbf{POLITY2 Scores}

As indicated in Tables 7.4 and 7.5, Rwanda and Burundi have consistently received similar \textit{POLITY2} scores. Throughout most of the post-independence period, each has received a ranking of “-7”\footnote{As a reminder, \textit{POLITY2} scores rank countries on a scale from “-10” to “+10,” with lower numbers indicating the presence of more authoritarian regime characteristics and higher scores indicating the presence of more democratic characteristics (see also Chapter 4).} There are some exceptions, however. In the initial years after independence (1962-1964), Burundi is coded as having been less authoritarian than Rwanda; the country is also listed as less authoritarian the year prior to the assassination of President Melchoir Ndadaye.\footnote{For the years 1963-1964 and 1992 Burundi is coded a “-3.”} Between 1966 and 1972, \textit{Polity IV} codes Rwanda as being more democratic than Burundi.\footnote{In other words, between 1966 and 1972, Rwanda is coded as a “-5”; Burundi as “-7.”} All of the \textit{Polity2} scores largely accord with literature that has been written on the process of political development in both countries in the early post-independence period (see for example studies by Lemarchand 1970, 1994a, 1994b; Reyntjens 1993, 1995; Prunier 1995, Weinstein 1976).
Political Centralization

According to the qualitative data, the traditional political system of Burundi was a highly decentralized system. The monarchy is described by Lemarchand (1970: 27) as “at best...a loose aggregate of semi-autonomous chiefdoms; at worst...a cluster of warring principalities.”

Powers were distributed between the mwami and the ganwa chiefs, the latter of whom represented different factions of the mwami’s extended family. The source of power and legitimacy of the ganwa stemmed from heredity, not political loyalty, as was the case with the Tutsi chiefs in neighboring Rwanda. Each of the ganwa held control over substantial segments of territory within the Kingdom and, within their respective territories, exercised the powers to tax, to appoint their own officials (e.g. sub-chiefs), and to organize their own armies (1970: 27).

In contrast to the system in Burundi, the traditional political system in Rwanda was a unitary system of government. The mwami of Rwanda stood alone at the top of a rigid political hierarchy; beneath him in rank were the chiefs and below them, the hill-chiefs (later made “sub-chiefs”).

How this came to be is largely the result of the decision made by Mwami Ntare II Rugaamba (c1795-1852) to give a substantial portion of the territories he had conquered during his reign to each of his sons. The result was a bitter struggle for power between these sons and Ntare’s eventual successor—Mwami Mwezi II Kisabo (c1852-1908). The rivalry that ensued between the heirs of Ntare (the Batare ganwa) and the heirs of Mwezi (the Bezi ganwa) lasted until the first few years after the country’s independence (Lemarchand 1970: 22-23).

Additionally, ganwa factions could have substantial influence over the crown and the course of national policy. The level of influence a ganwa faction acquired depended partly on its strength, measured in terms of territorial holdings, size and genetic proximity to the mwami. During the period of colonial rule, and in the first years after independence, the ganwa faction with the greatest political strength and influence in Burundi was the Bezi branch.

The rise to power of the Bezi royal lineage was an indirect result of certain policies enacted by the Belgian Trust Authority. Foremost among these was a policy initiated in 1929 which consolidated the smaller chiefdoms of the country into larger administrative units, control of which fell primarily into Bezi hands. By 1959, the Bezi controlled the majority of chiefdoms in Burundi. A great deal of the Bezi’s power also derived from their close association with the mwami in particular, and with the institution of the monarchy in general. For several years the Bezi controlled the majority of seats on the Regency Council and they derived additional legitimacy from their familial connections to past rulers, most notably the powerful Mwezi II Kisabo (Lemarchand 1970: chaps. 11-12, 1977: 101-107).

During the period of the Kingdom’s consolidation, all positions of political authority at the local level (e.g. lineage heads) were supplanted with Tutsi chiefs and hill chiefs. As indicated in Chapter 6, both the chiefs and hill chiefs in Rwanda were political appointees. Their legitimacy was based on loyalty, not heredity or merit. This particular characteristic of the political system had negative repercussions for patron-client relations in particular, and for Hutu-Tutsi relations in general.

As a reminder, the patron-client system and the political system in Rwanda were closely intertwined. In practice this meant that chiefs and hill chiefs both exercised political and economic authority over their subjects. Additionally, the fact that both served entirely at the pleasure of their superiors meant that they could easily be
Additionally, at the level of chieftaincy, there were three separate positions: army chief, cattle chief, and land chief.\textsuperscript{480} The former were responsible for administration of the provinces; the latter two, administration of the districts and the collection of tribute for the mwami. Chiefs and hill chiefs were selected almost exclusively from the Tutsi caste.

As a general rule, the strategies with which the German and Belgian colonial authorities ruled Rwanda and Burundi were a function of the indigenous ruling systems in place. In the case of Burundi, for example, the heavily decentralized political system—with its feuding ganwa and weak monarch—induced the Germans and Belgians to pursue a tactic of “divide and rule” in efforts to obtain greater political stability.\textsuperscript{481} Rwanda, on the other hand, was judged by the European colonists to be more conducive to indirect rule. Unlike Burundi, there were no powerful chiefs for the Europeans to contend with; the mwami exercised absolute control and authority over the political system. The primary effect of colonial rule in both cases was that it simply reinforced these pre-existing ruling structures.

As the above statement is applied to Rwanda more specifically, the multitude of reforms introduced by the Belgian Trust Authority in the 1920s and 1930s—in particular the 1926 policy that consolidated the positions of army, land and cattle chief—contributed to a further institutionalization of the rigid political hierarchy in place.\textsuperscript{482} Up to that time, a greater number of chiefs had ensured for a

---

\textsuperscript{480} This was a feature of the political system that did not exist in Burundi.

\textsuperscript{481} When Mwami Kisabo (c1852-1908) was forced to recognize German authority in 1903, he was forced to simultaneously recognize the political independence of Kilima and Moaconco, the two most powerful ganwa chiefs. Despite subsequent attempts made by German colonial authorities to consolidate the power of the crown, their general strategy was to recognize the authority of both the ganwa chiefs and the mwami. This particular policy continued under Belgian rule. The policy of “non-interference” followed by Belgian colonial rulers allowed the ganwa the freedom to “administer their fiefs as they pleased...[In some cases, the ganwa] chiefs...managed to arrogate for themselves almost absolute powers in their provinces” (Lemarchand 1970: 71; see also 49-56, 63-89; Louis 1963: chap. 13).

\textsuperscript{482} The purpose of the policies enacted by the Belgians between 1926 and 1931 was to “streamline” the indigenous administrative systems of both Rwanda and Burundi. In addition to a restructuring the chieftaincy, the Belgians also regrouped the lowest level of the administrative system—the hill units—into sub-chiefdoms. In Rwanda, Hutu chiefs and sub-chiefs appointed to office by the Belgian Residency during the 1920s, and the indigenous Hutu-Kiga chiefs and sub-chiefs who ruled the northern region of the country, were all relieved of their duties and replaced by Tutsi candidates. One additional administrative reform worth mentioning is the creation of
diffusion of power at the local level and was an effective check on the abuse of chiefly authority (to the extent possible). With power now vested in the hands of a single individual the possibilities for abuse and corruption—with Belgian support—were increased.\textsuperscript{483}

Under colonial rule Tutsi chiefs and sub-chiefs in Rwanda became agents of the Belgian Residency and were made responsible for the collection of taxes, as well as the enforcement of labor corvées on the local populations. For the Hutu peasants, the obvious downside to this was the fact that the indigenous authorities no longer felt any obligations towards their subjects (e.g. their traditional clients); their loyalties now rested with their Belgian employers. From this it is easy to understand how self-rule and the removal of the Tutsi monarchy became intermingled in the minds of many Hutu. As Lemarchand (1970: 125) suggests:

The Tutsi monopoly of chiefly position...exacerbated racial tensions in two ways: their awareness of both the advantages and inconveniences of their role made the Tutsi chiefs and subchiefs remarkably status conscious as a group, vis-à-vis the Hutu masses; and because they were looked upon as the agents of the European administration, the Tutsi chiefs were generally held responsible by the peasantry for all the hardships and sufferings associated with colonial rule.\textsuperscript{484}

As discussed in greater detail below, Belgian interference in the processes of political recruitment and political competition in Rwanda drastically altered the political fortunes of both Tutsi and Hutu. The irony, as noted by scholars such as Prunier (1995), is that the system of “majority rule” that was established by the Hutu revolutionaries in 1961 was, for all intents and purposes, a centralized authoritarian regime that was similar in many ways to its predecessor. The new President was an absolute ruler who stood as the “incarnation of moral values” for the country; patron-client ties at all levels of the political system remained the norm, and the ideology in place emphasized the inherent value of the

\textsuperscript{483} According to Lemarchand (1970: 72), the 1926 reform “prepared the ground for the emergence of a more starkly authoritarian system, centered on the rule of a single and virtually omnipotent chief” (see also 1970: 119-120).

\textsuperscript{484} For his full discussion on the “bureaucratization of the chieftaincy” in Rwanda, see Lemarchand (1970: chap. 4).
dominant group. The major difference was that now complete control of the political system rested in the hands of the Hutu—with the Tutsi stripped of all political power and influence.

In contrast to Rwanda—where Belgian policies were used by Tutsi rulers as a means to further consolidate and strengthen their hegemony as a group vis-à-vis the Hutu—in Burundi Belgian rule instead fueled tensions and rivalries between the various ganwa factions. However, with the exception of the brief period under which Burundi was ruled by a constitutional monarchy (1962-1966), the political system that emerged in the post-independence period was similar to the Hutu-governments in Rwanda; until the early 1990s, Burundi was also ruled by a series of highly centralized single party presidential regimes. The major difference between the two countries rests with the fact that in Rwanda the Hutu were the politically dominant group; in Burundi, the opposite was the case. From November 1966 until 10 July 1993 political control rested almost exclusively in the hands of the Tutsi elite.

Executive Competition and Recruitment

According to the Polity IV data provided in Table 7.5, for most of the post-colonial period Burundi had a political system in which recruitment of the chief executive was extremely uncompetitive. With little exception, the process of executive recruitment in Burundi prior to 1993 was an unregulated process in

485 In this respect, it has been said that certain ganwa factions profited more from colonial rule than others. In the case of the Bezi, for example, their consolidation of power during the early to mid-twentieth century occurred despite the attitudes of the Belgian colonial powers. Lemarchand argues that, for a variety of reasons, the colonial authorities in Burundi—in particular Resident Robert Schmidt—were actually more partial towards the Batare ganwa faction (1970: 312-317).

486 It was on 10 July 1993 that the government of Melchoir Ndadaye officially took office. The Republic of Burundi (under the leadership of President Michel Micombero) was formally established by the Tutsi military following the deposition of the monarchy in November 1966. During this period, the 1962 Constitution was suspended and the National Assembly dissolved; Micombero and the UPRONA assumed complete control of the government.

In November 1976, Micombero was overthrown in a bloodless coup d’État led by Lt. Col. Jean-Baptise Bagaza. Micombero’s fall from power has been attributed to his own personal problems (e.g. alcoholism), as well as to fallout from the 1972 massacres of the Hutu intelligentsia. Unfortunately for the country, Micombero’s replacement was not much of an improvement. In many ways Bagaza was even more of an authoritarian leader than his predecessor. Many of the policies enacted by the government of the Second Republic proved to be extremely unpopular with the public, especially those that restricted the practice of religion in the country (see Chapter 6), as well as Bagaza’s policies of “villagization” which drastically increased government control over the rural populations. All of these policies—occurring in combination with wide-scale corruption and greater political marginalization of the Hutu—contributed to Bagaza’s overthrow in 1987 and his replacement with Maj. Pierre
which “changes in chief executive [occurred] through forceful seizures of power” (Marshall and Jaggers 2002: 19). With the exception of the administration of President Grégoire Kayibanda (1962-1973), the process of executive recruitment in Rwanda was also unregulated and uncompetitive (see Table 7.4 below).

These findings are partially substantiated by qualitative data for the post-independence period. With respect to Rwanda, sources including Guichaoua (1995: chap. 36), Africa Contemporary Record (1969-1994), and studies by Lemarchand (1970, 1994a) and Prunier (1995) indicate that the Tutsi held very few positions of authority in either the Kayibanda or the Habyarimana governments. The greatest number of ministerial portfolios held by the Tutsi during this period is two; at other times, this number was as low as zero. By way of a comparison, in Burundi the largest number of cabinet positions held by the Hutu in any of the governments formed prior to July 1993 is thirteen.

Qualitative studies also indicate that the methods by which executives were recruited in Rwanda and Burundi in the years after independence were similar in many ways to the procedures of leadership selection followed during the years of monarchical rule. In the case of Burundi, for example, Lemarchand (1970) traces the concept of ethnic parity in government appointments to the reign of Mwami Ntare II (c1795-1852) and the emergence of the decentralized system of government. To maintain stability among the feuding ganwa factions, the mwami frequently assumed the role of an umpire, a practice which continued after the country gained independence in 1962. By that time, the

---

487 A partial exception to this is the period during which the country was ruled by a constitutional monarchy. Methods of executive recruitment during this time were regulated and institutionalized. The executive was chosen by means of designation from within a political hierarchy, as well as by heredity (see Polity IV categories “XRCOMP” and “XROPEN”).

488 Under the category of executive regulation (“XRREG”), Rwanda is coded as “2” for the periods 1961 to 1972 and 1990 to 1992. A “2” indicates that executive recruitment is either in a process of transition to a regularized system, or is one in which the executive is chosen from within a political hierarchy. Based on Rwanda’s scores for the XRCOMP and XROPEN indices, as well as qualitative data, it can be surmised that for both time periods the executive were designated from within the political hierarchy.

489 More specifically, it is fair to say that the number of Hutu included in the governments formed by Pierre Buyoya was substantially larger than the number of Hutu in either the Micombero (1966-1976) or Bagaza regimes (1976-1987). At the same time, however, it is important to point out that the number of Hutu who held portfolios in the governments formed by these latter two presidents was still greater than the number of Tutsi included in either
focus of the crown’s attention had shifted to balancing the competing interests of Hutu and Tutsi political factions. Between 1963 and 1965, each of the governments appointed by the mwami included an equal number of Hutu and Tutsi and the position of prime minister was alternated between Hutu and Tutsi candidates.\textsuperscript{490} As indicated in the preceding paragraph, this practice of ethnic parity persisted throughout the next three decades, albeit in a much more limited form.\textsuperscript{491}

As indicated previously, the political system in Rwanda before independence was exclusively dominated by members of the Tutsi social stratum, with few exceptions. Through a series of events—which began with the Hutu uprisings of 1959 and ended with the coup d’état of Gitarama in 1961—the Hutu counter-elite obtained a complete reversal of power, after which the pattern of executive recruitment was altered to accommodate the new ruling class.\textsuperscript{492}

\textsuperscript{490} Of course during this time the more important cabinet positions remained in the hands of the powerful Bezi ganwa faction.

\textsuperscript{491} It is important to acknowledge that this dissertation in no way suggests that the post-independence governments established in Burundi were open and democratic; far from it. After all, it was during the First Republic that Hutu politicians and intellectuals were completely purged from all positions of power and influence in the country. Under the Second Republic only two of Burundi’s 16 provinces were governed by a Hutu and there were no Hutu included on the Supreme Military Council (the chief governing organ in Burundi from 1976 to 1979) (for further information on the politics of the Second Republic, see Lemarchand 1994a: 107-117, and Banks et al. 1999: 166; for data on the dispersal of political positions by ethnic group in the Second Republic, see \textit{Africa Contemporary Record} 1989-1990 1995: B244).

\textsuperscript{492} The Hutu Revolution of 1959 began on 1 November in the region of Gitarama. The revolution originated from a local dispute between Hutu residents and members of the Tutsi-led Union Nationale Rwandaise party (“UNAR”) and quickly spread to the rest of the country. It was not until the coup d’état of Gitarama in 1961, however, that the Tutsi monarchy was officially replaced with a republican system of government. Per an agreement reached in February 1962, the Tutsi were to be given two ministerial portfolios and a variety of other leadership positions at the national and local levels. However, by the end of the 1960s, the Tutsi occupied no official positions. Instead, the government had become a one-party system with control vested exclusively in the hands of the President and the Hutu-dominated PARMEHUTU. Much of this trend is partially the result of the invasions launched by the Tutsi rebels in the early to mid-1960s. These invasions solidified anti-Tutsi sentiment in the country (Lemarchand 1970: chaps. 7-9; for more on the policies of the Kayibanda regime, see specifically Prunier 1995: 54-61).

Besides restricting the presence of Tutsi in the government, a quota system was established during the First Republic that sharply delimited economic opportunities for the Tutsi. The percentage of Tutsi permitted to have jobs in the civil service and in other sectors of the economy, and the percentage allowed to attend educational institutions was limited to nine, a number commensurate with their demographic percentage. Although enforcement of these quotas was relaxed somewhat during the Second Republic, they remained in place nonetheless (Prunier 1995: 60; also 75-76). No official quota of this kind was used in Burundi.
Executive Constraints

As reflected in Table 7.4 (see below), the Polity IV data indicate that under the First Republic, and throughout most of the Second, the executive in Rwanda enjoyed unlimited authority.\textsuperscript{493} The same can be also said of the executive in Burundi (see Table 7.5). That the Micombero, Bagaza and Buyoya governments were ones in which the powers of the presidency were unlimited is not surprising given that all three were military dictatorships.\textsuperscript{494} Some exception to this can be found for the period 1962 to 1964, during which time Burundi was ruled by a dual executive whose powers were subject to various constitutional limitations.\textsuperscript{495}

Prior to the Burundi’s independence, however, the mwami was largely a figure-head in Burundian politics.\textsuperscript{496} The limitations placed on his power were not simply a matter of institutional practice; they were often times an indirect result of the personality of the office-holder.\textsuperscript{497} Despite the weakness of the institution, it nevertheless retained its legitimacy throughout much of the country’s history due in no small part to the function it served as a stabilizing force in politics. In this context, the mwami stood above ordinary politics and was generally considered by society to be a neutral figure among the powerful ganwa factions, and in later years Hutu and Tutsi politicians.\textsuperscript{498} It was only when the mwami attempted to

\textsuperscript{493} Under the category of executive constraints (“XCONST”), Polity IV consistently codes Rwanda as “1,” meaning that the executive had unlimited authority and power.
\textsuperscript{494} Similar to Rwanda, under the category of executive constraints Polity IV codes Burundi as a “1.”
\textsuperscript{495} “Dual executive” in this context refers to rule by a monarch (mwami) and a prime minister.
\textsuperscript{496} The mwami of Burundi has even been referred to as a “‘royal puppet’” ([Meyer 1916: 91] Lemarchand 1970: 27).
\textsuperscript{497} The history of Burundi has its share of powerful mwami, most notably Ntare II Rugaamba (c1795-1852) and his successor Mwezi II Kisabo (c1852-1908). However, the last two to occupy the position—Mwambutsa II (1916-1966) and Ntare III Ndizeye (1966)—were considerably weak by comparison. Whether their particular deficiencies were the result of poor education, a lack of leadership skills, youth, or inexperience is not especially relevant. What is significant, however, is the fact that these weaknesses enabled powerful factions within the country to capture greater control of the political system. This was especially the case with Mwami Mwambutsa who assumed the throne while still only a teenager. Because of his youth and inexperience he was vulnerable to the influence of close family members, all of whom belonged to the Bezi faction. As Lemarchand (1970: 310) describes, a strong bond was established between the young Mwami and the Bezi branch which “created a network of mutual obligations and reciprocities which continued to influence policies of the court long after independence...[O]n the very eve of independence, the strength of the nexus between the Bezi and the throne grew to such an extent as to lend retrospective justification to the view that the monarchy was little more than an instrument in the hands of ‘feudal’ elements.”
\textsuperscript{498} The fact that the mwami was perceived as being above politics meant that any public criticism of the government was directed toward the ganwa chiefs instead. According to Lemarchand (1970: chap 1) this is one of the reasons why Hutu-Tutsi relations in Burundi did not degenerate into conflict at a much earlier period of time (as
assume complete control over the functions of government that the legitimacy of monarchy was ultimately destroyed.

In contrast to Burundi, the mwami of Rwanda ruled absolutely; there were few restrictions placed on the powers of the Tutsi kings, or for that matter the Tutsi chiefs and sub-chiefs (see below). What few limitations did exist were those imposed by the Belgian colonial rulers.499

**Political Participation and Recruitment**

According to the Polity IV data, from 1966 until 1991 political participation in Burundi was restricted and/or forbidden entirely. In Rwanda, similar conditions prevailed from 1973 to 1992 (see Tables 7.5 and 7.4). Although the data for Rwanda generally accord with the data obtained from several qualitative studies—including the studies by Prunier (1995), African Rights (1995), Des Forges (1999) and others—the same cannot be said with respect to the Polity IV data for Burundi.

Political participation in Burundi between 1962 and 1964 is characterized by Polity IV as participation in lasting political parties formed mostly on the basis of reinforcing cleavages. The studies by Lemarchand (1970, 1994a), however, demonstrate that during these years the dominate political party in the country—the UPRONA—enjoyed broad public appeal. Like the UNAR party in Rwanda, the UPRONA was originally a pro-monarchist, pro-independence party led by members of the ruling Bezi elite. However, under the leadership of Prince Louis Rwagasore, the party adhered to a strong populist platform that called for greater political and social equality for all segments of society within the framework of a constitutional monarchy. Unlike the UNAR party, the UPRONA also included within its leadership ranks an equal of Tutsi and Hutu.500

---

499 The absolutist quality of the mwamiship had always posed certain problems for the ability of the Belgian Residency to effectively govern Rwanda. For example, Mwami Musinga—who occupied the throne of Rwanda when Rwanda was made a joint colony with Burundi—was intensely disliked by the Belgian Trust Authority for his hostility towards the Catholic Church, his personal habits, and his reluctance to accept the limitations placed on his power by the colonial administration. For all of these reasons, the Belgians replaced Musinga with a more “suitable” candidate in 1931 (see Lemarchand 1970: 67-70).

500 By 1961 the Central Committee of the party included three Tutsi and four Hutu (Lemarchand 1970: [Page 252])
An additional point worth mentioning with regard to political parties in Burundi in the early 1960s is the fact that the UPRONA and its main political rival—the PDC—were parties controlled by the two dominant ganwa factions—the Bezi and Batare respectively.\textsuperscript{501} The PDC was actually the more progressive of the two major parties; its primary goal was for Burundi to be on solid ground—both economically and socially—before independence from Belgian rule was achieved. However, the PDC did not enjoy the same level of mass appeal as the UPRONA due to the popular perception that the PDC was an elitist party with close connections to the colonial powers.\textsuperscript{502}

With the exception of the advisory council elections held in Rwanda and Burundi in the 1950s, and the first few years of monarchical rule in Burundi following independence, the qualitative data indicate that political competition was not permitted by the mwamiship in either country (see for example Lemarchand 1970, 1994a, C.Newbury 1988, Prunier 1995). What little competition was allowed was conducted in a manner that was less than fair and open—much of which was a result of the influence Belgian colonial rule had on the political processes of both countries (see below).\textsuperscript{503}

\textsuperscript{501} Similar to the MAR data, the Polity IV data for Burundi completely neglects consideration of the ganwa. As such it provides an inaccurate picture of Burundian politics in the early 1960s.

\textsuperscript{502} Much of this perception stemmed from the fact that many of the PDC’s party leaders were “drawn from those very elements whom the masses [tended] to distrust, i.e., from those administrative auxiliaries collectively known in Burundi as ‘Astridiens’ (after the Groupe Scolaire d’Astrida, where most of them received their training), who formed the lower stratum of functionaries against whom the masses inevitably tended to deflect their diffuse hostility towards the Belgian administration” (Lemarchand 1970: 337; for a fuller discussion of the PDC, including an excellent comparison between the PDC and UPRONA, see 1970: 334-338).

