

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



**OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OF THE REPUBLIC**

**THE UNITY OF RWANDANS
- BEFORE THE COLONIAL PERIOD
AND UNDER THE COLONIAL RULE
- UNDER THE FIRST REPUBLIC**

Kigali, August 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	I
CHAPTER I. RELATIONS BETWEEN RWANDANS BEFORE THE COLONIAL PERIOD AND UNDER THE COLONIAL RULE	4
1.1. Unity before the Colonial Period	4
I. I. I. Who were constituting unity ?.....	4
1.1.2. Unity characteristics (unity stocks).....	4
1.1.3. Obstacles to unity.....	7
1.2. Unity under the Colonial rule.....	7
1.2.1. Monarchy.....	7
1.2.2. Colonial administration.....	10
1.2.3. Religions	14
1.2.4. Schools.....	16
CHAPTER II. FORCED LABOUR UNDER THE BELGIAN COLONIAL RULE.....	20
2.1. Forced labour	20
2.2. Corvée	22
2.3. Cultivating fallow land	25
2.4. Milking cow	26
2.5. Coffee	27
2.6. Personal tax.....	27
2:6.1. Tax for Colonialists	28
2.6.2. The bad effect of Colonial tax (1916-1962).....	29
2.7. Punishments for those who did not perform forced labour.....	29
2.8. Clientship	31
2.8.1. Clientship before the colonial period.....	31
2.8.2. Clientship under the colonial period.....	33
2.9. Landed Estate.....	35
CHAPTER III. THE WAY OF GETTING RID OF COLONIZATION (1952-1962).....	36
3.1. The people's role.....	36
3.2. Rwandan Authorities	37
3.3. Colonial Authorities	38.
3.4. Elites (élites)	39
3.4.1. Perfecting (Mice au point).....	40
3.4.2. Hutus'Manifesto.....	42
3.5. U.N.O.....	47
3.6. The Church's role.....	48
3.7. Political parties.....	51

CHAPTER IV. ORIGIN AND RELATIONS BETWEEN HUTUS,TUTSIS AND TWAS	57.
4.1. Orgin	58
4.2. The fact of belonging to Hutu, Tutsi and Twa ethnic groups before the White People's Arrival	60
4.3. The fact of belonging to Hutu, Tutsi and Twa ethnic groups under the Colonial rule.....	61
CONCLUSION: Ideas on main actions which can reestablish Unity	63
Appendix 1. Distribution of students admitted in Butare Astrida School and per ethnic group 1932-1962 (Ruterana J.M.V.p.129)	66
Appendix 2. Decree 1/54 by King Rudahigwa : abolition of clientship.....	68
Appendix 3. Clans and Chiefs in Bugoyi before the Belgian rule (Kajeguhakwa Valens and Gahigi Denis).....	72
Appendix 4. We can use the culture to reestablish the unity of Rwandans (Kayihura Michel).....	82
Some bibliography.....	84

PREFACE

Within the framework of the meetings which are held in Urugwiro Village every Saturday from May 9, 1998, His Excellency Pasteur BIZIMUNGU, President of the Republic, on June 27, 1998, set up a Committee for studying the issue of the unity of Rwandans, after the meeting had exchanged ideas about it.

The duty entrusted to that Committee made up of thirteen people was to answer questions which people often ask about the unity of Rwandans. The Committee hastened to start that job, its members agreed on the meeting's agenda, on the issues to be examined, and fixed two days a week for meeting together.

The procedure which the members of the Committee agreed upon in order to carry out their duty is the following : to meet together and quite discuss each issue, each member bringing in ideas based on his knowledge or on the fact that he has much experience. After discussions, members of the Committee used to go back home, its Chairman and Deputy-Chairman staying there : making a clear report, and putting together the ideas which had been given by members of the Committee, such ideas being enriched by historical ideas which were explained and finalized, mainly based on in-depth analysis of writings contained in the books or archives which are in Brussels in Belgium. in Rome in Italy, and here in Rwanda.