\textsuperscript{503} The process towards self-rule was initiated by the Belgian Trust Authority in the joint-colony of Rwanda-Urundi with a series of institutional reforms enacted in the early 1950s. The first major change was the establishment of advisory councils at each level of government. Although by 1956, members to the sub-chiefdom council (the lowest-level council) were elected by popular vote, in both of the council elections held in 1953 and 1956 all members to the upper councils were selected through an indirect process. In Rwanda, this process resulted in the selection of a disproportionate number of Tutsi to serve in the upper councils. In Burundi, Lemarchand contends that the results of the 1953 and 1956 advisory council elections did not produce the same level of discord within the Hutu population (as had occurred in Rwanda) because power in Burundi at that time was still largely held by the ganwa factions—not the Tutsi (1970: 83-84).

Further changes to the political system in each territory were mandated by the Belgian decree of 10 November 1959. Per the decree, sub-chiefdoms in both territories were to be transformed into communes, each placed under the control of an elected burgomaster and communal council; chiefdoms were to be made into administrative units (provinces), and the national political system of each country was to become a constitutional monarchy (for a full discussion regarding the various elements associated with the operation of advisory councils in Burundi, see Weinstein 1976: 109, 121-122, 125, 263; as this topic pertains to both Rwanda and Burundi, see also Lemarchand 1970: 81-83, 146-149, Prunier 1995: 43; for specific information regarding the November 1959 decree, see Weinstein 1976: 143, Lemarchand 1970: 84-85, 178).
However, compared to the Hutu in Rwanda, the Hutu in Burundi enjoyed far greater access to the political process, at least until their abortive coup d’État of October 1965.\textsuperscript{504} For generations, sub-chiefs in Burundi were appointed primarily on the basis of clan affiliation, not social rank.\textsuperscript{505} As a result, many of Burundi’s sub-chiefs, in addition to some of the kingdom’s chiefs, were members of the Hutu social stratum.\textsuperscript{506}

Like the traditional practices of executive recruitment, political participation and recruitment in Rwanda prior to independence was a privilege reserved almost exclusively for members of the Tutsi social stratum. For a time, these traditional practices of leadership selection were strongly reinforced by Belgian colonial policies. However, in the years after World War II, the attitude of the colonial authorities and the European clergy changed dramatically to one which supported the demands for regime change expressed by the newly emergent Hutu counter-elite. The change in the Catholic Church’s position regarding the Hutu has already been discussed in Chapter 6 and will not be addressed in further detail here. What is more relevant to the present discussion is the change of heart expressed by the Belgian Trust Authority.

\textsuperscript{504} The October 1965 coup attempt was a reaction to a series of policies enacted by the \textit{Mwami}. According to Lemarchand (1970), between 1961 and 1966, the monarchy had become more absolutist. By the time legislative elections were held in the country in May 1965, the government had been effectively reduced by the crown to the status of a bureaucracy, with policy-making authority resting largely in the hands of \textit{Mwami} Mwambutsa.

In the May elections the Hutu gained a majority of seats in the National Assembly. Their selection of Gervais Nyangoma—a staunch critic of Mwambutsa—as prime minister was rejected outright by the \textit{Mwami}, along with all of the other Hutu candidates proposed. Additionally, the fact that the \textit{Mwami} made the post of burgomaster into an appointed position meant that the Hutu’s chances of gaining greater representation at the local level were effectively eliminated. In response to these actions, on 18 October 1965, a faction of the Hutu elite attempted to seize control of the government.

In the months following the coup attempt, Mwambutsa was replaced with his son, and the Hutu were purged from all positions of power within government. This did little to improve relations between the government and the crown, however. When the new \textit{Mwami} and his close supporters attempted to garner greater power for themselves at the expense of the Tutsi elite—who by now controlled both the military and bureaucracy—the \textit{Mwami} was deposed and a military regime established in place of the constitutional monarchy (for a full discussion regarding the chronology of events that surrounded the abortive October 1965 and the deposition of the \textit{Mwami}, see Lemarchand 1970: chap. 16; also 1977: 115-121).

\textsuperscript{505} Similar to Rwanda, sub-chiefs in Burundi were traditionally appointed by the chiefs. However, in contrast to Rwanda, sub-chiefs were selected from the clan to which the \textit{ganwa}-chief belonged. Because clans could be comprised of Tutsi, Hutu and Twa lineages, this meant that a sub-chief in Burundi could be selected from a high-ranking Hutu lineage (Lemarchand 1970: 27-28).

\textsuperscript{506} Many of these Hutu chiefs were responsible for administering the territorial possessions of the crown. However, in 1931 the chiefs were relieved of their duties by the Belgian Trust Authority and their posts awarded to Tutsi candidates (Lemarchand 1970: 27-28).
To some extent, the attitudes of the colonial administration were in no doubt influenced by the anti-Belgian sentiment expressed by members of the Tutsi ruling elite. The initial source of the rancor between the Tutsi and their former European allies stemmed from a belief held by the former that the Hutu’s demands for greater political and social equality and their criticisms of the Mwami represented a failure on the part of Belgian authorities to adequately protect the interests of the Tutsi elite. Many Tutsi interpreted the institutional changes mandated by the 10 November 1959 decree as proof that the Belgian administration possessed a pro-Hutu bias (and rightly so as it turned out). In the eyes of Tutsi political leaders, the principle of “majority rule” was synonymous with a total loss of political power and prestige. All of these factors prompted the Tutsi to adamantly insist that Rwanda be granted immediate independence from Belgian rule.

In his discussion of the variety of different factors that precipitated the occurrence of the Hutu revolution, Lemarchand (1970), (1974) stresses the importance that the November 1959 Hutu uprising had on changing the course of political development in Rwanda. To the author, it was the Belgian administration’s interpretation of this uprising as a nation-wide revolution—conducted by a social under-class in the name of democracy—that significantly contributed to the eventual success of the Hutu political movement. In this respect, by “[imputing] to the Hutu masses a degree of revolutionary consciousness which was as yet limited to very specific areas…and to certain categories of individuals,” the colonial authorities indirectly legitimized the demands for regime change voiced by the Hutu counter-elite (1970: 168; on this point, see also 1974: 144).

These demands for change were more directly legitimized through actions taken by the Belgian administration during and immediately following the uprising. Their failure to adequately respond to the violence as it was occurring, and their refusal to allow the Tutsi government to do the same, severely

---

507 According to Prunier, this was the principle reason for the Belgian administration’s change in attitude towards the Tutsi (1995: 50). Furthermore, it did not help matters much that the largest Tutsi-led party, the UNAR, had pro-Communist sympathies (for more on this point, see Lemarchand 1970: 161, 176).

508 For more complete details on all of the factors that influenced the attitudes held by the Tutsi elite in the period leading up to revolution, including the impact that the death of Mwami Mutara had on group perceptions, see Lemarchand (1970: 134-137, 153-159).
crippled the chances of the monarchy to retain its power and legitimacy (1970: 109-110, 166-167). Also significant during this time was the decision made by colonial authorities to temporarily fill the posts of chief and sub-chief that had been vacated during the November jacquerie with Hutu candidates.\(^{509}\) The colonial administration’s involvement (or rather interference) in the 1960 communal elections and afterward allowed the Hutu to further consolidate their power at the local level.\(^{510}\)

The last step in the process—the seizure of power at the national level—was also achieved with the help of the colonial administration. On 28 January 1961 the Hutu revolutionaries took control of the government in a bloodless coup d’état (the coup d’état of Gitarama) during which they proclaimed Rwanda a republic. For their part, the Belgians simply refrained from stopping the process as it unfolded and consented to the outcome once it occurred.\(^{511}\)

By way of contrast, the monarchy in Burundi was never identified with the hegemony and privilege of one group. As a result, Lemarchand (1970) suggests that the crucial issue that arose during independence was not over whether the political system would remain a monarchy. Instead, the critical issue was over which ganwa faction would control the system. Although the Tutsi generally retained more political power than the Hutu, the primary contest for power at the time of independence was between the Bezi and Batare ganwa factions, just as it had been for generations.

\(^{509}\) The chiefs and sub-chiefs being replaced were all Tutsi who had fled or had been killed during the 1959 uprising. As Lemarchand states, the intent of this particular policy was to “hasten the politicisation of the Hutu masses, no matter what the cost” (1970: 175; see also Prunier 1995: 51).

\(^{510}\) The Belgian authorities took a number of steps to ensure that Tutsi UNAR candidates would fare poorly in these communal elections. The colonial administration not only used the local media to portray Tutsi incumbents in an especially poor light (as “saboteurs of democracy”), they also banned political meetings in the country. It is important to acknowledge that the UNAR party’s chances for victory at the polls were already slim due to the fact that much of their base of support (the Tutsi) had fled the country. Now that the Belgians had thrown their full support behind the political opposition, however, the outcome of the 1960 elections was a near certainty. The Hutu-led PARMEHUTU won a landslide victory (2,390 out of 3,125 seats). The period after these elections saw a transformation in political patronage ties as the old Tutsi patrons were replaced by new political patrons (the Hutu burgomasters). Many of the actions subsequently taken by the burgomasters received the full support of the Belgian administration, despite the damaging effect these policies had on Hutu-Tutsi relations (Lemarchand 1970: 178-183).

\(^{511}\) It is worth noting that the coup d’état of Gitarama was perpetrated in clear disregard of the wishes of the United Nations. UN General Assembly Resolution No. 1579 mandated that certain criteria be fulfilled before national legislative elections were held in Rwanda. The coup d’état was therefore an effort by the Hutu—specifically the PARMEHUTU—to circumvent the postponement of these elections (for a full discussion on the events which led to and followed the coup—including the September 1961 legislative elections and the abolition of the Tutsi monarchy—see Lemarchand 1970: 188-196, Prunier 1995: 52-54).
As indicated above, the most substantive impact the Belgian policies of the 1920s and 1930s had on the balance of power within Burundi was that they provided greater opportunities for the Bezi faction to consolidate its grip on the institutions of local government (e.g. the chiefdoms). Any efforts made by the Belgian authorities to increase the relative power of the Batare faction—the colonial favorite—only intensified the rivalry between the two ganwa factions. However, unlike the example of Rwanda, the actions taken by the Residency in no way threatened the legitimacy of the monarchy or ganwa rule per se.\textsuperscript{512} Instead, the mwamiship was the source of its own undoing.

Additionally, a certain degree of irony rests with the fact that the political party least favored by the colonial authorities in Burundi—the UPRONA—had a membership base that included a substantial number of Hutu.\textsuperscript{513} When comparing the Belgians’ attitude towards the UPRONA with their attitude towards the PARMEHUTU in Rwanda, it appears that the driving force that shaped their opinions was not so much an overt fondness for the Hutu per se, but for groups that favored the colonial administration.

The political system that emerged in Burundi following the deposition of the \textit{Mwami} is categorized by Bratton and van de Walle (1997) as a “military oligarchy.” The authors define a “military oligarchy” as a system in which

\textsuperscript{512} Similar in certain ways to the Hutu-led PARMEHUTU in Rwanda, the PDC in Burundi derived benefit from their colonial connections during the preliminary stages of self-rule. In addition to providing material support for the PDC’s electoral campaigns, the disciplinary actions taken by the colonial administrators against leaders of the UPRONA—which included harassment, arrest and deportation—affected the results of the communal elections that were held in Burundi in November and December 1960. The PDC received the majority of seats in these elections (942 out of 2876); another party also favored by the Belgians—the Parti Démocratique Rural (“PDR”)—received 502 seats. Because delegates to the Provisional Assembly were chosen by members of the communal councils, it was no surprise that the PDC captured more seats in the Assembly than any other party (25 out of the 64 seats available). In the provisional government, the PDC also garnered two posts; UPRONA none (Weinstein 1976: 116-117, 234-235, 278, Lemarchand 1970: 334, 338; for specific information on the Provisional Government and Assembly in Burundi, see Weinstein 1976: 242-243, and Lemarchand 1970: 338).

After this period, however, the political tide turned in favor of the UPRONA which won a landslide victory in the national legislative elections held in September 1961 (58 of the 64 seats) (Weinstein 1976: 172), (Lemarchand 1970: 340). The results of the 1961 elections were due in large part to the actions of the United Nations. In early 1961, the UN nullified the results of the 1960 communal elections and took steps to ensure that Belgium \textit{did not} obstruct the UPRONA’s chances for victory in the national elections (Weinstein 1976: 235).

\textsuperscript{513} However, it is important to call attention to the fact that the fate of the UPRONA as an all-inclusive party was to be somewhat short-lived. Following the assassination of its leader and Prime Minister-elect Prince Louis Rwagasore, a battle for the leadership and direction of the party ensued between Hutu and Tutsi factions. By the late 1960s, control of the party rested almost exclusively in the hands of the Tutsi (Weinstein 1976: 278-279; for further information on the Monrovia and Casablanca factions, see Lemarchand 1970: 354, 387-390).
[e]lections [are] few or entirely suspended; all decisions [are] made by a narrow elite behind closed doors. There [is] a visible personal leader, but power [is] not completely concentrated in the hands of one man; decisions [are] made somewhat collectively by a junta, committee, or cabinet that often [includes] civilian advisors and technocrats alongside military officers. (1997: 79-80)

The government of Rwanda, on the other hand, is categorized by Bratton and van de Walle as a “competitive one-party system”; in other words a system which allows a limited degree of political competition to take place among candidates in a single ruling party (1997: 80-81). During the First Republic, this single ruling party was the PARMENHUTU; under the Second Republic, the MRND.

Looking strictly at the number of presidential and legislative elections held, the difference between Rwanda and Burundi appears to be quite substantial. From 1962 until 1989, there were five presidential and five legislative elections held in Rwanda. In Burundi, only one presidential and two legislative elections were held over this same period (1997: 70).

However, the level of importance associated with the frequency of elections should not be overstated. This applies above all to the case of Rwanda. The fact that the country held more “competitive” elections than Burundi does not mean that an ethnically diverse group of candidates ran in these elections. The fact of the matter is that by the late 1960s no Tutsi deputies were included in the National Assembly; by 1988, the number of Tutsi deputies in the Conseil National du Developpment (“CND”) was two (out of 70) (see Guichoaua 1995: 762). By comparison, in the October 1982 legislative

---

514 The authors consider the competitive one party system and the military oligarchy to be two different forms of a neo-patrimonial regime, which they consider to be a hybrid system that embodies the characteristics of both the traditional patrimonial and modern “rational-legal” systems of government. Neo-patrimonial systems of government are highly personalized, with power resting in the hands of one or a few individuals (“Big Men”). Similar to traditional patrimonial regimes, the stability of the neo-patrimonial system depends largely on the ability of the Big Men to provide benefits and distribute favors to their supporters (e.g. clients). At the same time, these systems of government also, “possess bureaucratic institutions and written laws” or the “rational-legal institutions” of modern government (1997: 62). This latter statement is tempered by the fact that bureaucratic institutions in countries ruled by neo-patrimonial governments provide far less than an adequate check on the power of the executive. Instead, they are often used as a source of political patronage. As the authors state: “In return for material rewards [e.g. public sector jobs etc.], clients [mobilize] political support and [refer] all decisions upward in a mark of loyalty to patrons” (65-66; for their full discussion on the characteristics of and political behavior associated with the neo-patrimonial regimes in Africa, see Bratton and van de Walle 1997: chap. 2).
elections in Burundi 15 of the 65 seats available in the National Assembly were awarded to Hutu candidates. By 1987, the number of Hutu in the National Assembly was seven.515

**Political Paradigms**

Political paradigms were first introduced as a topic in Chapter 6 of this dissertation. Chapter 6 provided evidence which demonstrated that institutions of civil society have traditionally been used by the governments of both countries to reinforce certain policy paradigms. The current chapter focuses more closely on the origins of these paradigms.

In the case of Burundi, scholars have suggested that the paradigm of National Unity is deeply rooted in the cultural and religious significance associated with the mwami who was long-revered as a symbol of national unity and harmony for the country. Similar to the ways in which the National Unity paradigm was used by political leaders in post-independence Burundi, the institution of the monarchy was used by the UPRONA as a symbol to galvanize public support for independence in the 1950s and early 1960s. In later years, the monarchy was used by the Tutsi-led military as a means to legitimize the systems of government established in the wake of the October 1965 coup attempt. It was not until the collapse of the monarchy in November 1966 that the doctrine of National Unity—in its modified “civilian” form—was used by the Tutsi-led governments of the First and Second Republics as a means to control the population and eliminate dissent.

As demonstrated by the preceding statement, there are certain flaws associated with the concept of National Unity. One of the foremost these is the fact that the doctrine is premised on a belief that separate ethnic groups do not exist in Burundi. At the same time, the historical evidence suggests that whether the paradigm served a valuable purpose in the establishment of a multiparty system of government was a function of the political leadership in place. Under Presidents Buyoya and Ndadaye,

---

515 For additional information on the political makeup of the National Assembly of the Second Republic of Burundi, see Lemarchand (1994a: 107-117) and Banks et al. (1999: 166).
for example, the doctrine was transformed into a consensus-building tool to garner greater popular support for the new joint-rule system.

The type of political paradigm that legitimized the various systems of government in Burundi is starkly different from the doctrine of group supremacy that justified both the Tutsi monarchy and the Hutu republics in Rwanda. The system of Tutsi rule in Rwanda was under-girded by a set of highly institutionalized norms that legitimized the dominance of the Tutsi in all aspects of society. These norms were transmitted and preserved through oral and later written history, and codified in the *ubwiiru* or the Esoteric Code.\(^{516}\)

All of the components which embodied the “myth of Tutsi superiority” were accepted without question by colonial authorities, as well as by the missionaries who first penetrated the region. As indicated in previous chapters of this study, an important element that reinforced the indigenous norms of inequality and which further rigidified social cleavages in Rwanda was the “Hamitic hypothesis.”\(^{517}\) Advocated by the European settlers, the Hamitic hypothesis advanced the idea that the distinction between Hutu and Tutsi was not a social but a racial distinction. Considered a “settler minority,” the

---

\(^{516}\) The Esoteric code in Rwanda was the ritual code that “enshrined the testament of the departing king and the choice of his successor” (Lemarchand 1970: 32). Lemarchand suggests that there were three different themes associated with the *ubwiiru*, the first of which concerned the level of religious importance attached to the social hierarchy in place. In this context, the social status of all three groups in society—Tutsi, Hutu and Twa—was depicted as divinely ordained. The second theme depicted the *mwami* as “the incarnation of the deity (Imana), the embodiment of ancestral virtues, and the source of all prosperity” (1970: 33). The third and final theme directly pertained to the notion of the Tutsi as the “master race.” According to this last argument, by virtue of their superior qualities as a group, the Tutsi were destined to rule over all others in society (33-34).

In addition to the *ubwiiru*, the norms associated with Tutsi supremacy were further enhanced through the *ubucurabwenge* and the *ibisigo*, the former a type of oral history of the kingship, the latter a form of poetry. The role of oral history in the legitimization of the monarchy was different in Burundi. Unlike Rwanda, for a variety of different reasons Burundi did not have an extensive oral history of monarchical traditions. As a result, norms associated with the kingship were extremely vague and open to interpretation and modification by those in power. To Lemarchand, this particular quality made the traditional political system of Burundi far more adaptable to change in later years as challenges made to the political system were never perceived by those in power as challenges to the *entire* social system (1970: 31-36, 1977: 68-71, 94-96; see also Vansina 1961: 166-167).

\(^{517}\) Scholars such as Mamdani (2001), Prunier (1995), Mann (2005) and others attribute the basis of the Hamitic hypothesis to the belief by European settlers that any form of civilization in Africa could not possibly have occurred *without* the help of people of Caucasoid origins. Because of their physical characteristics, and social distinction (as pastoralists), the Tutsi were considered by the Europeans to be Caucasoid, most likely from Ethiopia (for a full discussion regarding various versions of the Hamitic hypothesis, see Mamdani 2001: 80-87; for additional information concerning the role of the Belgian colonial authorities in the creation of the doctrine of Tutsi supremacy, see Chrétien 1985, 2003, Prunier 1995: 35-40, Des Forges 1995: 44-45).
The Tutsi were depicted by their colonial sponsors as a group apart from, and foreign to, the “native” groups of Rwanda, or the Hutu and the Twa.

The ideology of Tutsi supremacy was also reinforced by the changes made to Rwanda’s indigenous political institutions by the Belgian Trust Authority, including those which restructured the chieftaincy and lower-level positions of authority in government (see above).\textsuperscript{518} As Mamdani states:

The notion that the Tutsi were a \textit{race} apart from the majority turned into a rationale for a set of institutions that reproduced the Tutsi as a \textit{racialized} minority. The Tutsi were racialized, not just through an ideology, but through a set of institutional reforms that the ideology inspired, in which it was embedded, and which in turn reproduced it [all italics in original].” (2001: 87)\textsuperscript{519}

Because political, economic and social power coincided with ethnicity in Rwanda, it followed that any demands made for the reform of \textit{one} component of the system were perceived by the monarchy and the Tutsi elite to be a challenge to the \textit{entire} system.\textsuperscript{520} The doctrine of Tutsi supremacy thus placed severe limitations on the ability of the system to accommodate Hutu demands for greater representation.

For similar reasons, the doctrine of supremacy advocated by the Hutu rulers of the First and Second Republics severely undermined the country’s ability to make a peaceful transition to multiparty rule in the early 1990s. The paradigm of “Majority Rule” or “Absolute Hutu Rule” emphasized, among other things the importance of the 1959 Hutu Revolution, “the intrinsic worth of being Hutu, [and] the total congruence between demographic majority and democracy” (Prunier 1995: 58).\textsuperscript{521}

Although the Tutsi in Burundi were viewed in a similar way by the Belgian colonial authorities (on this point, see Mamdani 2001: chap. 3, Ndikumana 1998, Chrétien 2003, Scherrer 1999, Ndimurukundo 1995: 126-127), similar policies enacted by the Residency in Burundi \textit{did not} have the same damaging effects as those initiated in Rwanda.\textsuperscript{522} Much of this stems from the nature of Burundi’s

\textsuperscript{518} Another way in which group identities in Rwanda were racialized was through the creation of identity cards by the Belgians in 1933. Each card listed the “racial identity” of citizens as either “Hutu,” “Tutsi,” or “Twa.”

\textsuperscript{519} For his full discussion on the racialization of identities in Rwanda, see Mamdani (2001: chap. 3); also Prunier (1995: 5-11).

\textsuperscript{520} This is the main thrust of Lemarchand’s (1970) argument in regards to the role of ideology in the political development of both countries.

\textsuperscript{521} The paradigm also stressed the importance of living “a moral Christian life” (1995: 58; see also African Rights 1995, Des Forges 1999, Mamdani 2001).

\textsuperscript{522} Although some of the reforms made to the governing structures of Burundi led to a reduction in the political power of the Hutu, most of the changes that were made impacted the political power of the \textit{ganwa} chiefs
political system, and the fact that the major players during the period of colonial rule were not the Tutsi, but the ganwa chiefs. Because the ganwa were more concerned with maintaining and increasing the power of their own individual members, as a whole they lacked a cohesive doctrine of group supremacy.

The Process of Democratization: An Initial Assessment

As Bratton and van de Walle (1997: 83) state:

In general, neopatrimonial rulers are driven by calculations of personal political survival. They resist political openings for as long as possible and seek to manage the process of transition only after it has been forced on them.