The next day of meeting together, members of the Committee discussed about the document, corrected it, and was the adopted by all of them after it had been finalized, then they moved to the following issue, and so on.

Another thing is that the Committee, as it had been advised by His Excellency the President of the Republic, appealed for help from people who are interested in the history of Rwanda.

Those people are the following

1. Michel Kayihura : it is he who took the initiative of writing the famous document called Perfecting ("Mise au point"); he communicated to the Committee some of the actions which were carried out by the National High Council and in which climate they were carried out, and indeed he actively participated in that Council because he even worked as its Deputy-Chairman, being the assistant of King Mutara Rudahigwa.
2. Valens Kajeguhakwa and Denis Gahigi : they explained the Committee how Rwandan authorities who governed Bugoyi had different clans (Ababanda, Abacyaba, Abagesera, and so on) and were Hutus and Tutsis including natives. They also distributed a document containing many historical facts (see Appendix 3).

It would have been much better if we had had other people whom to appeal for, but we did not do it because we found that we had not enough time to analyse their ideas and discuss about them usefully.

In this booklet, there are points which were examined by the Committee in connection with the duty entrusted to it, as this appears in the Reports of the meetings held at Urugwiro on 27/5/1998 and 11/7/1998

- Hutu - Twa - Tutsi ethnic groups and 18 classical clans and the way they are tangled forced labour; political parties' formation in 1959-1960; the National High Council and how it behaved toward problems which existed at that time; clientship; PARMEHUTU in Rwanda politics; the Church's role; the colonization role; including matters regarding cultivating fallow land, corvées and the milking cow.
- The Committee was also requested to give ideas on the main actions which would help reestablish the unity of Rwandans.

Apart from those points related to its mission, the Committee also examined other points relating to the unity of Rwandans and which are well interpreting that mission. Such points were therefore analysed as it comes out in the table of contents.

The point regarding "complexes" was also discussed by the Committee, but while writing, we found that it was not suitable for it alone to be dealt with in a chapter or a paragraph, and rather found that clientship and colonization "complexes" are well understood through what was written on clientship and colonization. However, a "complex" is something which is psychological (psychology/ psychologie), which is included among those which have a relationship with friendship, education, life, economy, religion and politics (ideology/idéologie).

The Committee was made up of the following members

1. MBONIMANA Gamaliel (Chairman)
2. RUTAYISIRE Paul (Historian) (Deputy-Chairman)
3. RUTAREMARA Tito
4. SAFARI Stanley
5. MUNYANKUGE Laurent
6. RWANGOMBWA Jean Chrysostome
7. MUNGARURIRE Peter Joseph
8. NSEKALIJE Aloys
9. IYAMUREMYE Augustin
10. KAJEGUHAKWA Valens
11. LHABAMENSHI Callixte
12. MUZUNGU Bernardin o.p. (was not available because of justified reasons)
13. NIBASEKE Lucien (was not available).

Members of the Committee tried hard to fulfil the mission entrusted to them, so that they were even obliged to work during the whole week-end. The Committee was happy with how responsible "services" in the Office of the President of the Republic helped them to carry out their mission properly. We cannot draw our conclusion without thanking very much Mr. KAYIRANGA

Théo Bosco (MININTER) who was very close to us from the beginning of four meeting, and who wrote this booklet for us on the "Computer" as quickly as possible.

The Committee hopes that they did something which is very useful, so that their ideas can help those who are interested in the unity and peace Rwandans.

THE COMMITTEE

CHAPTER I. RELATIONS BETWEEN RWANDANS BEFORE THE COLONIAL PERIOD AND UNDER THE COLONIAL RULE

1.1. UNITY BEFORE THE COLONIAL PERIOD

There are people who can ascertain that it is not necessary to prove that there was the unity of Rwandans before the Colonialists' arrival. However it is necessary, because there are many people who are currently writing that killings during the genocide and massacres which took place in Rwanda from 1959 until the culminating war of 1994 took root in bad relations between Hutus and Tutsis before the White People's arrival. This was written by some of the White People and Rwandans.