Although the decision to establish multiparty systems of government in both countries was partially a response to rising inter-group tensions, pressures for democratization also came from foreign donor countries and international lending institutions. Some of these demands were a response to the human rights abuses perpetrated by the Buyoya and Habyarimana governments in the late 1980s/early 1990s; pressures also stemmed from a desire on the part of the financial donors to create more suitable candidates for foreign aid.523

Regardless of the motives for instituting the systems of multiparty democracy, for both countries the transition process was largely an inflexible one—particularly for Rwanda. In this latter example,
institutional reforms were inextricably linked to the Arusha peace process. As discussed in further detail below, what emerged from the Arusha negotiations was a “recipe for disaster” (Lemarchand 1994b: 591; see also Prunier 1995: 159-191, C. Newbury 1995, Jones 1999: 131-156, Rothchild 1999: 330-331; Scherrer 2002, and Kirschke 2000).

Historical institutionalist scholars such as Jacoby (2000) argue further that it is not just the transfer process itself that determines the success of institutional change and reform, but also the existence of actors who are willing to “pull in” and accept the new institutions. As the Jacoby suggests, “without some prior organization of civil society, institutions that presume the exercise of social power become dependent on state elites and often remain mere words on paper” (2000: 3). As demonstrated in the previous chapter, it is in respect to this latter condition that the paths of Rwanda and Burundi diverge sharply.

In Burundi, following the outbreak of ethnic violence in the Ntega and Marangara communes in September 1988, President Buyoya initiated a series of institutional changes which were intended to achieve some degree of ethnic reconciliation in the country. One of the first measures enacted was the creation of a National Commission to Study the Question of National Unity in October 1988. Consisting of an equal number of Hutu and Tutsi, the Commission was charged with investigating the sources of inter-group discord in the country. Their report, issued the following May, contained a series of recommendations, among which included the creation of a Charter of National Unity, greater independence for the national legislature, and the creation of strategies to bring an end to discriminatory

---

524 The democratization process in Rwanda largely coincided with the outbreak of civil war. Consequently, the process of political liberalization became tied to the negotiations for peace between the Government of Rwanda (“GOR”) and the RPF. The talks that were held in Arusha, Tanzania between July 1992 and August 1993 were primarily conducted between members of the opposition parties (e.g. the MDR, PSD etc.) and the RPF. As discussed in greater detail below, the President, the MRND(D) and the smaller opposition parties allied with the President, boycotted and obstructed the peace talks.

The Arusha negotiations culminated in a peace treaty that laid out the structure of the BBTG, as well as the distribution of power in both the government and military. Other provisions included those that guaranteed the rule of law and the right of return for refugees.

525 In his study Jacoby uses the cases of East and West Germany to demonstrate the nexus between the type of transfer process (flexible versus inflexible), civil society, and the success of institutional reform. Jacoby’s argument is similar in many ways to the arguments offered by the democratization studies discussed in the Chapter 2 of this study.
practices in the hiring and promotion of workers in the public and private sectors (Lemarchand 1994a: 134-139; Reyntjens 1993: 564-565). The Buyoya government quickly followed through on several of these proposals.\textsuperscript{526}

Perhaps the most visible change made during this period was the formation of a power-sharing government comprised of equal numbers of Hutu and Tutsi, with a Hutu—Adrien Sibomana—awarded the position of prime minister.\textsuperscript{527} The President also created a separate commission in March 1991 to provide the framework for a multiparty system of government. Following their August 1991 report, the Constitution of Burundi was revised, put to a referendum in March 1992, and adopted by an overwhelming majority. The presidential and legislative elections that were held in June of 1993 were conducted in a peaceful and orderly manner, despite the occurrence of protests by Tutsi students and other groups.\textsuperscript{528} After losing the presidency to the Hutu opposition candidate—Melchoir Ndadaye—President Buyoya peacefully conceded defeat and stepped down.

The democratization process in Burundi has been characterized by scholars as having “initiated a culture of debate and dialogue which had been absent for a quarter of a century, and [which]...paved [the way] for the acceptance of a political system based on a popular mandate” (Reyntjens 1993: 581; see also Lemarchand 1994a and Chrétien 1989). On the surface, it would appear to be the case that the move from single party to multiparty democracy was a smooth process with few, if any, obstacles encountered by its participants. However, it is important to acknowledge the fact that there were some difficulties associated with the way in which the process of liberalization was conducted by the ruling Tutsi elite, and some fairly specific problems relating to the institutions of joint-rule that were established.

\textsuperscript{526} For instance, in April 1990, the Charter for National Unity was drafted. The Charter, which called for an end to military rule, was approved by national referendum in February 1991.

\textsuperscript{527} Sibomana served as prime minister in each of the governments formed by Buyoya between October 1988 and July 1993. Another important change made by the President during this period of time concerned the administration of the provinces. As of September 1987, only five of the country’s 16 provinces were governed by a Hutu. By March 1991, this number was increased to eight (see Guichoaua 1995: 745-746). Lastly, in 1991 a Hutu was chosen to be Secretary-General of the ruling party (see Amnesty International 1991: 53, 1992: 76).

\textsuperscript{528} It was also helpful that the 1993 elections were judged by foreign observer groups to have been conducted in a fair and open manner (Reyntjens 1993: 568, 568n).
Firstly, there were some in Burundi—Hutu and Tutsi alike—who questioned the President’s rationale for change. The fact that the institutional reforms initiated by Buyoya occurred in the wake of ethnic violence in northern Burundi led many to suspect that the President’s desire for democratization had more to do with the threat of international sanctions, than with any concern for greater political equality (for more on this point, see Lemarchand 1994a: 132-133).529

Secondly, the report issued by the National Commission was criticized by scholars, as well as politicians and political groups in Burundi for being too vague and for not delving far enough into the actual sources of the Hutu-Tutsi conflict.530 Instead, the position taken by the Hutu and Tutsi authors of the report was in full accordance with the government’s official position regarding the history of group conflict in Burundi—that it stems from the “legacy of colonial rule,” and the skillful manipulation of group identities by politicians.531 Critics—including area scholars such as Lemarchand—describe the Commission’s report as constituting “a political event...[whose] key aim [was] to satisfy the expectations of a domestic and international public, and to serve as tangible proof of the regime’s good intentions” (1989b: 685).

A third criticism that has been made of the democratization process in Burundi was that it was conducted in a very “top-down” manner by officials in the Buyoya regime. Reyntjens, for instance, points to the fact that, despite the various cabinet shuffles made by Buyoya between 1988 and 1992, a transitional government was never put into place, nor was a national conference ever held. Until July 1993, the country was ruled by a single party system of government. Furthermore, each of the members

529 On a related note, there is a clear distinction between the international community’s reaction to the 1988 massacres and its response to the 1972 partial genocide of the Hutu. In the case of the latter event, international condemnation of the violence perpetrated by the Tutsi military was virtually nonexistent. In 1988, however, the World Bank, the United States and the governments of a number of other countries immediately condemned the human rights abuses committed by the military (for an excellent comparison of the causes and consequences of the 1972 and 1988 massacres, see Lemarchand 1994a: 127-130; also Lemarchand 1989a).

530 Among the chief critics of the Commission’s report were the opposition parties FRODEBU and PALIPEHUTU (see Lemarchand 1994a: 143-144, 146).

531 As indicated in Chapter 6, the official position taken by all of the Tutsi-led governments since independence has been that ethnicity does not exist in Burundi and that “foreign influences” (read: Belgium) are responsible for the episodes of ethnic conflict that have occurred (for an in-depth analysis of the Report of the National Commission to Study the Question of National Unity, see Lemarchand 1989b, 1994a: 134-139, Reyntjens 1989; also Ndikumana 1998: 33-34).
of the above-referenced commissions was selected by the president and the ruling elite. Because members of opposition parties such as PALIPEHUTU were completely shut out of the process, a true negotiated settlement was not achieved. All elements associated with the democratization process—including the timing of elections—were at the complete discretion of the president (Reyntjens 1993: 56, 1995; on this particular point, see also Lemarchand 1994b).

In many ways, the multiparty system of government that eventually emerged in 1993 was substantially different from a consociational system. Lemarchand (1994a) points to the fact that three of the four institutional requirements for a consociational system—proportionality in recruitment to government and the bureaucracy, a mutual veto/concurrent majority, and segmental autonomy—were either totally absent or existed in modified form (1994a: 165-171).532 Although the author specifically makes this argument in reference to the various power-sharing governments formed by Buyoya, the same argument also applies to the multiparty system that was formally established in July 1993.

In terms of the mutual veto, the results of the June 1993 national legislative elections rendered the provision virtually useless. The Hutu garnered a clear majority, with FRODEBU—the opposition party headed by Melchoir Ndadaye—obtaining 80.2% of the seats. Looking at the election results by ethnic group, 85% of the 81 seats in the National Assembly were won by Hutu candidates (or 69 seats); 15% by Tutsi candidates (or 12 seats). With such a small number of seats in the legislature, the Tutsi were rendered virtually defenseless against the passage of any legislation that might harm their interests.533 On the bright side, neither of the two major parties was ethnically homogenous; a number of the FRODEBU deputies elected to the assembly were Tutsi and several of the UPRONA candidates were Hutu. To the

532 For a full discussion on all the institutional requirements of a consociational system, as well as the benefits and value of consociational systems more generally, see Lijphart (1977: 25-44; 1969; 1991).

533 This particular problem becomes especially apparent once the passage of constitutional amendments is considered. In order for an amendment to be passed a four-fifths majority is required. The fact that the Hutu were above this 80% threshold meant that, in theory at least, they could make any amendments to the Constitution they wanted (see Reyntjens 1993).
extent that party discipline existed at all in Burundi, members of these two parties could be expected to vote according to party and not ethnic interests.534

According to Lijphart (1977) the principle of proportionality applies not just to elections, but also to the allocation of jobs in the civil service sector. In Burundi, this requirement created a whole other set of additional problems. Despite the efforts made by Buyoya to “level the playing field” in the distribution of appointments during his tenure in office, by the time the Ndadaye government came to office in July 1993, the Tutsi still dominated the civil service sector. All of the efforts subsequently made by the new government to re-allocate these government jobs to FRODEBU party members meant higher unemployment for the Tutsi.535 When it came to the military, any attempts to alter its composition were not merely a source of anxiety for the Tutsi; as discussed below, the threat of new recruitment policies became a source of instability for the country as a whole.

The last two requirements for a consociational system are segmental autonomy and rule by a grand coalition. The former, as it is defined by Lijphart, did not exist in Burundi.536 Both legally and by virtue of tradition (e.g. the principle of “National Unity”), the political process in Burundi was geared towards the elimination of ethnicity as a form of political identity.537 With respect to the formation of a grand coalition, the Ndadaye government did not include representatives of all “significant segments” of

---

534 This is the logical extension of the argument made by Reyntjens (see 1993: 570-572). The fact that the results of the legislative elections were proportional by ethnic group occurred in spite of the particular voting system used. In Burundi, the system in place was a closed list system in which voters selected candidates from party lists. By law, each party had to include members of both ethnic groups on their lists. Although in theory, this was a positive step towards ensuring that a more diverse group of candidates would be selected from each party, in practice, it meant that voters were not necessarily choosing the candidates they wanted. Simply put, voters could not change the order of candidates placed on a party list. Depending on the size of the voting district, and the order in which candidates were placed on the list, a Hutu who voted for the FRODEBU in an effort to “vote the rascals out of office” may have ended up instead electing one or more Tutsi to the National Assembly (see Reyntjens 1993: 566, 1995: 9-11).

535 Furthermore, according to Reyntjens (1995: 12-13), the re-allocation of jobs was often done in violation of existing recruitment rules.

536 Lijphart defines “segmental autonomy” as “rule by a minority over itself in the area of the minority’s exclusive concern” (1977: 41).

537 Under the Constitution of Burundi, parties could not be formed on the basis of ethnicity.
society. As had been the case in all other stages of the democratization process, PALIPEHUTU was not included in the new moderate Hutu government.538

Taken together, all of these problems had negative implications for multiparty democracy in the long-term. A greater and more immediate problem, however, was the fact that control of the military remained in the hands of the Tutsi. By the time elections were held in the summer of 1993, no changes to the structure or composition of the military had occurred. Since its creation in 1960, the Armée Nationale du Burundi ("BNA") had been purged of Hutu officers and infantry men on a semi-regular basis. By the time Buyoya came to power in 1987, only two of the military’s 398 officers were Hutu; the number of Hutu non-commissioned officers and troops stood at 30 out of 11,970 (ACR 1995: B244). As of 1993, all positions of authority in the BNA remained in Tutsi hands (Guichaoua 1995: 746, 749).

For decades the BNA had served as the “linchpin of Tutsi hegemony” and the guarantor of political stability in the country (see Lemarchand 1994a: 168-169, 1970: chap. 17). It is therefore no surprise that a Hutu-led government would be perceived by many within the Tutsi-dominated military as a threat to its power and ability to influence national affairs. Plans for a recruitment of new members—scheduled to take place in November 1993—meant that the makeup of the military would be drastically altered (Reyntjens 1995: 13; Lemarchand 1994a: xvii-xviii).539 As per tradition, members of the army (acting at the behest of a small number of Tutsi officers) decided to seize control of the government on 21 October 1993. Although the coup d’état was perpetrated by two army units, the entire military was soon involved as inter-group violence spread throughout the country.

The problems associated with democratization in Burundi were also experienced in Rwanda but on a much larger scale. Throughout the entire process, President Habyarimana and the former ruling party, the MRND(D), created obstacles to impede the institutional changes they were required to make.540

---

538 In the cabinet formed by Ndadaye, Tutsi were given nine of the 21 cabinet positions, including prime minister and minister of defense; seats in government were also distributed on the basis of region (Guichaoua 1995: 736-737; Reyntjens 1995: 12; Lemarchand 1994a: 183).

539 For a more general assessment of the role of the military in the 1993 coup d’état, see Lemarchand (1994b: 598-602).

540 As a general note, on 5 July 1991, the MRND became the MRND(D), or the Mouvement
Unlike Burundi, the ethnic opposition in Rwanda was *never* perceived as a valid negotiating or governing partner by much of the Hutu ruling elite.

The decision to move to a multiparty system of government was first expressed by the President in July 1990. However, no actual steps were taken in this direction until after the RPF invaded Rwanda in October 1990. In April 1991, a National Synthesis Commission was given the task of revising the country’s constitution. In contrast to the way in which the process was conducted in Burundi, the Synthesis Commission in Rwanda included *no* members of the ethnic opposition. Additionally, the new constitution that was created was not put to a public referendum.

Once again, the Habyarimana government dragged its feet in implementing reforms that were now mandated by law. It was not until 30 December 1991 that a multiparty transitional government was officially established. The fact that the new government contained only *one* member of the political opposition immediately drew protests from the other major opposition parties—the MDR, the Parti Liberal (“PL”), the PSD. In April 1992, these protests paid off and a new transitional government was put in place that included members of all four opposition parties, with a member of the MDR—Dismas Nsengiyaremye—given the position of prime minister. In July 1993, a second transitional government was formed that included a female prime minister—Agathe Uwilingiyimana. It is important to call attention to the fact that *all* of the multiparty governments that were formed between December 1991 and July 1993 included at most only two Tutsi ministers.

Per the Arusha Accords, a Broad Based Transition Government comprised of 20 ministers (including five appointed by the RPF) was set to take office on 10 September 1993 and to govern for a

541 President Habyarimana’s “inspiration” to create a multiparty system of government derived in part from the advice given him by French President Francois Mitterrand at the Franco-African Summit in June 1990 (Prunier 1995: 89-90).
542 The breakdown in party membership of the July 1993 government was as follows: four seats, including the post of Prime Minister were given to the MDR; five seats to the MRND(D), three to the PL and PSD and one seat given to the PDC (Guichoaua 1995: 456).
543 However, four Tutsi were appointed to ministerial posts in the BBTG—three from the RPF and one from the PL (Guichoaua 1995: 754-757).
period of 22 months until presidential and legislative elections could be held in the country. The Arusha Accords placed sharp limitations on the powers of the president, relegating him to the ceremonial position of head of state. Primary governing powers now rested with the cabinet and the prime minister. Seats within the Transitional National Assembly (“TNA”)—the legislative body that was to replace the CND—were distributed by party, with 11 each awarded to the MRND(D), the RPF, the MDR, the PSD and the PL; four given to the PDC, and one seat given to each the minor political parties.

Lastly, the military was to be made an integrated force. Of the 13,000 troops that were to make up the new military, 40% were to be RPF soldiers, 60% from the Forces Armées Rwandaise (“FAR”). The officer corps was to be split evenly between the RPF and the FAR; an RPF officer was made the head of the gendarmerie and a Hutu placed in the position of the head of the armed forces.

None of these changes ever transpired. Although deputies were chosen for both the BBTG and the TNA, neither body officially took office. The transfer of power, originally set to take place in September 1993, was delayed several times before the president was assassinated and the genocide begun (or 6 April 1994). Although Habyarimana and his supporters attributed these delays to conditions of insecurity that prevailed in the country at the time, scholars who have written on the genocide strongly suggest that the delays were part of a strategy intended to completely block the democratization process (Prunier 1995, Des Forges 1999, African Rights 1995).

Although the stalling tactics employed by Habyarimana and the MRND(D) had begun long before multiparty democracy was made a part of the peace process, the initial stages of institutional change in Rwanda were not accompanied by nearly the same level of violence and mayhem as occurred during the period of the Arusha negotiations and afterward (see Table 5.2). As discussed in Chapter 5 of

---

544 This was the original date set by the Arusha Accords. It represented the 37th day after the Accords were signed.
546 The transfer was delayed a second time on 30 December 1993, again on 5 January 1994, 10 February 1994, 22 February 1994, 25 March 1994 and on 28 March 1994. Despite these delays, Habyarimana officially assumed the presidency of the BBTG on 5 January 1994. On that day, he announced that the 22 month transitional period had begun. On 22 February 1994, however, the President announced that the transitional period would
this dissertation, Jones (1999) suggests that much of the violence that was perpetrated by the MRND(D), the CDR and their militias was done to lessen the legitimacy of the transitional multiparty regimes and to create a sense of “nostalgia for single-party rule” (1999: 350).547

Aside from creating what Longman (1999) terms an “organization of chaos,” Habyarimana and the Hutu hardliners were also successful in their efforts to divide the opposition parties. African Rights (1995) reports that one strategy used by the President was to encourage his supporters to infiltrate the MDR—the primary rival of the MRND(D).548 Additionally, the President sponsored a national conference in Kigali in March 1993 in which representatives of all of major opposition parties attended, in addition to the MRND(D), and the extremist CDR party. The intent of the meeting was to create a “common front” against the RPF; the actual result was the formation of an immediate rift within each of the opposition parties between conference attendees, and the legitimate leaders of these parties (Prunier 1995: 181).

The conservative Hutu elite were aided further in their efforts to divide the opposition by the occurrence of certain events—some of which diminished support for the RPF among members of the moderate opposition parties; some of which simply eliminated the opposition. Two events that held special significance in this regard were the 8 February 1993 RPF invasion and the assassination of Emmanuel Gabyisi in May 1993.549 However, the event that had the most substantial impact on the

continue indefinitely due to conditions of internal insecurity in the country (Banks et al. 1999: 823; see also Prunier 1995: chap. 6).

547 In this way the violence that was occurring in the country could be blamed on the ineptitude and inadequacy of the Nsengiyaremye and Uwilingiyimana governments in particular, and on the system of multiparty democracy more generally (1999: 348-350).

548 Information regarding this particular tactic was obtained by African Rights from a government official, former Ambassador to Paris Bonaventure Ubalijoro. Ubalijoro indicated that two men in particular—Donet Murengo and Froduald Karamira—were especially helpful to the President in this regard (African Rights 1995: 87).

549 Gabyisi, a political rival of Habyarimana, had been in the process of creating a coalition in opposition to both the RPF and Habyarimana. His murder was therefore beneficial for the President. It also didn’t hurt that his death could be blamed (and was blamed) on the RPF and leaders of the MDR, including the future Prime Minister of the BBTG, Faustin Twagiramungu.

The February 1993 RPF invasion was launched in response to a wave of violence perpetrated in northern Rwanda against Tutsi civilians (see Table 5.2). Unfortunately for the RPF, the invasion had the effect of alienating the opposition. As Prunier (1995) states: “Since the [Habyarimana] regime had always presented the guerillas as bloodthirsty feudalists bent on seizing power by force, the Hutu opposition had progressively accepted the milder MDR view of the RPF and shrugged off its virulent conqueror image as a propaganda fabrication. Now, suddenly, it
consolidation of the extremist Hutu-Power movement in Rwanda was the 21 October 1993 assassination of Melchoir Ndadaye by the Tutsi-led military in Burundi. As the next chapter discusses, the way in which the assassination was framed by Hutu politicians and party leaders clearly reflected a perception of joint-rule a “total loss” for the country, specifically for the Hutu (Prunier 1995: 198-206; Des Forges 1999: 134-137).

On a more practical note, the split that developed in the opposition parties created serious problems with respect to which party members were to be given seats in the BBTG. Once the MDR, the PSD and the PL split into moderate and extremist “Hutu-Power” factions, demands were quickly made by the latter for inclusion in the new government being formed (on this point, see Prunier 1995: 197). Although their initial attempts to obtain cabinet portfolios were unsuccessful, it is highly significant that many of the ministries in the interim government formed by the Hutu extremists on 8 April 1994 were headed by members of the Hutu-Power factions (Guichaoua 1995: 758-759; also African Rights 1995: 102-107).550

In their efforts to hamper the implementation of the power-sharing government the Hutu extremists derived benefit not just from fortuitous circumstances, but also from the process of democratization itself.551 The establishment of a “free” press in Rwanda enabled extremists to use events such as the assassination of Melchoir Ndadaye to push their political agendas. The connection between the extremist “independent” newspapers, radio stations, and the Hutu ruling elite has already been discussed in extensive detail in the previous chapter and is not further elaborated on here. Suffice it to say, it is important to reiterate the fact that Habyarimana and his supporters maintained tight control over the official media, as well as de-facto control over crucial segments of the independent media.

---

550 Equally significant is the fact that 12 of the 19 ministers in the outgoing Uwilingiyimana government also served in the April 1994 interim government. This latter fact stands as a clear indicator that the ideology of the last transitional regime had moved in a more extremist direction, regardless of whether members of the Uwilingiyimana government were members of the Hutu Power movement or not.

551 This is a point that has been made in many of the major studies of the Rwandan genocide, including the studies by Prunier (1995), African Rights (1995), and Des Forges (1999); see also Chrétien (1999).
Additionally, the legalization of political parties in July 1991 provided Habyarimana with another devise with which to stall the process of institutional reform. The smaller political parties which were created in the early 1990s were closely affiliated with Habyarimana and the MRND(D). During the peace negotiations, the President, the MRND(D) and four of the minor parties demanded representation at Arusha, as well as in the BBTG; they further demanded to be consulted on all decisions made at the negotiations (Prunier 1995: 164, African Rights 1995: 86). The President also came to the aid of the extremist CDR party when, in March 1994, the CDR demanded a seat in the TNA.

Given all of these factors, it is somewhat difficult to accept the suggestion offered by Jones (1999) and other scholars that Habyarimana and the MRND(D) were politically marginalized in the new power-sharing government. On the one hand, certain features of the new system of government ensured for virtual policy gridlock. As Prunier (1995: 192) writes, the fact that a two-thirds majority was required for all decisions in the BBTG meant that for any decision to become effective it had to have the support of the RPF (five ministers), the MRND(D) (also five), and the MDR (four) for a total of fourteen votes. This sounded like a recipe for the constant blocking of any decision more contentious than the purchase of paper-clips.

The fact that seats within the TNA were distributed in a like manner posed similar problems for the passage of future legislation.

552 Included among these parties was the Mouvement des Femmes et du Bas-Peuple (“MFBP”), the Parti Progressiste de al Jeunesse Rwandaise (“PPJR-RAMA), and the Parti des écologistes (“PECO”). Seven of these small parties took part in the national conference held by Habyarimana in March 1993 (see above); three of these parties were also members of the Alliance pour le Renforcement de la Démocratie (“ARD”). Created by Habyarimana in November 1992, the ARD was a conservative group of anti-opposition parties which also consisted of the MRND(D) and the CDR (Prunier 1995: 171n; Guichaoua 1995: 767-768).

553 In the end, nine of the 10 minor parties were given seats in the TNA.

554 Incidentally, the decision of the CDR to sign the National Assembly Code of Ethics created yet another delay in the transfer of power. Signing the Code of Ethics was a requirement for all political parties who wanted a seat in the TNA. Prior to March 1994, the CDR had adamantly refused to sign the document. It is somewhat ironic that the decision to include the CDR in the Assembly was supported by several foreign parties, including the United States and Germany (for more on this point, see Des Forges 1999: 177-178; see also Prunier 1995: 208).

555 Jones bases this assumption on the fact that the RPF held a number of seats equal to the MRND(D) in both the BBTG and the TNA, in addition to the fact that the powers of the presidency had been substantially reduced. Jones also contends that the moderate parties (the MDR, the PSD etc.) were “natural allies of the RPF” (1999: 139-140).

556 According to Jones (1999: 139), for a majority coalition to be formed in the legislature, agreement had to be been reached between at least four parties (on this point, see also Reyntjens 1994). Although the MRND(D)
Furthermore, at the local level, the MRND(D) still retained substantial political clout. In the partial elections for burgomasters that were held in September 1993 in the northern part of the country (e.g. the demilitarized zone), for example, the former ruling party had emerged victorious (Prunier 1995: 196n, Des Forges 1999: 112). This victory occurred despite the previous losses the MRND(D) had sustained in the first round of local elections held in March 1993.\(^{557}\) It is important to note, however, that the March elections only applied to one-third of the communes in the country, and more importantly, they were held well in advance of the Ndadaye assassination. With this in mind, even the results of the September 1993 elections must be qualified.\(^{558}\)

The purpose of this discussion has been to demonstrate that the Hutu extremists did have other less risky options available to them. Given time, it is likely that the MRND(D) and its supporters would have strengthened their political position despite the implementation of the BBTG. Conditions in the country had created a crisis of legitimacy for the Hutu moderates, the RPF, and the power-sharing government as a whole.

In conclusion a few remarks must be made regarding the Arusha peace process itself. Firstly, certain features of the agreement did not bode well for the future of the joint-rule government in Rwanda. For instance, a reduction in the size of the military and the integration of the RPF into its ranks were to involve a mass demobilization of existing FAR troops. This translated into higher unemployment for the Hutu at a time in which jobs in Rwanda were especially scarce. Additionally, the provision that dealt

was clearly in the minority in the TNA, it is uncertain at to whether the RPF could necessarily count on the continued support of the more moderate opposition parties, particularly the MDR. It is safe to say that support from the PL was a virtual shoe-in given that most of its members in the TNA were Tutsi (at least nine of the 11). What was likely to occur was a situation in which three alliances would be formed: one between the MRND(D) and the smaller parties (18 votes), another consisting of the PL and the RPF (22 votes), and a third encompassing the MDR, the PSD and the PDC (26 votes). Of course this is only conjecture. It is impossible to say what exactly would have transpired had the genocide not occurred. It could very well have been the case that parties in the legislature would have polarized along ethnic lines, in which case the Hutu would have had the clear majority (for data of the distribution of seats in the TNA, see Guichaoua 1995: 762-764).

\(^{557}\) At that time, the MRND(D) had only won 16 of the 40 positions available. These were primarily in the north, although the former ruling party also won a few posts in the southeast and east. In the March elections, the MDR took 18 posts with the remaining six divided between PSD and PL candidates (Des Forges 1999: 112-113).

\(^{558}\) Lastly, it is important to remember that the Hutu extremists in the MRND(D) and the CDR exercised a monopoly over the means of coercion. As indicated throughout this study, the extremists controlled not only the military, but also various paramilitary groups and “death squads.” Additionally, even with the changes to be enacted
with the return of refugees was equally troublesome for the simple reason that resources in the country were already stretched to the limit.\textsuperscript{559}

Secondly, Jones (1999) argues that the various problems associated with Arusha had less to do with the actual pressures exerted on the GOR to reach an agreement, and more to do with the nature of the process itself.\textsuperscript{560} More specifically, he suggests:

Arusha was fundamentally about power-sharing, and the power to share was all held by the regime. Thus, the nature of the process was such that every conceivable resolution of an issue involved some limitation on the regime’s power. (148)

Many of these limitations—including the exclusion of the CDR from the negotiating process—were made in spite of the opinions expressed by external parties to the talks.\textsuperscript{561} The end result was an agreement that was completely unacceptable to many within the ruling regime, the majority of whom were members of the MRND(D). The treaty was widely perceived by Hutu extremists as constituting a “sell out” to the RPF; those blamed for the agreement included members of the moderate opposition parties and, by the spring of 1994, the President himself.

\section*{Conclusion}

According to a number of scholars, in order for the institutions of democracy to function within a society, the proper foundations must be present. In the current study, the foundations for democracy are operationalized as the two main independent variables—social structures and traditional political institutions. The evidence presented in the current and preceding chapters supports the main hypothesis to the structure of the military, the Hutu would still comprise a majority of the infantry and half of the officer corps.\textsuperscript{559} Another problem concerned the selection of deputies to the TNA. Instead of being elected, deputies were nominated to the TNA. This was a concession made to the RPF who feared it would obtain fewer seats in the legislature should seats be awarded by election (Prunier 1995: 163 ff.7).

Jones makes this assertion based on the fact that some of the external parties to the negotiations, in particular France and Zaire, were friendly to Habyarimana and the MRND(D) (1999: 148).

\textsuperscript{561} These parties included French and American negotiators (Jones 1999: 140-141). Because not all relevant parties were included in the BBTG and the TNA, and because several of the provisions “pushed well beyond what was acceptable in Kigali,” Jones argues that the Arusha Agreement failed as a measure of preventative diplomacy.

On a related note, the author contends that a large part of the reason why so many concessions were made to the RPF in the first place was a result of the fact that the RPF had become a significant force to be reckoned with on the battlefield. Their victories in the February 1993 invasion had thus given them a stronger bargaining position.
of this study that the types of *social structures* and *traditional political institutions* within each country heavily influenced the responses of political leaders to the prospect of joint-rule.

As demonstrated above and in Chapter 6 there are some very fundamental differences between Rwanda and Burundi in terms of the ways in which the society of each is structured, the types of informal institutions that have traditionally existed within each country, and the nature of their governing systems. Rwandan society has traditionally been one in which the predominant type of social cleavages are reinforcing cleavages. Group identities polarized along Hutu-Tutsi lines far earlier than in Burundi, a great deal of which had to do with the fact that the social hierarchy in Rwanda was reinforced and legitimated by the institutions of Tutsi rule (including those introduced during the period of Belgian colonial rule).

It is worth reiterating that the historical evidence strongly suggests that Belgian rule in Rwanda-Urundi served to exacerbate pre-existing social conditions in each kingdom. Contrary to the suggestion of scholars such as Scherrer (1999), conditions in both countries prior to colonialization were not peaceful and serene, nor would they necessarily have remained so in the long-term. This especially applies to Rwanda. Even if Scherrer’s argument were correct, it does not explain *how* or *why* Belgian rule came to have the particular influence it did on group relations in both countries. Additionally, if Belgian rule was the sole source of the hatred that eventually culminated in total genocide in Rwanda, this does not explain why genocide did not also happen in Burundi in 1993, particularly given the fact that the racialization of identities applied to Burundi as well. Instead, as the current and previous chapters have demonstrated, institutional structures mitigated the consequences of Belgian colonial policies in Burundi.

The opposite was the case in Rwanda. Unlike Burundi, the executive in Rwanda ruled absolutely. For much of the 19th and 20th centuries, the system of government was a highly centralized system, with power vested in either a single individual or political party. What justified the systems of Tutsi and Hutu

---

(1999: 149-151).

562 This is the position of many experts on the Great Lakes area including Lemarchand (1970, 1994a), and
rule were paradigms that emphasized the inherent superiority of the ruling group. Furthermore, because political and socioeconomic status traditionally coincided in Rwanda, the contest for power has always been perceived by competitors in zero-sum terms.

Evidence of this perception can be detected in the manner in which the Hutu political elite traditionally approached the concept of power sharing. In the period prior to the legalization of multiparty politics in Rwanda, very few Tutsi were allowed to participate in the institutions of government. Although some managed to obtain wealth, the real sources of power in the country were controlled exclusively by the dominant Hutu majority. Similarly, during the period of democratic transition, few Tutsi were allowed to take part in the negotiating process and fewer still held seats in the transitional governments formed prior to the BBTG. More generally, the prospect of sharing power with the Tutsi and Hutu moderates was ill-received by many of the more conservative members of the Hutu ruling elite. To prevent the joint-rule system from becoming a reality, the Hutu extremists engaged in a variety of tactics, the most serious of which was total genocide.

It is important to restate the fact that Rwanda and Burundi share certain similarities in the types of ruling systems established, and political practices followed, in the pre- and post-independence eras. Firstly, in terms of political competition, with some exceptions the quantitative and qualitative data for both countries indicate that political competition has been rarely tolerated; even after the process of democratization was initiated in Rwanda and Burundi, political participation was rather limited.563

---

563 The Polity IV data do not indicate the degree to which political parties were formed on the basis of factional interests during the initial stages of democratization. In the case of Rwanda, the qualitative data suggests that a number of political parties in the country were formed on the basis of regional, and/or ethnic identities. The MRND(D), the CDR, and the Hutu-Power factions created in each of the opposition parties, clearly reflected the presence of reinforcing cleavages in society (see Prunier 1995; African Rights 1995; Des Forges 1999).

In Burundi, FRODEBU and the URPONA had memberships that were more heterogeneous. At the same time, it would be extremely naïve to think that all parties in Burundi were ethnically heterogeneous, or for that matter, that voters in Burundi did not vote along ethnic lines. PALIPEHUTU, and the pro-Tutsi party the Rassemblement pour la Démocratie et le Développement Economique et Social (or “Raddes”) strictly appealed to members on the basis of ethnicity. Even the more moderate FRODEBU party attracted a greater number of Hutu voters than Tutsi voters. However, citizens did not vote strictly along ethnic lines in the 1993 elections. According to Reyntjens’ (1993) over 21% of voters in Burundi voted for UPRONA. This percentage is obviously greater than the percentage of Tutsi in the country (15%). Likewise, the fact that Buyoya received over 32% of the vote in the presidential elections indicates that a substantial number of Hutu voter for the Tutsi president.
Furthermore, prior to independence the executive in each country was chosen by means of heredity. Excluding the few years under which Burundi was ruled by a constitutional monarchy, executive recruitment in Rwanda and Burundi was predominately a non-competitive closed process.

Although for decades Burundi was also ruled by a centralized system of single party rule, generations of decentralized rule—absent an institutionalized doctrine of group supremacy—prompted political development in Burundi to take somewhat a different course. The qualitative evidence indicates that a certain ethos of consensus and cooperation has traditionally existed in Burundi, much of which is due to the combined effects of Burundi’s traditional social and economic systems, the greater flexibility of which effectively prevented both the ganwa and the Tutsi from achieving a strong degree of social cohesion. Furthermore, because both sets of rulers were in the minority compared to the rest of the population, there has always been a greater need to stress the importance of National Unity and inter-group consensus in order to maintain political stability.

The principle of National Unity has manifested itself in the larger numbers of Hutu included in all of the post-independence governments, in addition to the manner in which the democratization process was conducted by President Buyoya and the Tutsi ruling elite in the early 1990s. Unlike Rwanda, the ruling elite in Burundi made a greater effort to include Hutu in the democratization process as it was occurring. Furthermore, in both the Buyoya and Ndadaye regimes, the ethnic opposition was not portrayed as an enemy, but as a partner with a stake in the success of the transition.

The evidence presented in this chapter, as well as in the previous chapter, supports a number of the assumptions embodied by the theory of historical institutionalism. Firstly, the pattern of institutional development in each country clearly exhibits a path dependent quality. The behavior exhibited by the incumbent elite in each country during the period of institutional transition reflects institutional traditions and legacies that have persisted for generations. Secondly, because of the past institutional experiences of each country, the critical juncture of multiparty rule clearly affected the ruling elite of Rwanda and Burundi in different ways. In the case of Rwanda, the transition to multiparty rule was an abomination in clear defiance of the concept of Hutu majority rule. As such, the likelihood that unintended
consequences would arise from the process of democratization in Rwanda was in many ways greater compared to Burundi. Lastly, in accordance with scholars such as Rothstein and Stolle (2002), della Porta (2000) and others, the evidence presented in both Chapters 6 and 7 demonstrates that informal institutions within each country heavily impacted the formal ruling systems in place and vice versa.

Of course there are certain limitations to the arguments made above. Notably, the link between institutional change and the behavior of the political elite is not clearly established. Instead, what the evidence above does establish is a clear-cut case of revealed preferences. This particular problem is one of the major difficulties associated with the theory of historical institutionalism and is the one of the primary concerns of this study.

As mentioned previously, total genocide is an extreme policy course that is very costly for a state to pursue. In order to fully understand how democratization led to total genocide in one of two very similar cases, it is therefore necessary for this study to take a closer look at the decision-making processes that led to the outcomes in question. To do so, this study requires the use of an additional theory—prospect theory. As discussed in Chapter 3 of this study, prospect theory is an especially useful tool with which to understand how actors choose between options because it incorporates context into the decision-making process; it also assumes that more than one type of decision rule is followed by actors.

Chapter 8 applies prospect theory to both cases in conjunction with a test of the second alternative hypothesis—the “rational choice” hypothesis. To demonstrate that political leaders in both cases behaved in a manner that was more consistent with the assumptions of prospect theory—instead of rational choice—the following chapter provides the results of a content analysis performed on statements made by political actors in both countries regarding the transition to multiparty rule.
Table 7.1. Political Differentials Index, Burundi and Rwanda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Burundi-Hutus</th>
<th>Burundi-Tutsi</th>
<th>Rwanda-Tutsi</th>
<th>Rwanda-Hutu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data for Tables 7.1 through 7.3 were obtained from Minorities at Risk Project (2005) College Park, MD: Center for International Development and Conflict Management (retrieved from http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/inscr/mar/, 12 December 2006).
Table 7.2. Political Differentials Indictors, Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hutas</th>
<th>Tutsi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to civil service, political recruitment, right to organize, legal protection.</td>
<td>Politically advantaged in access to power, the right to organize and legal protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to civil service, political recruitment, right to organize, legal protection.</td>
<td>Politically advantaged in access to power, the right to organize and legal protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to civil service, political recruitment, right to organize, legal protection.</td>
<td>Politically advantaged in access to power, the right to organize and legal protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to civil service, political recruitment, right to organize, legal protection.</td>
<td>Politically advantaged in access to power, the right to organize and legal protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to civil service, political recruitment, right to organize, legal protection.</td>
<td>Politically advantaged in access to power, the right to organize and legal protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to civil service, political recruitment, right to organize, legal protection.</td>
<td>Politically advantaged in access to power, the right to organize and legal protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to civil service, political recruitment, right to organize, legal protection.</td>
<td>Politically advantaged in access to power, the right to organize and legal protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to civil service, political recruitment, right to organize, legal protection.</td>
<td>Politically advantaged in access to power, the right to organize and legal protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to civil service, political recruitment, right to organize, legal protection.</td>
<td>Politically advantaged in access to power, the right to organize and legal protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to civil service, political recruitment, right to organize, legal protection.</td>
<td>Politically advantaged in access to power, the right to organize and legal protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to civil service, political recruitment, right to organize, legal protection.</td>
<td>Politically advantaged in access to power, the right to organize and legal protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to civil service, political recruitment, right to organize, legal protection.</td>
<td>Politically advantaged in access to power, the right to organize and legal protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 7.3. Political Differentials Indicators, Rwanda**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Huts</th>
<th>Tutsi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Significant differential: political power, civil service jobs, recruitment, right to organize; extreme differential: legal protection.</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to political power and right to organize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Significant differential: political power, civil service jobs, recruitment, right to organize; extreme differential: legal protection.</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to political power and right to organize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Significant differential: political power, civil service jobs, recruitment, right to organize; extreme differential: legal protection.</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to political power and right to organize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Significant differential: political power, civil service jobs, recruitment, right to organize; extreme differential: legal protection.</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to political power and right to organize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Significant differential: political power, civil service jobs, recruitment, right to organize; extreme differential: legal protection.</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to political power and right to organize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Significant differential: political power, civil service jobs, recruitment, right to organize; extreme differential: legal protection.</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to political power and right to organize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Significant differential: political power, civil service jobs, recruitment, right to organize; extreme differential: legal protection.</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to political power and right to organize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Significant differential: political power, civil service jobs, recruitment, right to organize; extreme differential: legal protection.</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to political power and right to organize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Significant differential: political power, civil service jobs, recruitment, right to organize; extreme differential: legal protection.</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to political power and right to organize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Significant differential: political power, civil service jobs, recruitment, right to organize; extreme differential: legal protection.</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to political power and right to organize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Significant differential: political power, civil service jobs, recruitment, right to organize; extreme differential: legal protection.</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to political power and right to organize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Significant differential: political power, civil service jobs, recruitment, right to organize; extreme differential: legal protection.</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to political power and right to organize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Significant differential: political power, civil service jobs, recruitment, right to organize; extreme differential: legal protection.</td>
<td>Significant differential in access to political power and right to organize.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.4. *POLITY IV* Data, Rwanda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>POLITY2</th>
<th>XRREG</th>
<th>XCOMPO</th>
<th>XOPEN</th>
<th>XCONST</th>
<th>PARREG</th>
<th>PARCOMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data for Tables 7.4 and 7.5 were obtained from the *Polity IV* Project (2002) College Park, MD: University of Maryland Center for International Development and Conflict Management (retrieved from www.cidem.ump.edu, 01 October 2005).
Table 7.5. *POLITY IV* Data, Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>POLITY2</th>
<th>XRREG</th>
<th>XRCOMP</th>
<th>XROPEN</th>
<th>XCONST</th>
<th>PARREG</th>
<th>PARCOMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CODING for Polity IV:**

XRREG: refers to the degree of regulation of executive recruitment within a country. A country coded “1,” is a country in which the process of recruitment is unregulated. A designation of “2” represents a situation in which the executive is designated from within a political hierarchy, or has come to power with the intent to establish a system in which executive recruitment will be regularized. For a country coded “2” there is no political competition. A country is coded “3” if the system is one in which the methods of executive recruitment are regulated and institutionalized. A country is coded “88” if it is in the process of transition; “77” if it is an interregnum period and “66” if the political system is in a state of interruption.

XRCOMP: refers to the degree of competitiveness of executive recruitment within a country. Countries are coded “1” if chief executives are chosen purely by means of designation from within a political hierarchy, by heredity, or a combination of both; countries are coded as “2” if a dual executive is chosen (e.g. one by heredity, the other by election). Countries are coded as “2” if they are in transition from a system in which executives are chosen by
means of designation/heredity to one in which executives are chosen via competitive elections. Countries are coded “3” if executives are chosen via competitive elections. Countries that are coded as having an unregulated system of executive recruitment, or a system that is undergoing a transition to or from an unregulated system, are coded “0,” which means “does not apply.” A country is coded “88” if it is in the process of transition; “77” if it is an interregnum period and “66” if the political system is in a state of interruption.

XROPEN: indicates the degree to which the political recruitment of executives is an open process available to everyone. Countries are coded “1” if the system is one in which an executive is chosen strictly by means of heredity; “2” if there is a dual executive chosen by heredity and by designation; “3” if there is a dual executive chosen by heredity and by electoral means; “4” if executives are chosen by designation, through competitive elections, or that the country is in a process of transition from a system in which executives are chosen by designation to one in which they are chosen through competitive elections. Similar to XRCOMP, if a country is coded as “0” this is a reflection of the way in which the country was coded on XRREG. A country is coded “88” if it is in the process of transition; “77” if it is an interregnum period and “66” if the political system is in a state of interruption.

XCONST: refers to the level of executive constraints present within a country. Countries are coded “1” if executives possess unlimited authority; “2” if they fall within an intermediate category between categories 1 and 3; “3” if there are moderate limitations on the authority of the executive; “4” if the country falls between categories 3 and 5; “5” if there are substantial limitations on the authority of an executive; “6” if a country falls within an intermediate category between categories 5 and 7; “7” if the power of the executive is either checked or diminished by other governmental bodies or groups (e.g. a legislature, a political party etc.) A country is coded “88” if it is in the process of transition; “77” if it is an interregnum period and “66” if the political system is in a state of interruption.

PARREG: refers to the degree to which participation in political affairs is regulated. Countries are coded “1” if political participation in a country is unregulated (e.g. no controls over political activity. It is entirely fluid and unstable); “2” if there are lasting political parties which compete with one another and are mostly formed on the basis of reinforcing cleavages; “3” if parties are formed strictly on the basis of reinforcing cleavages and there is political factionalism and governmental favoritism of some group(s) over others; “4” if political participation is largely restricted; “5” if political participation is regulated, but stable and open. A country is coded “88” if it is in the process of transition; “77” if it is an interregnum period and “66” if the political system is in a state of interruption.

PARCOMP: indicates the degree to which participation in political affairs is competitive. Countries are coded as “0” if they were previously coded as “unregulated” in terms of political participation (e.g. if they are coded as “1” on the PARREG variable); “1” if political participation is repressed; “2” if some forms of political participation are tolerated (albeit with severe restrictions); “3” if parties compete with one another on the basis of factional interests; “4” if they are in a transitional stage from a restricted or factional system of participation to a more open system; “5” if parties can openly compete with one another at the national level of government. A country is coded “88” if it is in the process of transition; “77” if it is an interregnum period and “66” if the political system is in a state of interruption.

For further information on all of these indices, see Marshall and Jaggers (2002: 17-27).
CHAPTER 8
REFERENCE POINTS, DECISION FRAMES
AND COLLECTIVE VIOLENCE IN RWANDA AND BURUNDI

The evidence presented and discussed in Chapters 6 and 7 strongly supports this dissertation’s main argument that informal and formal institutions influenced the ability of incumbent rulers in both countries to make a successful transition from single party to multiparty rule. However, what the qualitative and quantitative evidence reviewed thus far establishes is a case of revealed preferences; the link between institutions and individual behavior in both cases has not yet been sufficiently established.

To more fully comprehend how institutions contributed to the outcomes in question, this dissertation must delve deeper into the ways in which joint-rule was perceived by individual actors in both countries; more specifically whether democratization was considered a loss or a gain for members of the incumbent group. Conducting an individual-level analysis allows this study to clearly demonstrate that more than one type of decision rule was utilized by political actors in both countries during the period of democratic transition, contrary to arguments that rely either directly or indirectly on the assumptions of rational choice.

The current chapter proceeds as follows: first, this chapter briefly revisits the various rational choice arguments that have been used (or can be used) to explain the outbreak of communal violence in both countries in the early 1990s. A rational choice alternative hypothesis is then presented and discussed. To test this alternative hypothesis against the main hypothesis, this study performs a content analysis on statements made by members of the incumbent political elite in both countries which specifically reference the transition to multiparty rule. Following a discussion of the results of the content analysis, the rational choice alternative hypothesis is further assessed with qualitative data obtained from
several studies of the genocide in Rwanda and the collective violence that occurred in Burundi in the 1990s. This chapter concludes with a summation of the findings and a few brief remarks regarding Chapter 9 of this dissertation.