The truth from history is that before the Colonial period, i.e. before the year 1900, that Catholic Missionaries began to live in our country, in which there was strong unity „ between Rwandans : no ethnical war took place between them before that year. Unit before the Europeans arrival will be examined in three points : we shall talk first about people who were constituting that unity, then will follow its characteristics (its stocks), and finally the obstacles to it, because there is a say that " things cannot be always good i "

1.1.1. Who were constituting Unity ?

That unity was for all Rwandans : Hutus, Tutsis and Twas. They were making up all together what our ancestors called "The King's People". All of them also knew they were Rwandans, that Rwanda was their country, that nobody could say that he had the right to it more than the others. Even though they said that Rwanda was belonging to the King (Rwanda's Owner, the Country's Owner), they ascertained that "the King was supported by the warriors".

1.1.2. Unity characteristics (unity stocks)

We cannot fully explain them, because every " stock " alone can be written in a whole book. Before examining unity characteristics during the Kings' period, let us enumerate first . the clan (clans, examples : Abagesera, Abega, Abanyiginya, Abasinga), the language, the culture, the religion, the King, some organizations (of government, social, economic, things'value, housing) institutions.

The clan (in the "clan " or clans').

These are those clans that people often say that they are 18, even if there is argument about their number, because for instance Alexis Kagame ascertains that they are 15.

The main thing is to know that all Rwandans, Hutus, Tutsis, Twas, were sharing those 18 clans. Those clans are the following : Abasinga, Abacyaba, Abungura, Abashambo, Abatsobe, Abakono, Abaha, Abashingo, Abanyakarama, Abasita, Abongera n'Abenengwe (rb.M. d'Hertefeld, Ancient Rwanda's clans / Les Clans du Rwanda ancien). Many people, including writers, wondered about the reason for sharing his clan, and he immediately replied without any doubt that he was Umusinga, Umuzigaba, Umusindi, Umwega, Umubanda, etc.; he could not think that he was asked whether he was Twa, Tutsi or Hutu.

Another thing is that one element which was bringing Rwandans together in helping one another, assisting one another is the clan (such as the clans of Abatsobe, Abungura, Abanyakarama, Abongera, etc.) : when an Umusinga traveller (be he Hutu, Tutsi or Twa) arrived among other Basinga, he was well received and feeling at home. Ubuse (which was based on the "clans") brought Rwandans together . Ubuse is the friendship relation between people which appears in the rites such as laughing at a poor person (gutsirora) or removing a proscription (kuzirura), being lucky (kweza). One wh^o performs such rites is called "umuse".

The language: Kinyarwanda

There is a dictionary (Inkoranyamagambo : dictionnaire) which has just been worked out by the S.T.R.I. / I.R.S.T (Butare). It consists in Kinyarwanda words which are explained in Kinyarwanda, with many examples. Any reasonable person can understand that Kinyarwanda is still very useful to us. Rwandans are sharing one language. In Africa, countries which are so lucky are very few.

The culture (culture)

I.e. customs,rites, ancestral customs, taboos, arts, crafts, music, dance, human medicine and veterinary medicine, etc.

The religion : belief in one God

Religious matters which some people call " Evangelization" are based on believing in God and respecting ancestors, appeasing the ancestors'spirits, initiating into Ryangombe's mysteries, consulting the sorcerer. Appeasing the ancestors'spirits brought together the alive and the dead: it was a way of remembering them.

Those who had met in Ryangombe's mysteries, one having been godfather to another, had relations as those between a parent and his child, and even their children were considered as brothers . Hutus, Tutsis and Twas were initiated together into Ryangombe's mysteries without any distinction, and one who was chosen initiated

others. That fact of not being selfish comes from the fact that when initiated people are performing the rite of initiating others into Ryangombe's mysteries, they are not like ordinary people and must not behave like them. Brotherhood from initiation into Ryangombe's mysteries was something very important which brought Rwandans together.