Rational Choice Explanations of Collective Violence in Rwanda and Burundi

All of the studies that seek to explain the causes of the collective violence that occurred in Rwanda and Burundi in the early 1990s—whether from a structural, institutional or micro-level perspective—tend to rely heavily on the assumption that political actors in both countries behaved in a rational manner. In other words, the decision of actors to accept or reject multiparty rule was the consequence of a rational choice-making process in which the costs and benefits of all options were considered and the option with the highest benefit relative to cost selected. In the case of Rwanda, this argument translates into the suggestion that the extermination of the country’s Tutsi population and the massacre of all Hutu moderates were perceived by the perpetrators as a more cost-effective solution to the problems associated with joint-rule.

As indicated in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, the idea that total genocide was a rational policy choice encounters serious problems when the same argument is applied to Burundi. If indeed a “single and mutual decision rule” was utilized by the conservative Hutu in Rwanda, then similar conditions of risk should have prompted political incumbents in Burundi to behave in a similar manner. That this did not occur raises significant doubts as to the applicability of rational-choice arguments to either case.

However, in order to arrive at any definitive conclusions regarding the appropriateness of rational choice explanations in this context, it is necessary for this study to test an additional alternative hypothesis which is as follows:

Alternative Hypothesis 2: Members of the incumbent political elite in Rwanda and Burundi conducted their decision-making in regards to the implementation of multiparty democracy in a manner consistent with the assumptions of rational choice. Under similar conditions of risk, leaders weighed the costs and benefits of all options before them and chose the option that carried with it the lowest cost relative to benefit.
The alternative rational choice hypothesis is tested against a segment of the general hypothesis which suggests that if multiparty democracy is perceived by members of an incumbent political elite as illegitimate, or a “sure loss,” the transition process will fail and total genocide will be chosen as a means to reverse the status quo (e.g. to reinstitute the previous system of single party rule). Conversely, if multiparty democracy is perceived by political incumbents as legitimate, the multiparty institutions of government will be accepted and total genocide will not occur, despite the occurrence of a similar set of unfavorable circumstances (e.g. economic crisis, communal violence etc.).

The above hypothesis is derived from prospect theory which assumes that perception heavily impacts the policy choices political actors make. It is in this context that prospect theory is used by this dissertation to establish the link between institutions, institutional change and individual behavior.

When a speaker advocates a preference for a risk-seeking policy course—such as total genocide or some other form of massive group violence—and clearly uses the former status quo as his or her reference point, he or she is considered to be behaving in a risk-acceptant manner. In such a situation, the main hypothesis will be confirmed and the rational choice hypothesis disconfirmed. Similarly, when a speaker demonstrates a preference for a risk-averse policy—when it appears that he or she perceives multiparty democratization as a “gain” and is willing to forgo the alternative with equal or greater value—the main hypothesis will once again be confirmed and the rational choice hypothesis disconfirmed.

Content Analysis: Results and Discussion

As discussed in Chapter 4 of this dissertation, the content analysis performed by this study is meant to specifically test three secondary hypotheses, all of which pertain directly to the main hypothesis discussed above:

_Hypothesis 1a:_ A greater proportion of the arguments made by members of an incumbent elite group which favor a particular course of action to be taken in response to multiparty democratization are those in which a reference point is used by the speaker.

_Hypothesis 1b:_ Arguments made by members of an incumbent elite group that favor a risk-seeking policy course contain a greater proportion of arguments in which the speaker uses the
prior system of absolute rule (e.g. the former status quo) as his or her reference point. These are arguments that tend to portray multiparty rule as a complete loss.

Hypothesis 1c: Arguments made by members of an incumbent elite group that favor a risk-averse policy course contain a greater proportion of arguments in which the speaker uses the current system of multiparty democracy (e.g. the current status quo) as his or her reference point. These are arguments that tend to portray multiparty rule as a gain.

To test these hypotheses, this dissertation obtained a sample of articles from the Lexis-Nexis database that referenced multiparty democracy or some aspect of multiparty democracy as it pertained to Rwanda and Burundi.⁵⁶⁴

For Rwanda a total of 1038 articles were selected for the period January 1991 to April 1994.⁵⁶⁵ Out of this sample, 158 articles were selected which contained a statement or statements made by speakers regarding the democratization process. In total, 280 statements were identified by the coders from these 158 articles.⁵⁶⁶

As indicated in Chapter 4 of this study two coders were used for the content analysis to ensure for reliability.⁵⁶⁷ Inter-coder reliability for the full sample was assessed with the use of a Cohen’s kappa

---

⁵⁶⁴ In order to be as inclusive as possible, this study accepted articles that referenced a variety of issues either pertaining to the process of democratization or mentioned within the context of democratization, including articles that discussed the Arusha Accords and peace process (in Rwanda), and articles which addressed the expansion of civil liberties and rights (for more information, see Appendix A). All articles selected for consideration were selected by the author of this dissertation.

⁵⁶⁵ As a reminder, for each country, the period of time for which articles were selected and assessed is the period beginning six months prior to the legalization of multiparty democracy and ending the date on which the presidents of both countries were assassinated. For Burundi this period extends from 01 October 1991 to 21 October 1993; for Rwanda from 01 January 1991 to 6 April 1994.

⁵⁶⁶ At times an article could yield as many as 11 separate arguments. A statement is considered to constitute an argument if it includes both a policy preference, as well as a clearly defined reason for that particular preference (for further information, see Chapter 4).

⁵⁶⁷ The second coder used by this study is a fellow graduate student who is also familiar with Rwanda and Burundi, especially with the episodes of conflict each country experienced in the early to mid-1990s. To ensure that the sample of articles selected were coded appropriately, prior to the coding process, the second coder was given a number of studies and books written specifically on the topic of ethnic conflict and democratization in both countries. The second coder was also given information concerning the identities and party affiliations of members of the Hutu political elite in Rwanda (during the reign of President Habyarimana), as well as the Tutsi political elite in Burundi during the reigns of Presidents Buyoya and Bagaza. The total amount of time required for coder training was approximately 15 hours.
test.\textsuperscript{568} Cohen’s kappa ($\kappa$) measures inter-coder reliability on a scale from “1” to “0,” with values closer to “1” being a sign that greater inter-coder agreement is present.

There tended to be quite a bit of inter-coder disagreement with respect to whether or not a statement constituted a policy argument or not. Initial agreement was reached on 259 of the 280 statements.\textsuperscript{569} Out of these statements coders agreed that 193 constituted policy arguments. The Cohen’s kappa score obtained for this sample is .81.\textsuperscript{570}

In the same sample, greater agreement was reached between coders concerning whether or not a speaker was using a reference point in his or her argument, the type of reference point used and the type of policy being advocated. Coders agreed that 153 of the 193 policy arguments were reference point-related; 30 non-reference point-related.\textsuperscript{571} The Cohen’s kappa score obtained for this particular sample is .83. Additionally, coders agreed that speakers used the former status quo in 72 of the 153 arguments that were found to be reference point-related, and the current status quo in 75 of these arguments. Coders disagreed on only six arguments and the Cohen’s kappa score obtained for this particular sample is .92. Lastly, with regard to the types of policies preferred by speakers, coders agreed that in 101 of the 193 policy arguments speakers advocated a preference for the “low risk” or risk-averse policy option; in 78 of the policy arguments speakers advocated a preference for the “high risk” or risk-seeking policy option.

\textsuperscript{568} Assessing inter-coder agreement is crucial in order to ensure that coders are evaluating the same data in a like manner. Inter-coder reliability is a thus measure of the extent to which data categories are clearly defined. Due to the relatively small sample size for each case, this dissertation did not assess inter-coder reliability with a small randomly selected sample, but instead applied the Cohen’s kappa test to the full sample. The use of Cohen’s kappa is an appropriate measure of inter-coder reliability because it provides a conservative assessment of agreement. On a separate note, a simple assessment of the percentage of agreement between coders was not used by this study. According to Lombard, Snyder-Duch and Bracken (2005) there is consensus in the methodological literature that the use of percent agreement is an inappropriately liberal measure of inter-coder reliability and tends to be somewhat misleading as it does not indicate the occurrence of agreement by chance.\textsuperscript{569} To be more specific, coders agreed that the 259 statements either were or were not policy arguments; coders agreed that 66 of these 259 statements were not policy arguments.\textsuperscript{570} According to Lombard, Snyder-Duch and Bracken (2005) to claim sufficient inter-coder reliability it is preferable to obtain a kappa score of at least .80 or higher for the sample tested. While a higher kappa score would have certainly been preferable for this initial sample, as with most of the other reliability samples examined, the author of this dissertation is satisfied that the minimum threshold for inter-coder reliability has been met.\textsuperscript{571} There was inter-coder disagreement on only 10 of these 193 policy arguments.
There was inter-coder disagreement on a total of 14 of the policy arguments and the Cohen’s kappa score attained for this final reliability sample is .85.

Most of the disagreements between coders were resolved in post-coding discussion.\textsuperscript{572} In total, agreement \textit{could not} be reached on nine policy arguments—all of which were subsequently discarded. A chi-square test was then run on the remaining sample of 205 policy arguments.

As indicated in Table 8.1, the majority of arguments made by political actors were reference point-related (173 of the 205 articles or 84.4%). Of these, roughly half contained arguments that demonstrated a preference on the part of speakers for the “low risk” policy course. As a reminder, a policy course that is “low risk” is one which is intended to further the course of political liberalization as mandated by law. “Low risk” policies are risk-averse policies. In the context of Rwanda, “low risk” policy strategies include national conferences, negotiated settlements, greater compliance with the terms of the Arusha settlement agreement, and implementation of the transitional institutions—the BBTG and the TNA—without delay.

\textsuperscript{572} One of the two most frequent areas of disagreement between coders concerned whether or not the demands made by Hutu conservatives for early communal elections constituted a preference for a “low risk” or a “high risk” policy option. The second most common disagreement between coders was over whether or not arguments made for the immediate establishment of the transitional ruling institutions for the specific purpose of keeping with the timetable established by the Arusha Accords were reference point or a non-reference point-related arguments. Coders decided that these “timetable” arguments were reference point-related as they indicate a desire on the part of political actors to move forward with the transition process in a legitimate manner (see the coding scheme outlined in \textit{Appendix A}). As for the first argument, coders agreed in post-coding discussions that calls for early local elections were an example of a “high risk” policy course. This assessment is based on several of the studies written about Rwanda, all of which indicate that the attempts made by Habyarimana and the MRND(D) to hold early local elections were strictly for the purposes of shoring up support for the former ruling party (see for example, Des Forges 1999, African Rights 1995 and Prunier 1995).
### Table 8.1. Cross Tabulation of Arguments by Policy Preference and Reference Point Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-reference point</th>
<th>Reference point</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LR (0)</td>
<td>23 (17)</td>
<td>85 (91)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR (1)</td>
<td>9 (15)</td>
<td>88 (82)</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 88 of the 173 reference point-related arguments, speakers advocated a preference for a “high risk” policy course. A “high risk” policy is one that is intended to obstruct and/or completely reverse the democratization process. “High risk” policies are risk-seeking policies. In the context of Rwanda, these policies include orchestrated acts of violence perpetrated against Tutsi civilians and members of the Hutu opposition, boycotts of the Arusha peace process and agreement, refusals to actively participate in the transitional multiparty governments or the BBTG and TNA, as well as efforts to include extremist parties in the BBTG and TNA.

As indicated in earlier chapters of this dissertation, in none of the articles examined did speakers make specific references to a “Final Solution.” As indicated in several of the qualitative studies written about the Rwandan genocide, political actors in Rwanda instead used terms such as “self-defense” or commands to “be vigilant” as euphemisms for collective violence and genocide (see for example, Prunier 1995 and Des Forges 1999). The use of softer language in this context likely stemmed from the fact that these particular speeches and interviews were broadcast on the official radio station, Radio Rwanda. Messages transmitted on Radio Rwanda were then subsequently picked up by a variety of international

---

573 The left hand figures in each column are the observed frequencies; the figures in parentheses to the right the expected frequencies.

574 While these latter two policies seem contradictory, both were used by the President, the MRND(D), the CDR and the Hutu-Power factions of the opposition parties at varying times to obstruct the peace and democratization processes (see Chapter 7 for further discussion on this point).

As a reminder, this study includes within the “high risk” category, policies that were intended to obstruct the democratization process because they too posed a threat to peace in Rwanda and were perceived by many as likely to reignite the civil war with the RPF.
news sources including the *BBC* and *Agence France Presse*. By way of contrast, the statements and messages broadcast on the “privately-owned” stations in Rwanda—such as Radio-Télévision Libre des Milles Collines—were un-censored and far more inflammatory (see Chapter 6 and the discussion below).

A chi-squared test of independence was performed on the above cross tabulation. The relationship between argument type and policy preference was found to be statistically significant. The likelihood that the null hypothesis is true—that no correlation exists between use of a reference point and the type of policies preferred by speakers in this example—is between .02 and .01.575

Table 8.2 provides the results for the cross tabulation of arguments by *type* of reference point and type of policy preferred by speakers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSQ</th>
<th>FSQ</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LR (0)</td>
<td>78 (43)</td>
<td>7 (42)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR (1)</td>
<td>10 (45)</td>
<td>78 (43)</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated above, in 78 of the 85 arguments in which speakers indicated a preference for the “low risk” policy course, the current status quo of multiparty democracy was used as the primary point of reference. As expected, the vast majority of arguments in which the former status quo was used as a reference point are those in which speakers advocated a preference for “high risk” policy strategies (or 78 of the 85 arguments). The expected frequencies for all types of arguments differ dramatically from the observed frequencies which as an initial indicator that the chances the null hypothesis is true are quite small. This

575 The chi-square test statistic for this sample is 5.48 with one degree of freedom. The critical values for the chi-square distribution for one degree of freedom are 5.024 and 6.635 (see Hamilton 1996: 430). The above statement can be translated to mean that, in this particular example, a chi-square value larger than 5.48, given one
was verified with a chi-square test of independence in which the relationship between reference point type and policy preference was found to be statistically significant at the .001 level.\textsuperscript{576}  

Compared to Rwanda, there were far fewer articles available that addressed multiparty democratization in Burundi. In total, 280 were selected from the Lexis-Nexis database for the period 01 October 1991 to 21 October 1993. Of these articles, only 52 contained a statement or statements made by political actors regarding some aspect of institutional change. A Cohen’s kappa test revealed a somewhat high level of disagreement between coders as to whether or not the speaker’s statement constituted a policy argument. Coders agreed that 72 of the statements either were or were not policy arguments. Despite the fact that coders \textit{disagreed} on only nine statements, given the relatively small sample size (81 statements total), it was no surprise that the Cohen’s kappa score obtained is also rather low (or .78).

The level of inter-coder disagreement was far lower with respect to whether or not policy arguments were reference point-related. Of the 40 statements coders agreed were policy arguments, 10 were found to be non-reference point-related; 29 reference point-related. The Cohen’s kappa inter-coder reliability score attained for this sample is .93.

Far worse results, however, were obtained with regard to the type of reference point used by speakers. Once again, these results were likely the consequence of a small sample size. Coders agreed that speakers used the current status quo as their reference point in 20 of the 29 reference point-related arguments; the former status quo in only four arguments. The Cohen’s kappa score obtained for this sample is a dismal .52. There was more agreement, however, over the types of policies speakers advocated. Coders agreed that speakers preferred “low risk” policies in 34 of the 40 policy arguments, “high risk” policies in five of these arguments. The Cohen’s kappa score for this last reliability sample is .90.

\textsuperscript{576} The chi-square test statistic for this cross tabulation is 112.4, with df = 1. The probability that the null is true—that no relation exists between reference point-type and preferred policy course—is less than .01% (Hamilton 1996: 430).
In post-coding discussion, agreement was reached on a total of 46 policy arguments.\textsuperscript{577} The chi-square test results for this sample proved to be especially problematic. One of the more immediate problems concerned the observed frequency of “high risk” non-reference point-related arguments. As indicated in Table 8.3, the observed frequency of these arguments is less than five.\textsuperscript{578}

Table 8.3. Cross Tabulation of Arguments by Policy Preference and Reference Point Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-reference point</th>
<th>Reference point</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LR (0)</td>
<td>9 (8.5)</td>
<td>30 (30.5)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR (1)</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
<td>6 (5.5)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chi-square test of independence performed on the above cross tabulation indicated that the relationship between the use of a reference point and an actor’s policy preference is largely insignificant. The likelihood that the null hypothesis is true is quite high for this sample—over 50\%.\textsuperscript{579} As indicated above, the fact that a cell with an observed frequency of less than five can disproportionately influence the results of a chi-square test may explain this particular result.

\textsuperscript{577} One of the biggest areas of disagreement between coders was as to whether or not references made by the outgoing president to the problems associated with voting on the basis of “subjective factors” were an indication that the former status quo was being used as the reference point. Based on factual information obtained from studies of the political history of Burundi in the latter half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century (see for example, Lemarchand 1994a, 1994b), coders decided that these arguments were “former status quo” arguments. Coders agreed that President Buyoya’s references to voting on the basis of subjective factors were another way of suggesting that ethnicity is not a legitimate part of the political discourse in Burundi. This is an argument that is similar in many ways to those advocated by the former Tutsi presidents, Michel Micombero and Jean-Baptiste Bagaza.

\textsuperscript{578} It is preferable to have an expected frequency of five or greater in order to avoid making incorrect inferences from a chi-square test of independence. The cases included in a “thin cell” (e.g. a cell with an observed frequency of less than five cases) may be included in that cell simply by chance (for more on this problem, see Hamilton 1996: 225-226, 231-233).

\textsuperscript{579} The chi-square test statistic for this sample is .285 with one degree of freedom. The critical value for the chi-square distribution is .455 (Hamilton 1996: 430). In other words, the probability that the chi-square value is larger than .285 (with df of 1) is greater than .50.
Better results were obtained with the cross tabulation performed on arguments by reference point type and policy preference. As demonstrated below, in the vast majority of arguments in which speakers advocated a preference for a risk-averse policy course, the current status quo was used as the reference point (20 of the 30 arguments).

Table 8.4. Cross Tabulation of Arguments by Type of Reference Point and Policy Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSQ</th>
<th>FSQ</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LR (0)</td>
<td>20 (17.5)</td>
<td>10 (12.5)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR (1)</td>
<td>1 (3.5)</td>
<td>5 (2.5)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly enough, these results also indicate that speakers who preferred a “low risk” policy option were more inclined to use the former status quo as their reference point than speakers who preferred a higher risk policy (10 out of the 15 former status quo arguments). This finding is not terribly surprising. Although many members of the Tutsi incumbent elite in Burundi looked favorably on the process of democratization, they also understood that if institutional change did not proceed in a strictly controlled manner (e.g. controlled by them) they stood to lose substantially. Examples of this type of argument include those in which speakers strongly advocated further political liberalization but referred to some of their political opponents as “enemies of democracy,” to the voting process as a whole as being ethnically based, or to multiparty democracy as a source of instability for the country.

A chi-square test of independence run on the above cross tabulation yielded somewhat more favorable results. With one degree of freedom, the likelihood that a chi-square value exists that is greater
than 3.7 is between .10 and .05. Stated differently, the chance that no correlation exists between the type of reference point used by speakers and the type of policy preferred is between five and 10 percent.

Given the results obtained in the first and second cross tabulations and significance tests for Burundi, the researcher chose to expand the sample of articles by one year. Additional articles were coded for the period between 01 October 1990 and 01 October 1991. A total of 42 additional articles were found which directly or indirectly referenced democratization. From this sample, seven articles were found that contained a statement or statements made about multiparty democracy.

Fortunately, coders reached perfect agreement on the nine statements included in these seven articles. As such, there was no need to perform an additional Cohen’s kappa test for this particular sample. Unfortunately, however, policy arguments were made in only three of the nine statements. These additional arguments were added to the original sample which increased the total sample size from 46 to 49 policy arguments.

As demonstrated in Table 8.5, when all of the arguments in the revised sample were cross tabulated by use of reference point and policy preference, the results were only a slight improvement over those obtained from the original cross tabulation.

### Table 8.5. Second Cross Tabulation of Arguments by Policy Preference and Reference Point Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-reference point</th>
<th>Reference point</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LR (0)</strong></td>
<td>10 (9.4)</td>
<td>32 (32.6)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HR (1)</strong></td>
<td>1 (1.8)</td>
<td>6 (5.4)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

580 At one degree of freedom, the relevant critical values are 2.706 and 3.841 (with probabilities of .100 and .050, respectively).

581 Expanding the time period is appropriate as a means to increase sample size in this particular instance, especially given the fact that the period of time for which articles were selected for Rwanda is also approximately three years.
The chi-square test statistic obtained for the above cross tabulation is .475. This means that, with one degree of freedom, the chance no correlation exists between reference point use and policy risk level is between 25 and 50%.\(^{582}\)

Table 8.6 contains the results from the second cross tabulation of arguments by type of reference point and policy preference. The results obtained from this examination were better than those achieved in the original cross tabulation analysis. In this example, the likelihood that the null hypothesis is correct—that the chi-square value is greater than 6.3—is between .01 and .02.\(^{583}\)

Table 8.6. Second Cross Tabulation of Arguments by Type of Reference Point and Policy Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSQ</th>
<th>FSQ</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LR (0)</td>
<td>22 (19)</td>
<td>10 (13)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR (1)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When all of the results for Burundi are taken into account, it appears that the null hypothesis can safely be rejected in only the second of the two cross-tabulations. In other words, the correlation between reference point type and policy preference is really the only significant correlation. Unlike Rwanda, no significant relationship was found between speakers’ use of a reference point and the types of policy preferred. As stated previously, it is likely that this latter finding is the result of small sample size.

---

\(^{582}\) The relevant critical values for a chi-square distribution with one degree of freedom are .455 and 1.323 (Hamilton 1996: 430). The likelihood that the chi-square value is larger than .475 is between 25 and 50 percent.

\(^{583}\) As indicated above, the chi-square statistic obtained for this sample is 6.3. The relevant critical values for the chi-square distribution with one degree of freedom are 5.024 and 6.635 (which correspond to the probabilities .025 and .010, respectively).
However, given the sheer lack of news reports available for Burundi for the time period in question, the researcher rejected the idea of extending the article search further.584

In sum, this dissertation found strong support for all three of secondary hypotheses for Rwanda. The rational choice alternative hypothesis is disconfirmed for this case. A greater proportion of the policy arguments made by speakers were arguments in which a reference point was used (84%, or 173 of the 205 policy arguments) and the difference in proportion between non-reference point and reference point-related policy arguments was found to be statistically significant. Additionally, 89% of the arguments made for “high risk” policy alternatives were arguments in which speakers used the former status quo as a reference point. An even greater percentage of the arguments made for the pursuit of “low risk” policies were arguments in which speakers used the current status quo as a reference point (92%). As the results from the second cross tabulation indicate, the difference in the proportion of “high risk” former status quo arguments and “high risk” current status quo arguments is statistically significant, as is the difference in the proportion of “low risk” current status quo arguments and those in which speakers preferred the “low risk” policy option but used the former status quo as a reference point.

For Burundi, on the other hand, only two of the three secondary hypotheses can be confirmed. Thirty-eight of the 49 arguments made by speakers were reference point-related (77%). However, the difference in the proportion of reference point-related and non-reference point-related policy arguments is not statistically significant. The null hypothesis—that an equal number of arguments made by speakers will be reference point and non-reference point-related—therefore cannot be rejected.