The King

The King was the crux for all Rwandans. Poets called him Sebantu (: the father of all people in Rwanda). And after he was enthroned, people said that "he was not umututsi any more", but the King for the people. And in their daily life, Hutus, Tutsis and Twas were familiar with the King. It was forbidden to keep somebody away because of his height or his colour : anyone who wanted could meet the King. In the programme of expanding Rwanda, there was no room for disputes between Hutus, Tutsi and Twas. The King brought all of them together to that watchword.

Organization of the existing institutions : (government, friendship, justice).

- The political organization was mixed with that of organising war matters, so that all Rwandans, Tutsis, Hutus, Twas had a unit of warriors in which they all met Abashakamba, Uruyange, Abarasa, etc.
- Nobody would forget in which part there was too much clientship : people shared the same Patron, spent the evening together, conversed, helped one another.

For all Rwandans, a girl was called "gahuzamiryango" (someone who brings families together), "nyampinga" (who receives everybody without distinction) : she received people without despising them, and could even play a big role in settling disputes between families by forwarding her message to gacaca, if she had been married and got children.

All Rwandans liked their country, and were feeling that they shared the Rwandese nationality. A French specialist in history, Louis de Lacger, was astonished by the way Rwandans of the 1930s were characterized by feeling that they were sharing the same country and really liked it (Patriotism/ Patriotisme); that writer ascertains that some of the elements which were at the origin of that patriotism was the fact of having one single language.

Housing

There was no region for Hutus, no region for Tutsis or Twas. All of them had a mixed housing. They helped one another based on being neighbours (and there is a say that "neighbours give birth to children who look like each other").

In a few words, before the White People's arrival, all Rwandans had unity which was based on one King and patriotism, spoke the same language, had the same culture, the same belief and tried hard to be in peace and live together, completing each other in their daily needs. When the King needed a sorcerer to make

divination for him, it was his secret advisors who chose him, based on his capacity and nothing more.

1.1.3. Obstacles to Unity

It cannot be ignored that in the Kings' Rwanda, Twas were kept at distance, and particularly disregarded . But they were not kept away from the Royal Court and the chiefs' residences, and even some of them got married with daughters of high authorities, but that fact of being disregarded has not disappeared.

The second obstacle to unity was hatred and fightings from those who wanted to be on power. The nearest example is Rucunshu (Nyamabuye Commune-Gitarama), where people killed each other because some of them wanted to kill King Mibambwe IV Rutarindwa, in order to replace him with Musinga, son of Kigeri IV Rwabugiri and Kanjogera. This took place at the end of the year 1896. Also, at that time, White People had taken position at Rwanda's border at Shangiri (in Cyangugu). One would say that while White People were invading Rwanda to colonize it, and missionaries bringing in their religion, high rank Rwandans (at the Royal Court and the chiefs' residences) were mistreating each other without having political relations : this made things easy for White People. Unity which Rwandans had before started dying away little by little.

1.2. UNITY UNDER THE COLONIAL PERIOD

1.2.1. Monarchy

Wherever colonization itself is established, it brings in come government, economic and social changes.

Another thing is that colonization came with religions from outside (Christianity and Islam). Those religions also have consequences on changes in the people's living conditions, on religious institutions (religion) and the way of thinking and understanding longevity, life and environment.

When White People came at the end of the 19th century, Rwanda had problems at the government level after the death of King Kigeri IV Rwabugiri, especially problems stemming from Rucunshu's consequences. In March 1897, Captain Ramsay gave the King, when they were at Runda, a German flag with a letter to protect Rwanda

(Protectorate / Protectorat).

But those problems of government took another step because of colonization, while Rwandans would have perhaps found another way, other particular solutions to them. The monarchy's image changed by force; monarchy lost forces. There was no freedom. The King was not any more capable of taking decisions and strategies of freely governing the country.

The German period

German government weakened monarchy too much, but did not destroy it, and the King continued to hold some of the authority (autorité) he had before. He continued to kill and save people, to give cows to people, to take cows back from the people he wanted even if this went on decreasing. Another thing is that the function of secret advisor was the main stock for monarchy that continued to exist.

The King's government never became an obstacle to Germans, mainly because of their forces : they had got a lesson from the attack launched on Shangi which was overcome by Belgians (July 1896) under the reign of Rutalindwa. Even Rwandese authorities themselves had disputes, which were based on government : The case of Ndungutse and Basebya is an example (1911-1912).

The Belgian period

During the Belgian period, monarchy lost value. Before, the King's order could not be reviewed, it was respected : the King was the holder of things to be offered (Nyamugirubutangwa). In 1911, the King was ordered to sign that every Rwandan will adhere to the religion he wants. Those who got profit from that are Catholics. In that same year, Belgians withdrew from the King of Rwanda the right of death penalty or of killing not as a punishment. From that time, nobody had no fear of being killed by the King.

In 1923, the King lost the right of giving cows or taking them back from the chiefs without the Belgians' (Resident's) approval. Colonizers replaced the King in his authority and respect. Because of that, some of the Chiefs and the youth from the Royal Court started to despise the King and to convert themselves to White People, be they Colonizers or Fathers.

In 1925, in order to make monarchy lose more value, the Resident of Rwanda suppressed the function of secret advisors (overmentioned) = he eradicated the rite of premices: the King used to lead that rite in order to show that he was the owner of fertility (nyiruburumbuke) and multiplicity; in that year, the head of the King's secret advisors, Gashamura, was chased far away (to Gitega in Burundi) by Belgians. From that time, Musinga's and his Mother's monarchy was only existing by the name. Dispossessing him on 12th November 1931 was like finishing a dying person.

Another thing which became clear is that Musinga was not the Rwandans' mediator any more, even if some people were still transferred to Kamembe, some people continued to go to him.

From 1931 to 1940, Mutara Rudahigwa tried hard to enforce the Belgians' rules, and ordered the chiefs to follow them by all means. Regarding religion, there was something which people called "the King's word" : this meant Rudahigwa's order that all Rwandans had to adhere to the Catholic religion.

Within the framework of ideology, some Colonizers and Fathers opposed that Rwandans consider Rudahigwa as a real King (roi), instead of considering him as an ordinary chief ("sultan"). The real King, whom Rwandans had to know that he was the only holder- of that name, was the King of Belgium.

When Rudahigwa was enthroned in 1931, some Rwandans were not happy with that: some said that he was "the King from the source" (umwami wo mu isoko) when 'White People enthroned him; "the King who was enthroned on the anthill" (the podium on which he was standing when he took the floor); "one who clubs people senseless" (who beats people)...

From 1940 to 1948, Rudahigwa recovered little by little his monarchy's image and earned many people's respect.

It was easy for him, because he was also supported by Fathers: Baptism in 1943; in 1946, he handed Rwanda over to Christ the King; Pope Pie XII gave him the ring as a reward for supporting Christianity, which was slid into his finger at Kabgayi on 20th May 1947, by the papal envoy to Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi. In general, Belgians liked him because he was a good worker, who also made others perform the work they wanted. But some people were against him [among "civilized people"(évolués) / elites = élites)] and they even wanted to replace him in government, being supported in that by some of the White People (such as Brother Secundien).

But from 1948 to 1959 (when he died), even if it was Belgians who continued to have sovereignty (souveraineté), Rudahigwa himself understood little by little the responsibility he had on Rwandans as a King, and he proved that by trying hard to change the Rwandans' daily living conditions (to abolish clientship, to abolish forced labour...). Thus Rwandans never became like an army without a commander (impehe). He went on daring colonial government more and more until he wanted to get rid of it, and the situation got worse in 1958, when he came from the Universal Exhibition of Brussels.

In a few words, at the beginning of colonization, monarchy started losing value little by little, especially under the Belgian rule, until 1940. After monarchy began to be strong and respected because of Rudahigwa : he showed his will of solving Rwandans' major problems. They could feel that they had somebody who was defending them.