However, 83% of the arguments made for “high risk” policy strategies were ones in which the former status quo was used as a reference point. In 69% of the arguments in which speakers advocated “low risk” policy alternatives, the current status quo was used as the primary reference point. Because the difference in the proportion of “high risk” former status quo and “high risk” current status quo arguments is statistically significant, and the difference in the proportion of “low risk” current status quo arguments

584 This decision was made in light of the results obtained from the second search for additional news articles. Most of the articles obtained in this search either focused specifically on the civil war in neighboring
and “low risk” former status quo arguments is also statistically significant, the author of this dissertation is comfortable concluding that, with respect to Burundi, the main hypothesis has been confirmed and the rational choice alternative hypothesis disconfirmed. Judging from the data, the incumbent Tutsi elite in Burundi appeared to have approached the prospect of multiparty democracy in a more risk-averse manner compared to much of the incumbent Hutu elite in Rwanda.

**Discussion and Qualitative Evidence of Risk Assessment**

**Rwanda**

The results obtained from the above analyses accord with much of the data obtained from qualitative sources, in particular the studies written specifically on the violence that occurred in both countries during the period of political liberalization in the 1990s.

With respect to Rwanda, several studies of the genocide—including the analyses by African Rights (1995), Prunier (1995), Chrétien et al (1995), Des Forges (1999), Jones (1999), and Longman (1999) among others—provide substantial evidence which supports this study’s argument that the Hutu conservatives perceived multiparty democracy as a loss. A great deal of this evidence includes verbal statements and/or speeches made by members of the Hutu elite to sources other than Radio Rwanda, as well as articles and other written materials published or released by Hutu politicians, and members of the military and political parties.

One of the earliest and clearest indications of the mind set of members of the incumbent elite in Rwanda is the September 1992 memorandum issued by then-chief of staff Colonel Déogratias Nsabimana. The intent of the report was to identify Rwanda’s primary and secondary “enemies.” The primary enemy is listed in the memorandum as

Tutsi inside or outside the country, extremist and nostalgic for power, who have NEVER recognized and will NEVER recognize the realities of the 1959 social revolution and who wish to reconquer [sic] power by all means necessary.” (Des Forges 1999: 62)

---

Rwanda, or strictly pertained to economic issues (e.g. debt repayment, structural adjustment agreements etc.).
According to the Hutu military, those who rendered aid to the enemy, who failed to support the President, or who chose to support the opposition parties in any way were considered accomplices of the Tutsi enemy; they were “partisan enemies” (1999: 63).585

An even earlier example of the perception conservative Hutu held with regard to the Tutsi is provided by the “Hutu Ten Commandments.” Published in the extremist newspaper Kangura on 10 December 1990, the document lists a number of forbidden activities, including inter-marriage and business dealings with the Tutsi, as well as recommendations that the distribution of economic, political and military power remain strictly in the hands of the Hutu. The “Commandments” also demands that the Hutu show no mercy for the Tutsi, but stand “firm and vigilant against their common Tutsi enemy.”586 The strength of the dominant political paradigm is perhaps best exemplified by the tenth command which calls on all Hutu to adhere to and spread the Hutu ideology; any who oppose the ideology (e.g. “who persecutes his brother Mahutu for having read, spread and taught this ideology”) are “traitors” (for more information, see African Rights 1995: 43).587

As discussed in Chapter 6, much of what was published about the democratization process in newspapers like Kangura was highly inflammatory and intended to incite inter-group animosities. In many of these articles Tutsi are portrayed as being inherently untrustworthy. For example, an article published in the March edition of Kangura, titled “A Cockroach Cannot Give Birth to a Butterfly,” stated that the Tutsi inyenzi were incapable of change. According to the author of this piece:

The history of Rwanda shows…clearly that a Tutsi stays always exactly the same…The malice, the evil are just as we knew them in the history of our country. We are not wrong in saying that a cockroach gives birth to another cockroach. Who could tell the difference between the Inyenzi who attacked in October 1990 and those of the 1960s. They are all linked…their evilness is the

585 According to this same document, the “partisan” enemies were being recruited from a variety of groups both inside and outside of the country (Des Forges 1999: 63; see also African Rights 1995: 62).
586 Similar calls for vigilance were made by the CDR in later years. For example, on 6 January 1993 the CDR leadership issued a call to the Hutu people to “be vigilant, for the fatherland is in danger” (BBC ME/1582/B 9 09 Jan. 1993). Many of the articles examined in the content analysis for Rwanda demonstrate that “greater vigilance” was a command frequently made by Hutu politicians and party leaders. Once the genocide began, RTLM broadcast commands to the Hutu population to be vigilant and to protect themselves against their Tutsi neighbors (Kirschke 1996: 70).
587 As indicated in Chapter 7, the political paradigm of “Absolute Hutu Rule” stressed the importance of the Social Revolution of 1959 and the hardships the Hutu had endured under the Tutsi monarchy.
same. The unspeakable crimes of the Inyenzi today...recall those of their elders: killing, pillaging, raping girls and women etc.

A similar point of view was expressed by the President in a speech carried on Radio Rwanda on 16 February 1991 in which he compared the 1990 RPF invasion to the invasions conducted by the Tutsi rebels in the 1960s (see Chapter 5 of this dissertation). In this speech he describes the more recent RPF invasion as having been conducted by “a section of refugees, nostalgic for their former feudal monarchical power” (BBC ME/0999/B/1 18 Feb. 1991).

At one point, the newspaper Kangura also alleged that the Tutsi were “thirsty for blood” and intended to exterminate the Hutu in order to create a “Nilotic empire from Ethiopia...and Douala to the sources of the Nile and from...Gabon to Lesotho going through the vast basins of the Kongo, the Rift Valley of Tanzania...down to the Cape and the Drakensberg Mountains” (Des Forges 1999: 79-80). This particular theme was echoed by politician and political activist Léon Mugesera in a March 1991 pamphlet in which he compared the RPF to the Nazis (Des Forges 1999: 80; see also African Rights 1995: 41).

An additional piece written in the January 1994 edition of Kangura by the newspaper’s editor, Hassan Ngeze, suggests that the “hidden” intent of the RPF was to violate the Arusha Accords and take complete control of the government with the help of forces from the United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda (“UNAMIR”). In the article, titled “Who will Survive the War of March?” Ngeze writes:

The RPF...kills innocent people. After that, they go back to their lairs, the animal holes that were given to them generously by the Arusha ‘peace’ Accords. What is irritating is that these acts of provocation and killings are carried out while UNAMIR watches. And we are made to understand that the CND building where the RPF is accommodated is surrounded by UNAMIR...But nobody should be surprised. The short time that the UNAMIR soldiers have been in Kigali, they have shown themselves to be leaning a great deal towards the RPF. (African Rights 1995: 72-73)

---

588 Des Forges discusses the above article in reference to a recurring theme in the anti-Tutsi propaganda which depicts the Tutsi of Rwanda and/or the RPF as seeking to create a Tutsi empire by joining with other countries also controlled by Tutsi or groups affiliated with the Tutsi, such as Uganda (1999: 79-81; for a more complete discussion of this and other themes associated with anti-Tutsi propaganda, see Des Forges 1999: 72-85). The accusation that the RPF and the Tutsi sought to create a Tutsi empire was found in several of the articles selected for the content analysis.

589 The RPF soldiers referred to in this piece are the 600 soldiers who were stationed in Kigali in early 1994 in preparation for the transfer of power.
In an additional article published in Kangura in March 1994 titled “Habyarimana Will Die in March,” Ngeze further speculates that President Habyarimana will be murdered by a Hutu “bought by Inyenzi [italics in original]” soon after the transitional institutions (the BBTG and the TNA) were established (for more information, see African Rights 1995: 73-75).

The Tutsi were by no means the only targets of Kangura and other extremist newspapers in Rwanda. Members of the opposition parties, in particular Prime Ministers Uwilingiyimana and Twagirimungu, were repeatedly lambasted for their support of the Arusha Accords, as well as the transitional process more generally. The unfavorable opinions conservative members of the Hutu elite held towards members of the political opposition is perhaps best demonstrated by the speech made by Léon Mugesera at a MRND(D) rally held on 22 November 1992. In this speech, Mugesera condemns the moderate opposition parties for negotiating with the RPF, and for challenging the MRND(D)’s hold on power. Not only were members of the moderate opposition “traitors” and “accomplices of the RPF,” Mugesera also implies in his speech that the moderates meant to cause harm and wreak havoc in the country (Des Forges 1999: 84-85; African Rights 1995: 76-77).

Similar criticisms were voiced by the extremist radio station RTLM. As discussed in Chapter 6 of this dissertation, RTLM tended to appeal to a younger demographic because of its on-air format, in particular its use of “Western style disc jockey personas” (Kirshke 1996: 51). As Kirschke writes

|footnote| In this now infamous speech, Mugesera also states that the Tutsi would be sent back to Ethiopia via the Nyabarongo River. According to Des Forges, the Nyabarongo River was a euphemism for genocide as rivers were usually the dumping grounds for massacre victims (1999: 85). |

|footnote| Additionally, RTLM broadcast information from other sources, specifically the newspaper Kangura (Gulseth 2004: 64-65). |
The fact that many of the guests interviewed were members of the Hutu political elite or were educated persons lent credibility to the information broadcast by the station (Gulseth 2004: 79-81). For all of the above reasons, RTLM quickly became an alternative source of information and entertainment for many in the country.

Kirschke (1996: 52) suggests that the messages broadcast on RTLM did not become purposely inflammatory until after the assassination of Burundian President Melchoir Ndadaye. In messages transmitted on RTLM between 21 and 31 October 1993, announcers blame the violence in Burundi on the Tutsi as a whole. The military coup in Burundi is also presented as a warning of things to come for Rwanda and, in some instances, the RPF are blamed directly for the violence. In these same October broadcasts, RTLM portrays the assassination as a source of happiness for the Rwandan Tutsi. As one RTLM announcer states: “After the coup in Burundi, all the Tutsi in Rwanda danced with joy, [while] the Hutu of Rwanda were saddened” (1996: 53).

Journalists, members of moderate opposition parties and civil society organizations who supported the democratization and peace processes were strongly criticized by the MRND(D) and the party militias on RTLM. In a September 1993 broadcast, for example, Léon Mugesera claims:

---

592 In Gulseth’s (2004: 81) analysis of RTLM broadcasts, the author found that the majority of persons interviewed—whether they were members of the Hutu elite or not—advocated a position that was “Hutu Power friendly.” Correspondingly, when Tutsi sources were quoted by RTLM their statements or arguments were presented in an extremely unfavorable light and often taken completely out of context. Three of the most frequently quoted Tutsi sources were Maj. Paul Kagame, Col. Alexis Kanyarengwe (a Hutu) and Deputy Tito Rutaremara of the RPF. Their treatment by RTLM journalists only contributed further to the growing Hutu-Tutsi polarization in the country (2004: 83-85).

593 In an interview Kirschke conducted with Gérard Prunier, Prunier indicated that one of the major differences between RTLM and Radio Rwanda was the nature of the message being broadcast about the RPF and the Tutsi. Whereas Radio Rwanda repeated the more traditional argument which warned of the “evils” associated with Tutsi rule, RTLM broadcast a simple message of ethnic hatred (1995: 51). However, references were still made by RTLM broadcasters to the “Social Revolution of 1959.” In a 23 May 1994 RTLM broadcast, for example, an announcer suggests that the RPF intended to reclaim what the Tutsi lost in 1959. The announcer states: “The fathers of Inyenzi fled away in the 59’s. However, the fathers told their children: [‘]It’s high time to take weapons and fight for the recovery of the power encroached upon us by Hutus. So, stand up[‘] [italics removed].” (Gulseth 2004: 113).

594 To demonstrate this point, Kirschke uses the example of a RTLM broadcast in which a journalist reads on air an article from the extremist paper Ijambo, which commands the Rwandan Army to “go and destroy the quarters of [the RPF] in Burundi, if they agree that the Hutu also have the right to live in Rwanda and Burundi. If they do not do that, the attack that will come from Burundi will be strong[.] To wait for the international community to go to the rescue of the Hutu in Burundi, is to delay too much, and this will allow the Tutsi to regroup” (1996: 53).
The delegates in Arusha do not represent Rwanda. They do not represent Rwanda at all, to tell you the truth. Rwanda’s delegates, the so-called Rwanda delegates, are led by *Inyenzi* [italics in original]. They go and talk to *Inyenzi*. As they say in one song, saying that it is God from God, they too are cockroaches from cockroaches who speak for cockroaches. (African Rights 1995: 79)

In some cases, veiled threats were issued over the air to moderate politicians and other opponents. In a December 1993 broadcast, RTLM states that, “Prime Minister [Agathe Uwilingiyimana] has created a bad atmosphere because she co-operates with the RPF. She should remember the scar she has was previously a wound” ([Mironko and Cook 1995] Kirschke 1996: 55). Because of the close relationship between RTLM and leaders of the party militias and the “Zero Network” death squads, the risk that threats of bodily injury would be carried out was real and immediate.

Threats were also made on the air to the entire Tutsi population in Rwanda. In a message directed to the RPF and moderate members of the PL, Jérôme Bicumumpaka of the PL-Power faction warns that

all Banyarwanda should know that in all préfectures we have stood as one to fight the enemy: the RPF. Victory is very close. No-one can fight seven million people. Forces drawn from ten per cent of the population cannot fight that many millions and win over them. A message for the RPF: Stop fighting this war if you do not want your supporters living inside Rwanda to be exterminated. (RTLM 1994, cited in African Rights 1995: 79)

In the few days prior to Habyarimana’s assassination, the signs that an outbreak of violence was imminent were quite clear. In a 3 April 1994 RTLM broadcast, an announcer states that the RPF was planning to restart the war:

They [the RPF] have dates, we know them…we have agents…who bring us the information. They tell us this: on the 3rd, the 4th, and the 5th, there will be a little something here in Kigali City. And also on the 7th and 8th…you will hear the sounds of bullets and grenades explode…But I hope that the Rwandan armed forces are on alert. (Kirschke 1996: 60)

According to Kirschke’s 1996 analysis, RTLM was indicating to its listeners that the “little something in Kigali City” was actually intended by the RPF to “serve as a decoy, to draw public attention elsewhere. [A] larger attack would then follow and take the country by surprise” (61). This larger attack would be a final attack between the Hutu and Tutsi and would involve a genocide—however a genocide perpetrated

---

595 For her full discussion on RTLM’s denouncement of “traitors” in the country, see Kirschke (1996: 54-56).
by the RPF, not the Hutu. After the death of the President, and the initiation of the genocide, RTLM states in a 17 June 1994 broadcast: “In a final war such as this, there can be no clemency for people who joke around, be they members of the military or civilians…This war is really final…We must wage a war without mercy” (1996: 67-68).

In Gulseth’s (2004) study of RTLM broadcasts, the author further argues that the twin goals of promoting the extremist Hutu-Power ideology and mobilizing the Hutu population for conflict were successfully met. By portraying itself as a source of truth, and a champion of the “popular will,” the RTLM was triumphant in inculcating a sense of fear and hatred among the wider Hutu population. Once the violence began, RTLM was instrumental in directing the activities of the Hutu militias and ordinary civilians. Citizens were ordered by the radio station to turn on their Tutsi neighbors—to refuse them shelter and to aid authorities in finding, capturing and killing the “traitors.” RTLM also provided the Hutu extremist militias and security forces with information regarding the identity and location of potential targets, the activities of RPF troops, as well as requests for supplies.

In order to reach any definitive conclusions regarding the types of policy preferences Hutu incumbents held with respect to institutional change, it is certainly preferable to use direct evidence. All of the above evidence—including the data obtained from the content analysis—demonstrates that multiparty democracy was perceived as a total loss by members of the conservative Hutu elite, and as a gain by moderate incumbent politicians in the country. To strengthen this argument further, the current chapter also considers qualitative evidence that documents the variety of “high risk” tactics taken by the Hutu conservatives to reverse the democratization process. Non-violent measures discussed previously in

---

596 This is not to say that efforts to control RTLM broadcasts were never made. Both the Gulseth (2004: 74-77) and Kirschke (1996: 58-60) studies concede the fact that members of the government, in particular the Minister of Information and the Director of ORINFO, issued a number of warnings to RTLM. Several civil defamation cases were also filed against the radio station. However, all of these lawsuits were blocked by the courts and little action was taken against RTLM.

597 Other types of propaganda techniques used by RTLM included the use of stereotypes, the biased use of written materials, repetition, and the portrayal of the Rwandan army as unbeatable. For a full discussion of these and other propaganda techniques used by RTLM, see Gulseth (2004: chap. 6).

598 For a full discussion of the role of RTLM in the genocide, including a comparison between RTLM and Radio Rwanda, see Kirschke (1996: 69-84); also African Rights (1995: 78-85).
Chapter 7 of this study are not elaborated on in further detail here. Instead, this chapter focuses more specifically on risk-seeking policies that involved the use of violence.

Party militias were established soon after multiparty democracy was legalized in Rwanda. The *Interahamwe* (or “those who stand together”) began as a youth wing of the MRND(D) and was eventually transformed into an armed paramilitary group; the *Impuzamugambi* (“those with a single purpose”) was an armed militia associated with the extremist party, the CDR. Supported by the President and party members, both groups were responsible for countless episodes of violence perpetrated against Tutsi civilians, members of the Hutu opposition parties, and critics of the government in the period prior to April 1994 (see Table 5.2). Both militias were also instrumental in the genocide itself.

Besides contributing to an “organization of chaos” which reduced the legitimacy of the various transitional multiparty governments, members of the *Interahamwe* were also involved in efforts to physically disrupt the transfer of power to the BBTG. For example, in January 1994, the President of the *Interahamwe* met with leaders of the MRND(D), the Rwandan Army, and the secret police to discuss appropriate locations in which to hide weapons from UNAMIR officers, as well as ways in which relations between the Rwandan police, the Rwanda population and UNAMIR officers could be disrupted. A number of the more violent demonstrations conducted by the *Interahamwe*, members of the CDR, the Presidential Guard, and military during this period were also intended to obstruct the transfer process.

---

599 The *Interahamwe* was trained primarily in two camps run by the military. Arms and ammunition were supplied to the militia by Col. Théoneste Bagosora, one of the chief architects of the genocide. In its 1995 analysis of the Rwandan genocide, African Rights contends that, “the true extent of the mobilization and arming [of the *Interahamwe*]...remained a secret. Only when the mass killings began did the sheer scale of the *interahamwe* [italics added] become evident” (61). The *Interahamwe* and the *Impuzamugambi* both also received training from the French military (on this point, see Prunier 1995: 165 ff. 10). Members of both militias were largely unemployed young men. Members were also recruited from the Burundian refugee population in Rwanda (African Rights 1995: 54-64).

600 This information is courtesy of Belgian intelligence sources (see Des Forges 1999: 148-149). Another similar meeting reportedly took place on 26 January 1994 (158).

601 According to one informant, Belgian UNAMIR officers were to be murdered in a demonstration conducted by the *Interahamwe* on 8 January 1994. The intent of this act of violence (which did not occur) was to induce the Belgian troops to withdraw. On other occasions, UNAMIR soldiers were shot at by the demonstrators (Des Forges 1999: 150-151, 157; see also Table 5.2 of this dissertation).
In addition to the creation and support of extremist paramilitary groups, another measure that reflects the “losses frame” under which many members of the Hutu political elite were operating at the time is the formation of the death squads (also called the “Zero Network”). According to African Rights (1995), Prunier (1995) and other scholars, the death squads operated in association with the Interahamwe and the Presidential Guard. Those responsible for the creation and maintenance of these squads were members of the Hutu power hierarchy, in particular the military and the akazu. Like the militias, the Zero Network was responsible for a number of violent attacks on Tutsi and Hutu opponents of the regime. The assassinations of political opposition leaders Samuel Gapyisi and Felicien Gatabazi have also been attributed to the death squads (African Rights 1995: 65-66).

Not only were specific groups being armed and trained by the military and conservative members of the Hutu political elite in Rwanda, efforts were also made by these same actors to provide local government leaders, communal police, and the greater population, with the means to defend themselves against “enemies of the state.” Arms were distributed to the communes and lists of possible targets prepared by local officials. Those included on these lists were persons believed to pose a threat to national security—in other words, anyone considered an accomplice of the RPF (Des Forges 1999: 99-101). For obvious reasons, these lists became particularly valuable once the genocide began.

The arming of the civilian population was a policy first instituted by the government in late 1990. Under the civilian “self-defense” plan, certain numbers of citizens were obliged to carry out patrols and

---

602 The Presidential Guard is described by African Rights as an “elite” group that was formed soon after the 1990 RPF invasion. Made up of members recruited largely from the President’s home region, the Presidential Guard was both trained and armed by the French military. It is believed that the Presidential Guard was involved in several political assassinations prior to the genocide (African Rights 1995: 49-50).

603 As a reminder, the akazu (or “little house”) was a conservative faction of the Hutu elite that was closely associated with the president’s wife. Another extremist faction that existed in Rwanda during this time was the AMASASU, or the Alliance des Militaires Agacés par les Séculaires Actes Sournois des Unaristes. Created in 1992, the AMASASU was comprised of members of the military including Col. Bagosora. In January 1993 the group sent a letter to the president which warned the RPF was planning to reignite the civil war; the letter also warned that supporters of the RPF would soon become targets of the military for revenge (for a full discussion of the January 1993 letter and of the views of Bagosora more generally, see Des Forges 1999: 103-106).

604 Like the Interahamwe, the Zero Network is also believed to have taken part in the Bugesera massacres (Prunier 1995: 168).

605 The man in charge of training and arming the communal police was Col. Alphonse Ntezeliyayo. Under his watch, Russian assault rifles and machine guns were distributed to the communes, along with ammunition and
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man roadblocks in their communes. The weapons used by the civilian patrols ranged from guns to simple machetes.\textsuperscript{606} The program of civilian self-defense was supported not only by Hutu politicians, but also high-ranking members of the military (1999: 101-108).\textsuperscript{607} Similar to the party militias, the civilian self-defense groups played an integral part in the genocide.

According to Des Forges (1999), African Rights and others, all of the above the measures, along with increases in the purchase of arms from abroad, demonstrate that many Hutu preferred genocidal war as the optimal policy course. As Prunier (1995: 169-170) writes:

By late 1992, the protagonists in the future genocide had all found their places as shadowy counterparts of the official institutions. The [Army] had its secret society [the AMASASU], the extremist parties their militias, the secret service its killer squads…What the new brand of extremists now emerging from the ranks of the old order wanted was absolute power through absolute terror. When facing the members of their society who wanted to [liberalize] and broaden the limited openings it had offered, they reacted by attempting not lonely to tighten up but to destroy the adversary completely.

This perspective only increased further once the Arusha Accords were signed and the establishment of the joint-rule system of government became a certainty. As discussed in previous chapters of this study, and as indicated above, the perception of multiparty democracy as a complete and total loss was also exacerbated by events such as the assassination of the Burundian president and the February 1993 RPF invasion.

\textit{Burundi}

Chapter 6 of this dissertation indicated that the media in Burundi was far more moderate compared to the media in Rwanda. Prior to the transfer of power in July 1993, the messages broadcast by the incumbent training (Des Forges 1999: 97-99).

\textsuperscript{606} It is important to restate the fact that firearms were by no means the most common weapon used by the perpetrators of the genocide. Machetes were also ordered by the military \textit{en masse} and were widely used as a means of annihilating the enemy (African Rights 1995: 66).