1.2.2. COLONIAL ADMINISTRATION (Administration Coloniale)

The German period

In the year 1897, the Royal Court accepted to be submitted by force (kuba ingaruzamuheto) by Germans : they put themselves in the Germans' armpit.

Regarding administration, one would say the following

1. The King was no more managing or travelling throughout Rwanda as he wanted, as an independent authority. One of the actions which prove that is the fact that the King was obliged to stay in one place, keep quiet , staye at Nyanza, abandon the Kings' habit of "distributing plots" (to change cities or palaces): he was obliged to stay at Nyanza by all means. He was to have a

known place in which he could meet with White People (Germans or Missionaries), and that place was Nyanza.

At that time, the Chiefs also began to have other places in which they could meet and which were not the Royal Court (Cour Royale): in new government headquarters (which were called "boma" such as Gisenyi, Ruhengeri, Shangi, Gatsibo, Musaho, Rubengera). This proves that the King lost something as regards his authority, and being the only mediator for Rwandans. There were other people who were fighting for heading politics, administration and religion: before, the King was the main redeemer (umutambyi / libérateur) for Rwanda.

2. Losing full independence and authority also appeared in establishing borders between Rwanda and countries which are surrounding it now. It had consequences on the unity of Rwandans: it mainly appeared on the people from the north of Rwanda (example: those from Mulera, Bufumbira, Rutshuru) who fell in traps of goings and comings by White People and their Soldiers who were fighting for borders while fixing their pegs, then some people became Congolese, and others Ugandans.

This took place between 1896 and 1912. Apart from supervising (controle) the country and establishing the country's borders, Germans had just established civil administration: the example is the Residence for Rwanda which was established in 1908 and managed by Richard Kandt. This made Kigali become a city competing (concurrente) with Nyanza.

Before the year 1908, Germans were governing Rwandans from Usumbura; and Usumbura was governed by Dar-es-Salaam because the Governor was living there.. The Germans' policy of administration was indirect rule (administration indirecte).

In their way of governing, Germans supported the King and monarchy because they had interests in them: they had heard that in Rwanda the Kings' government was strong, that it could help them reach their objective of colonizing without difficulties. Another thing is that they were very few and needed support from native authorities. That is why they did all their possible to fight all those who were against the King, such as Ndungutse and Basebya (1911-1912). Germans also chased away some Fathers who were obstacles to the King's government: those are Pouget and Barthélemy. The conclusion would be that Germans supported monarchy and the King, and had watchwords of developing the country, but this did not prevent their colonial government from disturbing the unity of Rwandans. Example: the fact that Rwanda lost its independence, and that the King was no more the crux for all Rwandans. The fact that they supported those who introduced new religions, while it is well known that any new relig changes the family's living conditions, culture and good relations.

The Belgian period

Belgian government appeared in three periods:

- The military period;

- The Mandate period;
- The Trusteeship period.

1) Military government (1916-1926)

After Germans had just left the country, while they were supporting Musinga, Rumanuka famine was the consequence of the war (especially at Bugoyi), carrying luggages for Germans and their Soldiers who were fleeing, the pressure of feeding new authorities who had just occupied the country (and who were called "Congolese") and working with them without understanding each other, all this put Rwandans in distress. Even the King remained without knowing where he was standing.

Among bad things which were noted were

- "abasemyi"(interpreters/interprètes) : i.e. Rwandans who could speak very little Swahili, who were using it when interpreting for Belgians and Rwandans and who got too much profit from that, mistreating people because of that: they beat people, took their properties on the pretext that they were supported by Belgians. They started in 1916 and they had caused chaos in 1919;
- " to rape" (gufaringa or gukinda) which means taking women or girls by force in public;
- those who carried the Germans' luggages and who remained abroad.

Within the framework of administration, there was something new. They established united provinces (provinces unies) with one governor. Minister Frank who was the minister of colonies wrote a letter of principle in Rwanda's structure: Belgians had to use indirect rule (administration indirecte), which meant that they had to get under control the whole Rwandese population by using Tutsis.