\textsuperscript{607} The civilian self-defense program was heavily supported by Col. Bagosoa, as exemplified by the defense plans Bagosoa sketched out in an appointment book that was subsequently recovered by officials after Bagosoa fled the country in 1994. According to his notes, members of the community selected for service in the program were to be trained by communal police and/or the military. Bagosora further spells out in his notes the number of people to be recruited from each commune, the types and amounts of arms and other supplies they were to receive, and the places in which the program was to be initiated. Portions of his plan were actually put into motion, notably the distribution of firearms in the communes (Des Forges 1999: 101-108).
elite on Radio Burundi emphasized the importance of “National Unity” and inter-ethnic reconciliation. After the Ndadaye government assumed office, nearly identical messages were issued by the newly-elected president and other politicians in the government, as well as by the former president.

Additionally, unlike Rwanda, all of the evidence indicates that there were no centrally-organized party militias or death squads in Burundi; what civilian “self-defense” groups did exist were most often created by Hutu civilians—not the incumbent Tutsi elite. As discussed in Chapter 7, the biggest obstacle to political liberalization that existed in Burundi was by far the BNA or the Burundian Army.

The details surrounding the October 1993 coup d’ état are provided in the August 1996 report issued by the International Commission of Inquiry for Burundi. With respect to the assassinations of Melchoir Ndadaye and other members of the government, in Part Three, Section Seven of its report, the Commission concludes that

the assassination of President Ndadaye, as well as that of the person constitutionally entitled to succeed him [the President of the National Assembly], was planned beforehand as an integral part of the coup that overthrew him, and that the planning and execution of the coup was carried out by officers highly placed in the line of command of the Burundian Army.

However, due to a lack of evidence regarding the culpability of the military officers and servicemen associated with the coup, the Commission recommended that no actions be taken against the accused.

The coup d’ état touched off a wave of violence in the country that eventually claimed the lives of an estimated 50,000 persons—both Hutu and Tutsi. Responsibility for this violence was attributed by the Commission to members of the Hutu majority party FRODEBU, Tutsi members of UPRONA, ordinary Hutu and Tutsi civilians, and of course the military. There is little evidence that suggests the massive bloodshed which began in October 1993 was the result of an organized plan created by Tutsi incumbents.

---

608 The International Commission was created at the behest of the United Nations Security Council in August 1995. Its purpose was to investigate the causes of the coup and the violence that followed, and to recommend appropriate measures to be taken against those responsible.

609 Responsibility for the October 1993 coup d’état has been attributed to military from the 1st Parachute and 11th armored battalions. However, the International Commission concluded in its report that none of the other army battalions, nor the Army Chief of Staff, Lt.-Col. Jean Bikomagu, made any real effort to stop the actions of the coup-makers (see Part Three, Sec. Four of the report; also Reyntjens 1995: 14). At approximately 1:00 p.m. the day after the coup, a “crisis committee” was established which included military leaders and the former Minister of the Interior Hasan Ngeze (a Hutu). However, the coup quickly fell apart in light of immediate public condemnation, which induced many members and leaders of the military to distance themselves from what had transpired the night
Likewise, despite allegations to the contrary, there is little to suggest a genocidal plan was drawn up by the Hutu political elite.\textsuperscript{610} Instead, the violence that was perpetrated was a \textit{response} to the coup d’état and the assassinations of the president and other political leaders.

Reyntjens writes that reprisals against Tutsi and Hutu members of URPONA were conducted a short time after the coup took place. Acts of revenge included the destruction of property, arrests and summary executions, much of which was conducted under the direction of local FRODEBU officials. Compared to Rwanda, efforts towards “self-defense” in Burundi were geared mainly towards preventing the military from entering the countryside and were organized locally and/or spontaneously. In response to the actions taken by the Hutu, scores of Tutsi civilians joined in with the military in enacting similar reprisals against their Hutu neighbors (1995: 15).

Overall, the military’s response to the violence has been deemed excessive. In Section 11 of Part Six of its report, the International Commission writes:

\begin{quote}
Although no evidence was obtained to indicate that the repression was centrally planned or ordered, it is an established fact that no effort was made by the military authorities at any level of command to prevent, stop, investigate or punish such acts. The Commission considers that this failure to act engages the responsibility of those military authorities with regard to such acts. (on this point see also Reyntjens 1995: 17-19)
\end{quote}

However, similar to the investigation into those responsible for the 21 October 1993 coup, the International Commission did not provide any recommendations for punishment due to the lack of sufficient evidence.

\textsuperscript{610} Reyntjens argues that the accusation made by some groups that the Hutu intended to annihilate their Tutsi neighbors is unfounded and more likely part of an attempt to exonerate the military of any responsibility for the violence. Reyntjens contends that, despite the numbers killed, the violence that erupted in Burundi in 1993 does not constitute genocide as there is \textit{no evidence} of genocidal intent on either side (1995: 16). These conclusions are contrary to those reached by the International Commission. In Part 6, Section 11 of its report, the Commission suggests that acts of genocide had been perpetrated “at the instigation and with the participation of certain Hutu FRODEBU functionaries and leaders up to commune level.”
Conclusion

The data examined in this chapter provide additional support for this dissertation’s main hypothesis. The viewpoints expressed by members of the Hutu elite in Rwanda, in combination with measures taken by extremist groups to violently obstruct the democratization process, are clear indicators of a losses frame. For many Hutu, the shift from an authoritarian single party governing system to a system of joint-rule with the Tutsi was a completely unacceptable turn of events. In their efforts to “turn back the clock” they chose to embark on an especially destructive policy course.

Compared to the option of normal political competition within the parameters of a multiparty system, the option of total genocide—eventually selected by the extremists—was the strategy with the widest variation in outcome. The best this risk-seeking option could offer the Hutu was a return to an authoritarian system of rule, minus all political opposition. This particular outcome was highly unlikely to occur, however. The genocide was more likely to reignite the civil war with the RPF, which was a war the Rwandan Army was certain to lose. Adding further insult to injury, an RPF victory would consequently entail not only harsh penalties and sanctions for the Hutu perpetrators of the genocide, but their complete loss of political power and influence within the system. As history has demonstrated, this is exactly what transpired as a result of the genocide.

Compared to the Hutu extremists, the moderates in Rwanda ranked their policy options differently. To the moderates, the best and worst outcomes associated with political competition were far better than the best and worst outcomes of any risk-seeking strategy. Unlike the extremists, and similar to the Tutsi elite in Burundi, the Hutu moderates understood that obstructing the democratization process—with a plan of total genocide or even lesser forms of violence—would likely lead to a drastic reduction in power for all of the reasons cited above. Both the Hutu moderates and the majority of Tutsi elite in Burundi chose instead to forgo greater political power and control in the name of political stability and a chance to reap greater political gains in the future from the new multiparty system.

Unfortunately, in the case of Burundi, not all of the data confirm this argument. The relationship between reference point type and policy preference was found to be statistically significant. However, the
evidence also indicates that the relationship between reference point use and policy preference is largely insignificant. Even with the use of a revised sample, similar results were obtained.

At the same time, when the behavior demonstrated by the Tutsi elite is fully taken into account, a picture emerges that is more consistent with this dissertation’s main argument. No death squads or party militias were used by the incumbent elite to terrorize the country during the period of democratization; no lists of potential victims were prepared and there was no effort to create a system of “Tutsi self-defense” prior to the coup d’état. Instead, most of the Tutsi incumbents, including President Buyoya, embraced the democratization process and appeared willing to concede greater power to the Hutu opposition. The gains frame of the Tutsi elite is demonstrated not only by their actions—which include the numerous institutional changes made by the ruling elite prior to the 1993 multiparty elections—but also by the viewpoints members of the Tutsi elite expressed to the media.

The next chapter of this dissertation is the concluding chapter. All of the findings obtained from the between-systems and within-systems analyses performed by this dissertation are reviewed and assessed. Chapter 9 places special focus on the implications these findings have for studies written on the origins of the genocide in Rwanda and the communal violence in Burundi, as well as the implications these findings have for macro-, meso-, and individual-level theories of regime change and collective violence more generally.
The purpose of this dissertation has been to resolve two interrelated puzzles that pertain to certain events that transpired in the countries of Burundi and Rwanda in 1993 and 1994, respectively. The first puzzle stems from the remarkable similarities that exist between both countries. Whether the period of time considered is the pre- or post-independence era, the data examined by this study have demonstrated that a pluralized system of group relations persisted in both countries for centuries; both are poor, underdeveloped countries that have had to contend with periods of economic stagnation and famine as a result of poor economic practices and population pressures. The data have also shown that Rwanda and Burundi experienced lengthy periods of communal violence and bloodshed from which the official use of excessive force against dissident or “troublesome” groups emerged as an institutionalized practice.

All of these conditions were prevalent when each country made the transition from single party to multiparty rule in the early 1990s. Despite similar conditions of risk, however, the incumbent elite of Rwanda responded to the implementation of multiparty democracy very differently from the elite of Burundi. In the case of Rwanda, as conditions rapidly deteriorated in the country following the signing of the Arusha Accords, a substantial segment of the Hutu elite elected to exterminate the country’s Tutsi population and murder all Hutu supporters of the BBTG as a part of their ongoing strategy to regain complete control of the government. The Tutsi elite in Burundi—with the exception of a segment of the Tutsi-controlled Armée Nationale du Burundi—chose instead to peacefully accept the majority-led Hutu government elected into office in June 1993. A total genocide did not take place in Burundi despite the coup d’état that was attempted by members of the military in October 1993.
The second puzzle concerns the inability of existing theories to explain these divergent outcomes. The explanatory deficiencies encountered by macro-, meso-, and individual-level explanations of collective violence in Rwanda and elsewhere in the developing world originate from a failure to connect larger-scale phenomena such as institutions or inter-group relations to the decision-making processes of individual actors, as well as from the common assumption that political decision-makers universally evaluate their policy options with similar criteria.

This dissertation demonstrates that the combined application of historical institutionalism and prospect theory to the topic of regime change and communal violence in Rwanda and Burundi provides an answer to both puzzles. The synthesis of a mid-range with an individual-level theory permits the formation of an explanation that closely links institutions to group behavior. Additionally, the use of a decision-making model that pays greater heed to the causal influence context has on individual perception makes it possible to provide a more comprehensive account of the anomalous behavior political incumbents in Rwanda and Burundi displayed in response to democratization.

The integrative approach advanced by this study argues that the outcome of institutional change is not simply a matter of a country’s past institutional experiences. Whether or not democratization in multiethnic societies hastens the occurrence of excessive communal violence is a function of the various ways in which pre-existing formal and informal institutions influence the decision-making processes of political actors. Stated differently, institutions constrain and shape the perceptions political incumbents possess with respect to the prospect of sharing power with “subordinate” communal groups.

An institutional tradition that encourages inter-group consensus reduces the likelihood that total genocide will be used by incumbent elite groups during periods of major institutional reform. This relationship holds even when a multiethnic country is experiencing or has experienced substantial economic and/or political hardships. The combination of informal institutions that inspire the creation of cross-cutting social cleavages and formal ruling structures that permit some degree of ethnic parity and political inclusiveness is conducive to democratic transitions that are less violent in nature.
This study cannot definitively state, however, that an institutional legacy of this type necessarily leads to a *peaceful* transition in all cases. As Burundi exemplifies, when a country has a history marked by periods of excessive violence and bloodshed between groups, the move from authoritarian to multiparty rule can result in further havoc and discord. This is especially the case when a government has consistently relied on coercive means to constrain dissident groups or actors. At the same time, the evidence indicates that an institutional tradition that emphasizes greater inclusiveness acts as an effective constraint on the ability and willingness of political incumbents to perpetrate total genocide (or massacre) in response to political liberalization. Despite the loss of political, as well as social and economic hegemony, the incumbent elite will be more likely to pursue a risk-averse, less violent strategy.

The present chapter presents a review of the findings obtained from the between-systems analysis. First, this chapter addresses briefly the results derived from the test of the structural alternative hypothesis. Next, this chapter reviews the outcome of the analyses of the two main explanatory variables. Close attention is paid to the ways in which these results provide partial confirmation of the main hypothesis examined by this dissertation. Next, this chapter presents a summary of the findings achieved from the within-systems analysis. Focus is directed to ways in which the data provided by the content analysis support the secondary hypotheses and disconfirm the rational choice alternative hypothesis. Lastly, the implications these findings have for the study of regime change and collective violence are examined, with attention given to areas for further research.

**The Influence of Social Structures and Traditional Political Institutions on Institutional Development and Change**

With the use of a most similar systems design, this study demonstrates that structural conditions alone do not provide a sufficient explanation of the genocide that occurred in Rwanda in 1994. All available data indicate that Burundi was also experiencing economic decline, political instability and conflict during its transition to multiparty rule. Additionally, the Tutsi-led military in Burundi had an extensive record of human rights abuses perpetrated on a mass scale. According to the macro-level theories frequently used
to explain the Rwandan genocide, conditions in Burundi in the early 1990s were actually more conducive to total genocide than those in Rwanda. The fact that genocide did not occur in Burundi eliminates structural conditions as causes of the violence that occurred in both countries.

When structural variables are factored out of the equation, institutions become the more likely suspect. Consistent with the core assumptions of path-dependency and critical junctures in historical institutionalism, this dissertation finds that the informal and formal institutions that pre-existed the establishment of multiparty democracy in Rwanda predisposed much of the Hutu incumbent elite to perceive joint-rule with the Tutsi as a zero-sum contest between the legitimate holders of power and the country’s former ruling group.

The example of Rwanda clearly demonstrates that informal social and economic institutions that do not permit groups to participate on an equal footing are more conducive to the formation of reinforcing social cleavages. Relations between the Hutu and Tutsi social groups in Rwanda were heavily influenced by a rigid social hierarchy and informal institutions that were premised on a doctrine of group supremacy. Prior to the Hutu revolution of 1959-1961, these traditional social structures were dominated by the Tutsi social caste. Considered “inherently superior” to the Hutu and Twa, the Tutsi enjoyed unlimited wealth and prestige from a system of economic relations that cruelly exploited the labor of subordinate groups; they also possessed what was then considered an inalienable right to rule. A highly centralized system of government with few constraints placed on the power of the Tutsi monarch and his representatives quickly led to the emergence of a despotic regime.

Despite a shift in the balance of power, this hierarchical system of social, economic and political relations continued in the decades after independence, although altered to accommodate a new ruling group. The monarchical system of rule was replaced by a single party state controlled entirely by the Hutu. Widely regarded as an “alien presence” in Rwanda, strict limitations were placed on the ability of the Tutsi minority to achieve social and economic advancement. The conditions of inequality created by the Hutu ruling elite intensified the level of polarization between groups in Rwanda and laid the groundwork for civil war and massive violence in the decades to come.
The traditional persistence of an asymmetrical distribution of socioeconomic and political power in Rwanda is clearly an outcome of distributional feedback mechanisms. During the years of Hutu rule, one type of distributional mechanism that had substantial influence on the policy-making behavior of the Hutu elite was the collective memory of oppression and abuse associated with years of Tutsi monarchical rule. The political paradigm that emerged from this experience emphasized the importance of the Hutu Revolution of 1959 and underscored the legitimacy and appropriateness of absolute Hutu rule.

In Burundi, collective memory was to some extent a “contested ideological terrain” between those who advocated the position that Burundi was comprised of one national group and those who insisted that Burundi was actually a multiethnic country. In the case of the former, the notion of separate communal identities was considered a legacy of Belgian colonial rule; to the latter, communal identities were perceived as a legitimate part of the country’s political discourse. In any event, unlike Rwanda, the National Unity paradigm was never associated with the legitimacy of one group’s right to rule. As a result, the doctrine could be more easily modified to accommodate the shift to a multiparty system of government and was thus more conducive to risk-averse behavior in the context of institutional change.

The same cannot be said of the political paradigm of “Absolute Hutu Rule,” or for that matter the doctrine of Tutsi superiority that superseded it. The inflexibility associated with dominant Absolute Rule paradigm left little room for any alternatives to the existing system of power. The collective decision frame that emerged among the conservative Hutu elite in Rwanda emphasized the need to defend the dominant paradigm and restore the system of government to what it once was. In the context of institutional change, it is safe to say that Absolute Hutu Rule was far more conducive to risk-seeking behavior.

In each of the two countries, the strength of political paradigms was reinforced by civil society. In accordance with social capital literature more generally, and the literature which addresses the link between social capital and collective violence more specifically, this dissertation finds that civil society played a large role in the persistence of reinforcing cleavages and inter-group violence in Rwanda. With the outbreak of civil war and greater demands made for political liberalization, civic institutions such as
the media were used by the President and the ruling Hutu elite as a means to foster greater division between groups. Innuendo, misinformation and propaganda were used to inspire fear and hatred among the Hutu population regarding the intentions of the RPF and the Tutsi community, as well as to instigate violence against the Tutsi and members of the moderate Hutu opposition. Consistent with the arguments made by Narayan (1999) and Colletta and Cullen (2000), this dissertation can comfortably conclude that, under the right circumstances, a combination of bonding social capital and a weak dysfunctional state precipitates extreme forms of collective violence.

Unlike Rwanda, the data indicate that the Buyoya and Ndadaye governments used the institutions of civil society to promote an agenda that underscored a need for greater harmony between groups. The fact that the legitimacy of the National Unity paradigm was never challenged by President Ndadaye and the majority-Hutu government that assumed power in July 1993 is a testament to its continued significance as a consensus-building tool for the country.

The historical data examined for Burundi provide additional confirmation of the fact that a less rigid, more inclusive institutional framework provides a better foundation for democratic rule. Burundi’s institutional legacies of ethnic parity and decentralized rule, in addition to a variegated social structure that permitted the formation of cross-cutting cleavages, made Burundi the better candidate for multiparty democracy in the post-independence period.

The informal and formal institutions that traditionally existed in Burundi permitted a greater dispersal of power between groups. The fact that the institutions of the patron-client system were not closely tied to the formal ruling structure meant that economic and political power did not rest exclusively in the hands of one group. Although of lesser social status than the ganwa ruling cliques, the Hutu and Tutsi in Burundi were nevertheless able to participate in a number of institutional environments on a more equal footing. Historically, both groups were able to occupy positions of patron and client, and both were permitted to serve as mushingantahe advisors.

Furthermore, the decentralized nature of the traditional ruling system in Burundi served as an effective check on the authority of the ruling caste. To gain greater influence with the mwami, it was
necessary for the *ganwa* factions to obtain some degree of grass-roots support from the larger population. The creation of de-facto constituencies and the presence of a king who was popularly perceived as a “neutral arbiter” between the feuding *ganwa*, added greater legitimacy to the political system and permitted its longevity.

These unique institutional underpinnings also influenced the shape authoritarian rule was to assume in the decades after independence. The principle of ethnic parity, as it was applied to the distribution of government positions, continued after the *ganwa* monarchy was deposed in the mid-1960s. That the Tutsi exercised hegemonic control over Burundi’s political institutions for the better part of four decades cannot be disputed. As in Rwanda, the distribution of power in Burundi was clearly asymmetrical. Unlike Rwanda, however, Burundi’s Hutu opposition was at least granted some minimal stake in the political process and, in later years, in the process of democratization and reform.

As a general rule, the monarchy and the military regimes that followed most commonly attributed these egalitarian practices to the doctrine of National Unity, in all its various forms. In reality, their behavior was more likely a result of the practical realization that, to maintain control and stability in a country in which they were few in number, it was necessary to adopt a more pragmatic approach to group relations. The behavior exhibited by the Hutu political elite in 1993 reflected a similar understanding.

The prominent influence Belgian colonial policies had on the trajectory of institutional development in both countries deserves special mention. More generally, the various methods used by Belgium to administer the kingdoms of Rwanda and Burundi exploited existing institutional arrangements to better serve Belgian interests.

There is no disagreement among scholars over the fact that the various institutional reforms introduced by the Belgians drastically increased the potential for group conflict in Rwanda. Initial Belgian support of the Tutsi ruling caste greatly exacerbated the level of socioeconomic inequality between Tutsi and Hutu and rendered further legitimacy to a corrupt and oppressive governing system. When the Belgian Residency shifted its allegiance and support to the Hutu in the decades after World
War II, the stage was set for a brutal contestation for power between the minority ruling caste and the majority counter elite.

Belgian rule did not have the same effect on the political fortunes of Burundi. A greater presence of heterogeneous social groupings and a highly decentralized ruling system safeguarded the kingdom against Belgian attempts to consolidate the power of any one group. Instead, it is more accurate to say that Hutu-Tutsi antagonisms in Burundi were the result of internal processes and inter-group dynamics, as well as events that transpired in neighboring Rwanda.

Institutional Change and Actors’ Assessment of Options

All of the findings yielded from this dissertation’s analysis of social structures and traditional political institutions provide a partial confirmation of the main hypothesis. This study finds substantial evidence to support the argument that past institutions strongly influenced the course of institutional development in Rwanda and Burundi. These findings are also consistent with historical institutionalism’s core assumptions of path-dependency and critical junctures.

From this initial analysis, a compelling argument can certainly be made that institutional legacies predispose political actors to respond to institutional changes in certain ways. However, this does not explain how institutions came to have the particular effect they did on the choice-making behavior of the Tutsi and Hutu incumbent elite in Burundi and Rwanda, respectively. To provide a more definitive link between the main explanatory variables and the outcomes in question, this study uses the technique of process-tracing. More specifically, this study focuses on explaining the mechanisms which induced individuals in both cases to respond to the process of democratization in different ways.

To achieve this task, this study uses a decision-making model grounded in the assumptions of prospect theory. Employing a within-systems analysis that concentrates closely on the relationship between context and individual perception allows this dissertation to avoid one of the problems most commonly encountered by theories that rely heavily on assumptions of path-dependency; namely the idea that individual choice and behavior are pre-determined by history.
To avoid this outcome, this dissertation examines a number of secondary hypotheses which specifically address the relationship between institutional traditions, the perceptions of political actors and their policy preferences. These secondary hypotheses were tested against a rational choice alternative hypothesis with the use of secondary evidence obtained from qualitative studies, and direct evidence derived from a content analysis of policy arguments made by political incumbents in both countries.

The results largely support all three of the secondary hypotheses. In both cases, the majority of policy arguments made by speakers clearly demonstrate the use of a reference point. Individuals who exhibited a preference for policies meant to impede the democratization process were more likely to use the former system of authoritarian rule (the status quo ante) as their primary reference point. Conversely, actors who exhibited a greater inclination for policies meant to legitimate the democratization process tended to use the current status quo of institutional reform as their reference point. With some exception for Burundi (see below), all of these relationships are statistically significant.

More generally, the behavior demonstrated by the incumbent elite in both countries is consistent with prospect theory’s assumption that actors are more averse to losses than gains. The evidence obtained from the content analysis and from qualitative studies of the genocide in Rwanda strongly suggests that many members of the Hutu elite simply could not make the adjustment to the new status quo of multiparty democracy. Acquiescence to multiparty rule was considered to be the worst of all possible fates. Consequently, any movement away from the status quo was deemed favorable. Although the costs associated with joint-rule democracy were objectively few compared to strategies of violence and total genocide, total genocide was eventually chosen because the Hutu extremists believed it held the key to restoring their complete control over the political system.

Both circumstantial and direct evidence also show that the moderate Hutu politicians in Rwanda, and most of the Tutsi elite in Burundi, were willing to accept diminished political power. In their policy arguments, members of both groups portrayed movement away from the new status quo of multiparty democracy as a substantial loss, not merely for their communal group, but for their country as a whole.
The combined influence of loss aversion and diminishing marginal returns induced these moderate groups to opt for the “sure thing” over a risky gamble to recapture control of the government.

This is not to suggest that the motivations for risk-averse behavior demonstrated by the Tutsi elite of Burundi and the moderate Hutu elite in Rwanda were one and the same. In the case of the Hutu moderates, it is safe to say that their choice-making behavior was more the result of a desire to gain greater political influence in a governing system that had long been dominated by the northern Hutu. In their pursuit of a more equitable distribution of power and a greater degree of stability for the country, the Hutu moderates were willing to join forces with the RPF and forgo attempts to gain even greater political power. In this context, the best and worst outcomes associated with the joint-rule system of government were considered preferable to any of the outcomes associated with a plan of total genocide.

Another element that factored prominently in the arguments made by political actors was the certainty effect. As discussed in Chapter 3, the certainty effect is the tendency for actors under conditions of risk to treat outcomes that are highly likely, but uncertain, as certain and those which are highly unlikely as impossible. As this applies specifically to Rwanda, the chance that the Hutu extremists would emerge victorious from a genocidal war was extremely unlikely. Yet those in Rwanda who argued in favor of policies intended to obstruct the transition process—including total genocide—did not portray the negative outcomes associated with these strategies as being remotely possible. From an objective standpoint, however, anything short of the extremists’ acquiescence in the new multiparty government was certain to lead to a renewal of the civil war with the RPF.

On the other hand, what the conservative Hutu elite in Rwanda believed was a certainty was that the institutions associated with the Broad-Based Transitional Government would grant complete power to the political opposition. This perception held despite the substantial headway the MRND(D) had made in local elections and the fact that they likely stood to gain additional political power and influence due to the growing unpopularity of the RPF, the emergence of the Hutu-Power movement, and the structural deficiencies of the new governing system. Given these conditions, a total loss in power was by no means certain.
A great deal of circumstantial evidence indicates that the mind-set of those responsible for the coup d’état in Burundi was quite similar. Several qualitative studies of the political conditions in Burundi in the post-independence period suggest that the military’s traditional role as “guarantor of stability” for the country was what likely induced members of the army to illegitimately seize power in October 1993. During the period of transition, the steps taken by the FRODEBU government to ensure a more equitable distribution of Hutu in the army were interpreted by the rebel Tutsi faction to mean that a Hutu takeover of the military was imminent. To avoid this outcome, the coup makers chose instead to exercise veto power over the new government. Given the military’s past successes with similar ventures, it can be surmised that the Tutsi rebels perceived another victory to be extremely likely.

In the case of Rwanda more specifically, total genocide was an extremely risky, all-or-nothing strategy. Success meant absolute control of the state. Failure, on the other hand, spelled disaster not merely for the Hutu, but for the country as a whole. Conversely, those who advocated a preference for the more cautious, risk-averse strategy of political competition saw instead a situation in which they had everything to gain and little to lose from joint-rule. The best and worst outcomes associated with multiparty democracy were considered preferable to any attempts to stall or completely reverse the transition process.

More generally, the fact that the incumbent elite in Rwanda and Burundi responded to multiparty democracy in a highly dissimilar manner provides strong support for this dissertation’s argument that choice is clearly a matter of how actors’ weight their options relative to their current circumstances. Because the behavior of political actors in both cases demonstrates the use of multiple decision rules, the alternative rational choice hypothesis is not supported.

The combined results of the between- and within-systems analyses allow this dissertation to conclude that political paradigms and institutional traditions shaped the ways in which political actors in Rwanda and Burundi perceived and responded to the establishment of multiparty democracy. In Rwanda, a tradition of informal and formal institutions organized to ensure the political and socioeconomic hegemony of the Hutu group predisposed much of the incumbent elite to view multiparty democracy as a
complete and total loss. Under these circumstances, joint-rule was framed as a return to political subordination; all available options perceived as a choice between negative outcomes. Conversely, an institutional tradition of consensus and compromise in Burundi permitted a greater acceptance of institutional change and substantially reduced the likelihood that foolhardy solutions to the problems associated with power sharing would be selected by the incumbent ruling group.

Implications of This Study and Areas for Further Research

The decision-making behavior of the incumbent political elite in Rwanda and Burundi was consistent with the assumptions of prospect theory. All of the major studies of the Rwandan genocide, in addition to the data obtained from the content analysis, clearly demonstrate that members of the Hutu elite who perceived multiparty democracy as a certain loss were among the strongest advocates of strategies of mass violence.

The case for Burundi, it must be conceded, is slightly weaker. The data supports only two of the three secondary hypotheses, which is to say that no significant relationship was found between policy preferences and speakers’ use of reference points. This finding is likely a result of the fact that far fewer arguments were available on the Lexis-Nexis database for Burundi. Additional research is necessary to more conclusively state that political actors in Burundi consistently evaluated their options with the use of reference points. Towards this end, a future study could more closely consider local newspapers as sources for policy arguments.

Despite these limitations regarding Burundi, the results obtained for both countries permit this study to conclude that the decision-making processes of the incumbent elite in each country were heavily influenced by institutional traditions and experiences. The greater a country’s experience with democratic institutions—no matter how limited—the less the likelihood that a formal transition to multiparty governance will end in total genocide. These findings have strong implications for all of the studies written on the origins of the genocide in Rwanda.
Although it is difficult to dispute the suggestion made by a number of studies that poverty, conflict and civil war contributed to the Hutu’s decision to exterminate their political opponents, these circumstantial factors by themselves cannot fully explain the genocide. The example of Burundi shows that, within the context of institutional change, these phenomena are necessary but not sufficient causes of genocide. Institutional legacies are instead the sufficient cause. Institutions establish the rules and procedures by which groups interact with each other; they shape and reinforce communal identities. Most importantly, institutions heavily influence the ways in which policymakers confront and contend with challenges made to the existing system of power relations. In sum, it is institutions—formal and informal—that explain why political actors in two strikingly similar countries responded to democratization in completely different ways.

Additionally, the results obtained by this study can be used to explain current conditions in both countries. Since the 1994 genocide, political institutions in Rwanda have been dominated by the RPF. To a great extent, power in the country largely shifted from one communal group to another just as it had for centuries. Conversely, since the Ndadaye assassination in 1993, Burundi has continuously struggled to maintain its system of joint rule. What is especially interesting with the case of Burundi is that the current President of the country, Pierre Nkurunziza, is a former leader of the rebel party the CNDD.

The findings have broader implications for studies that seek to explain the relationship between democratization and communal violence. To a certain extent, the conclusions reached by this study further strengthen the arguments made by democratization and conflict scholars that the nature and extent of regime change influences the degree of collective violence that occurs between groups in multietnic societies.

On a more basic level, this study’s findings provide additional confirmation of the arguments made by Ellingsen (2000), Mousseau (2001) and others scholars including Fein (1995), that multietnic
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611 This occurred despite the July 1996 coup d’état led by former President Pierre Buyoya. However, what is particularly interesting about this turn of events is that shortly after the coup Buyoya made efforts to return the country to a more democratic system of government. Buyoya handed power over to a Hutu, Dominic Ndayizeye, in 2003.
democratizing countries (or “hybrid democracies”) are especially prone to internal violence.\textsuperscript{612} Both Rwanda and Burundi are indeed heterogeneous societies that collapsed into conflict and bloodshed following the formal introduction of multiparty systems of government in the early 1990s. As these facts relate to the Ellingsen study more specifically, both countries were especially prone to conflict given that the second largest group in each, the Tutsi, is a medium sized communal group. Additionally, these results provide partial support for the argument advanced by Jenkins and Kposowa (1992) that the balance of power between the two largest ethnic groups within government influences the occurrence of conflict between groups.\textsuperscript{613}

However, the difference in the nature of the violence that took place in each country, its timing and severity provide greater support for the argument made by Hegre et al. (2001), and more specifically the argument advanced by Ward and Gleditsch (1998: 58) that “reversals [of the democratization process] are riskier than progress.”

The data indicate that the violence that transpired in Rwanda following the legalization of multiparty politics continuously progressed towards a more extreme endpoint—total genocide. In contrast to Rwanda, collective violence in Burundi abruptly spiked in response to the coup d’état and the murder of the country’s president in October 1993. Between the March 1992 and October 1993 the level of inter-group violence in the country was minimal compared to Rwanda (for purposes of comparison, see Chapter 5, Tables 5.1 and 5.2).

The study by Mousseau (2001) would experience a certain amount of difficulty in accounting for this variation. Mousseau posits that democratizing states that become more autocratic are likely to be less violent in the short term. However, as events in Rwanda demonstrate, this argument does not necessarily hold in all cases. Instead, as Ward and Gleditsch strongly suggest, countries that undergo more “rocky” democratic transitions tend to become more violent relative to countries that continuously progress

\textsuperscript{612} The findings obtained by this study also indirectly support the findings obtained by the Mansfield and Snyder (1995) study.
\textsuperscript{613} However, the fact that Burundi, with its more equal distribution of power, still experienced a number of attempted coups d’état in 1992 and 1993 weakens the authors’ argument somewhat.
toward a more open democratic system of government. Here, the greater the variation in authoritarian characteristics in a democratizing state, the more likely the occurrence of violence (1998: 59). This is an argument that is also echoed by Hegre et al. (2001: 44) who suggest that “if [semi-democracies] experience a succession of transitions in and around the middle zone, it will take a long time before there is a net decrease in violence.”

Both the qualitative and quantitative data indicate that the process of political liberalization in Rwanda was a far more contentious and cumbersome process compared to Burundi. Although, unlike Burundi, a series of transitional multiparty governments was established prior to the holding of nationwide elections, the real sources of power in the country largely remained in the hands of conservative Hutu factions, including the akazu and President Habyarimana’s political party, the MRND(D). The steady increase in the use of violence as a means to subdue political dissidents and members of the minority Tutsi group is testament to the fact that the state was slipping backwards towards a more autocratic system of government, despite the achievement of a political settlement in Arusha and the preliminary establishment of the Broad Based Transitional Government.

When compared to conditions in Rwanda, the transition from single party to multiparty rule in Burundi was a smoother process, absent the high levels of inter- and intra-group discord and political violence that accompanied the process in Rwanda. Despite the various problems associated with the manner in which the democratic transition was conducted by the Buyoya government, the most important stages of the process involved a superior degree of voluntary negotiation and compromise between the country’s two major communal groups. As all of the qualitative data demonstrate a greater presence of cross-cutting cleavages and a greater experience with the concept and practice of power sharing permitted the democratization process in Burundi to unfold with fewer obstacles and less opportunities for reversal.

Although Ward and Gleditsch, like Mansfield and Snyder (1995), focus their analysis largely on explaining the relationship between democratization and inter-state war, their findings nevertheless have important implications for studies that seek to explicate the relationship between regime-type and internal conflict. Inter-state war can be seen as an extension of the conflict-prone nature of the hybrid democratic state. If a hybrid democracy regresses towards autocracy, the likelihood that the government will use violence against dissident groups and others within the civilian population increases.
These results can be interpreted as providing some support for the argument posited by Braumoeller (1997). Looking specifically at the case of Rwanda, for instance, the behavior of the Hutu conservative elite is consistent with Braumoeller’s contention that “liberal nationalism”—the belief that political freedom is synonymous with freedom from other groups within society and not from the state per se—is more conducive to group conflict than traditional normative liberalism. As the opinions of democratization voiced by much of the Hutu incumbent elite in Rwanda demonstrate true democracy was majority democracy, absent the inclusion of the minority Tutsi group and others who aspired to create a joint-rule system of government. As a consequence, any attempts made by the Tutsi to increase their political power and influence within the governing system were interpreted by the Hutu as illegitimate and were met with violence and other tactics of obstruction.

More generally, Braumoeller’s argument accords with the argument put forth by this dissertation regarding the relationship between political paradigms, institutional failure, and group conflict. Seen in this light, the relative success or at least the initial success of the democratization project in Burundi can be attributed to the Tutsi elite’s perception of political liberalism. Here, the qualitative and quantitative data indicate that the manner in which liberalism was interpreted by most of the Tutsi incumbent elite was more in keeping with the traditional meaning of the concept. Instead of attempting to retain tight control over the political system, Buyoya and other members of the incumbent elite readily agreed to take part in a power-sharing arrangement with the Hutu. The evidence indicates that in Burundi the contest for political power was not perceived in “zero-sum” terms by the majority of the Tutsi elite.615

As discussed in Chapter 2, two of the more serious problems the quantitative democratization and conflict studies encounter are problems of structure and agency, and those which stem from the general depiction of institutional transition as a self-contained event. This dissertation successfully demonstrates that both the process and outcome of institutional change are heavily influenced by the types of
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615 Those who perceived multiparty democracy in this manner were the members of the military who attempted to overthrow the government in 1992 and 1993.
institutional structures that exist within a particular country beforehand. In other words, institutional legacies impact the success of future institutional reforms.

Quantitative democratization studies would certainly benefit from the inclusion of more qualitative data to supplement their analyses. As is often the case and as the *Minorities at Risk* data demonstrate, many of the factors associated with institutions are difficult to measure accurately. In the case of the developing countries in particular, institutional characteristics such as patronage systems, kinship groupings, political paradigms, and indigenous informal institutions of mediation are nearly impossible to quantify. Nevertheless, these factors must be taken into account otherwise theories attempting to explain the outcomes and problems associated with democratization in the developing world will be far from complete. To state the problem more bluntly, just because a phenomenon cannot be quantified does not mean it should be ignored. Conversely, because a phenomenon has been described in excruciatingly extensive detail, does not mean it has been adequately explained.

This second criticism applies specifically to the qualitative democratization studies, as well as the structural studies written on the genocide in Rwanda. Both groups rely in large part on a wide-range of anecdotal evidence, poorly measured independent and dependent variables, and a small number of cases for purposes of comparison and the testing of hypotheses. Consequently, the conclusions these studies reach about the correlation between larger-scale phenomena, the process of democratization, and the occurrence of collective violence in the developing countries fail to sufficiently account for variation in outcome and should therefore be accepted with a great degree of caution. As is most often the case with these studies, mass violence is both over-predicted and poorly explained.

This problem is especially evident in the qualitative studies that focus more or less on one specific factor to account for the failure or success of democratization in the African countries (see for instance the studies by Herbst 1999, Mkandawire 1999, and Hutchful 1997). Whether this factor is the
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616 An exception here can be made for the Mansfield and Snyder study (1995) in which the authors include qualitative data to supplement their quantitative analysis. More generally the quantitative democratization studies could take a page from Bratton and van de Walle’s (1997) analysis on regime change and conflict in post-colonial Africa.
presence or absence of a negotiated settlement between contending parties, the presence of a strong military, civil society and political culture, or Structural Adjustment Programs, without a focused comparison made between cases, it is impossible to pinpoint which variable is actually responsible for the outcomes in question.\textsuperscript{617} Not African countries are not the same. To assume that they are creates serious problems for any theory that attempts to provide a comprehensive explanation of the relationship between democratization and conflict in Africa.

At the same time, comparison between African countries is not impossible. One additional problem the qualitative studies experience concerns the tendency of some to focus specifically on explaining the outcome of democratization in one isolated case. An example of this problem is demonstrated by the Longman (1999) study which examines the relationship between civil society and the genocide in Rwanda. However, the fact that no additional cases are included for purposes of comparison, the author’s conclusion that the real culprit behind the genocide in Rwanda was the civil war becomes extremely questionable. As stated frequently throughout this dissertation, the problem of “selection on the dependent variable” is also common to all of the major studies written on the 1994 genocide in Rwanda (see, for example, the studies by Des Forges 1999, African Rights 1995 and Prunier 1995).

What this dissertation demonstrates is that a qualitative study—adhering to accepted methods of social science inquiry—can produce an explanation of the relationship between regime change and ethnic violence that is subject to rigorous examination, is more comprehensive in scope, and more empirically valid. On the one hand, the use of a most similar systems design allows for a controlled comparison to be made between two countries. Additionally, by creating an analytical narrative through the incorporation of a decision-making model, this dissertation escapes the structure-agency dilemma encountered by both qualitative and quantitative democratization and conflict studies, as well as by the micro- and macro-level analyses of group violence in Rwanda and Burundi.

\textsuperscript{617} An exception to this is the study by Lemarchand (1994b) in which he closely compares the cases of Rwanda, Burundi and South Africa to explain variation in the outcomes of democratization in these countries.
One of the most important results obtained by this dissertation which makes it distinct from most of the studies discussed previously is the finding that political actors—during periods of major institutional reform—do not all respond to or perceive regime change in the exact same manner or in a necessarily rational manner. Instead, this study demonstrates that, consistent with assumptions of prospect theory, dissimilar institutional experiences lead actors in different states to reach very different conclusions about democratization, despite the prevalence of similar conditions of risk. Furthermore, these results apply not only to variation across cases, but within cases as well.

These results are again largely consistent with Braumoeller’s argument. Seen in this light if liberalism is interpreted by political actors as liberal nationalism (or some variant thereof) based on that country’s level of experience with democracy, then it is likely that the outcome of the democratization process will be something other than what many of its advocates originally intended.618

The findings obtained from the content analysis are especially relevant for studies that seek to explain variation in the success of democratization projects across cases. Although the quantitative democratization and conflict studies successfully associate the occurrence of collective violence and/or inter-state warfare with varying levels of democracy within the countries they examine, they do not explain how these variations translate into the specific policy choices political leaders within these countries make.

The same criticism also applies to the qualitative democratization studies. Consequently, both groups of studies provide at best a limited explanation as to why political actors in the developing world have responded to democratization in vastly different ways. The incorporation of a decision model that takes into account the relationship between institutional factors and the choice-making behavior of individual actors therefore greatly alleviates not only the structure-agency problems these studies encounter, but also the difficulties associated with rational actor assumptions more generally.
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618 In the context of the sub-Saharan African countries, “advocates” include not only political opposition groups or the politically marginalized, but also the foreign donor countries and institutions that relentlessly pushed these countries to democratize in the early 1990s.
To be able to generalize the conclusions reached by this dissertation to a wider group of countries, however, a greater number of cases are needed for analysis. Future research could apply the model developed by this dissertation to other examples of democratization in the developing world. Although a controlled comparison of the type performed by this study would be more challenging in other contexts, such a comparison would not be impossible. In addition to histories of colonial subjugation, most of the African countries have multiethnic societies, histories of inter-group conflict, and most have experienced economic hardship and years of dictatorial rule. Additionally, the majority of African countries underwent the transition to multiparty rule at approximately the same time.

The model used here has the potential to make important contributions beyond democratization studies, however. The synthesis of prospect theory and historical institutionalism is beneficial to political science as it represents a “border crossing” that draws upon the existing strengths of a comparative and an international relations theory. Historical institutionalism permits the formation of an explanation which takes into account the effect that larger-scale institutional factors have on group behavior across cases. Prospect theory permits the formation of an explanation that closely associates these institutions with the individual behavior in question. An explanation of institutional change that incorporates both theories therefore represents a substantial contribution to the fields of comparative politics and international relations, as well as to the discipline of political science more generally.
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APPENDIX A:

1. **Does the article reference the topic of multiparty democracy?** Yes = 1; No = 0
   - Multiparty democracy can also be referred to by the following terms:
     - joint-rule
     - liberalization
     - democratization
     - political pluralism
     - power-sharing
     - Broad Based Transitional Government (BBTG); [Rwanda]
     - interim government
     - coalition government
     - transitional government
     - rule with opposition/Tutsi/RPF [Rwanda]
     - rule with opposition/Hutu/FRODEBU [Burundi]
     - reference to various issues related to multiparty democracy are also acceptable but only if mentioned in the context of democratization. These issues include:
       - freedom of the press and freedom of political association.

2. **Does the article include or explicitly refer to specific statements made by political officials, and/or party members/leaders that reflect an opinion in regards to multiparty democracy (or some aspect relating to multiparty democracy)?** Yes = 1; No = 0

3. **Do these statements include an argument or arguments for a particular course of action to be taken with regards to multiparty democracy (or some aspect of multiparty democracy)?** Yes = 1; No = 0

4. **Is a reference point used by decision-makers in their argument?** Yes = 1; No = 0
   - The use of a reference point is indicated by arguments that justify a particular course of action (“high risk” or “low risk”) according to how multiparty democracy is portrayed. In other words, is multiparty democracy described as loss or a gain for the country (in terms of the present or the future).
   - Indicators of a reference point-related argument include references made by speakers to:
     - losses of jobs, patronage and educational opportunities due to democratization;
     - massacre, genocide, or elimination of the incumbent group;
     - the creation of a Tutsi monarchy, empire, or feudalist system of government [Rwanda];
     - the creation of a "majority democracy" [Burundi or Rwanda];
     - the ethnic opposition in negative or positive terms;
• the benefits associated with multi-party democracy in terms of inter-group relations (e.g. equality, peace, stability);
• to the future of democracy in the country (positive or negative); and
• the previous system of government (positive or negative).

Indicators of a non-reference point-related argument include references made by speakers to:
• estimates of the probability of success of a course of action;
• abstract concepts such as “development,” “the spirit of democracy,” “the will/desire of the people,” “national dignity,” and “national unity” (Rwanda) as reasons for a course of action; and
• the moral status or reputational status of the government in the eyes of the international community as a reason for a course of action.

5. If a reference point was used by a speaker, was it the former status quo (e.g. the system of government that existed prior to multiparty politics), or is it the current status quo (e.g. the multiparty system of government being implemented OR which will be implemented per treaty/constitutional revision)? FSQ = 1; CSQ = 0. (NOTE: The indices for FSQ and CSQ are identical to those listed above for reference point-related arguments. The difference is that these latter indices are divided according to whether a positive or negative view of multiparty democracy is referenced:
• Indicators that the current status quo is being used as a reference point include references made by speakers to:
  • the ethnic opposition as friend, compatriot, partner;
  • the benefits associated with multiparty democracy in terms of inter-group relations (equality, peace, stability);
  • the positive future of democracy for the country; and
  • the previous system of government as an authoritarian dictatorship, or a monopoly of power; as being dominated by the incumbent ruling group.
• Indicators that the former status quo is being used as a reference point include references made by speakers to:
  • losses of jobs, patronage and educational opportunities due to democratization;
  • institutional change as having been forced on the country due to domestic and international pressures;
  • the forced retirement of army officers and job losses due to army demobilization as a result of democratization;
  • possible massacre, genocide, elimination of the incumbent group;
  • the creation of a Tutsi monarchy, empire, feudalist system of government [Rwanda];
  • the creation of “majority democracy” [Burundi or Rwanda];
  • to the ethnic opposition as enemies, and traitors; and
  • to the previous system of authoritarian rule as the better system

6. If an argument refers to a preferred course of action/policy option, is this option high risk or low risk? A high risk option is a policy that is geared towards either a removal of the multiparty system in favor of an authoritarian system OR maintaining the authoritarian system; a low risk option is a policy that reflects a desire to either establish multiparty democracy or to continue the process of democratization as previously agreed upon between the parties (per treaty/constitutional change); HR = 1; LR = 0
• Indicators of a preference for the low risk course of action include references made by a speaker to:
  • political competition within the system as mandated by constitutional change/treaty;
  • upcoming elections;
  • a refusal to stall the democratization process;
  • the legitimization of multiparty system as mandated by constitutional change/treaty; and
  • reforms already made or in the process of being made to the existing system for reasons which include:
    • further liberalization of the political system;
    • creating equality of opportunity for marginalized groups; and
    • ending government corruption and the monopoly of political power and patronage exercised by the incumbent ruling group.
• Indicators of a preference for a high risk course of action include references made by a speaker to:
  • extermination, elimination, destruction, or annihilation of the ethnic opposition and those affiliated with them;
  • a desire to create anarchy, chaos in the country;
  • “work” as a euphemism for genocide;
  • war against the ethnic opposition;
  • self-defense of the country against the opposition;
  • violence/revenge against opposition groups;
  • non-participation of the incumbent group in the new government;
  • a desire for the inclusion of extremist parties in the new government;
  • the exclusion of opposition groups from government; and
  • creating further obstacles to the democratization process.