In reality, such indirect rule did not prevent White People from mingling with the people up to the villages.

2) The Mandate period (1926-1946)

Usually, Rwanda administration had something which was complex. One colline was, for instance, governed by two or three chiefs: "the chief of land" who was in charge of supervising works, farmers and taxes on agricultural products); "the chief of pasture" who was in charge of cows and their owners as well as taxes relating to cows' matters; "the chief of warriors" who was in charge of assembling troupes during the war time, often getting them from each house.

Sometimes, one chief could supervise two things at the same time: Rwabilinda was the chief of land and pasture at Mpala (Cyangugu); Bikotwa was the chief of warriors and land at Buhanga-Ndara (Butare).

From 1926 to 1932, there was an important reform of administration in Rwanda and Burundi. Those who played a role in that are Governor Voisin who had his residence in Usumbura and Rwanda's Resident Mortehan, so that there were some people who wrote, as regards Rwanda, calling it "Mortehan's reform".

That reform dismissed those three chiefs and replaced them with one single chief, but they suppressed the warriors matters and set up theirs. This made the people be in distress of not knowing who was their real leader.

Among bad consequences of that reform, one would mention that Rwandans had their own conception on how to organize administration (organization administrative): administration was related to administrative centres (chefferies) and the chief could have two different chefferies, here and there. As to White People's administration, it was based on lands which were put together (territory / territoire). It is that White People's procedure which was followed and had bad consequences on the unity of Rwandans.

- Until 1926, chiefs were Hutus and Tutsis, and Hutu and Twa chiefs were progressively dismissed. It was the same in Burundi;
- The people had nobody to defend them. They had to respect new authorities, the main reason being that they were representing White People, and people were very afraid of the White man. He had different ways of punishing anybody who despised him (see punishments below).
- Such administration was accompanied by mistreating the people too much. Because chief-assistants, clerks, town criers had no salaries. Another example of mistreatment is that if somebody was dismissed from Government, his concrete properties, such as cows and cleints were taken by one who replaced him; this generated in disputes emanating from land properties. Even such disputes took place in some parts in which there were monopolized lands because of new chiefs.
- In that new government, only one person was in charge of administration and justice (administration et justice).

It is important to understand that this White People's new way of governing was spread throughout the whole of Rwanda, while before the overmentioned reform, there was different administration, even it though was concentrated on the King.

Another thing is that administration which was introduced by White People used documents (letters, books, records, identity cards ...) which made it easy for them to get Rwandans under control and oppress them with colonization.

Let us remind that such use of documents within administration (bureaucracy / bureaucratie) is one of the reasons why they wrote "Tutsi, Hutu, Twa" in the identity cards. There are also two other reasons for that:

- They had to know well whom they had to take for help them in government and who they were exactly.

- Belgians wanted to control Rwandans in order to use them while taking things from the country, in service, in collecting taxes, in mines, tea and coffee of Belgian Congo.

In a few words, new administration which was introduced by Belgians disturbed too much the unity of Rwandans, favoured one ethnic group, apart from the fact that within that ethnic group only few people were too much favoured, while the other big majority of Rwandans were too much oppressed.

Note : Administration during the Trusteeship period (Tutelle, 1946 - 1962) will be examined later.

1.2.3. Religions

Until 1900, no religion from outside had been introduced in Rwanda. In 1900 came Catholics, in 1907 came Lutherans (luthériens), and in 1910 Islam was established in Rwanda. After that came other branches of Christianity.

New religions changed something in the belief, cults, behaviour and rites of many among Rwandans. Another thing is that those religions generated disputes between Rwandans: disputes between members and non-members, disputes between religions and even between religious confessions themselves.

Among those religions, one which appeared to be working with colonizers is the Catholic religion, and this had many consequences among Rwandans.

Changes brought by religions from outside in the belief, cults, rites and behaviour.

New religious people disregarded Gihanga's religion (traditional religion). Catholics replaced Imana (God) with Mungu, Muslims used "Allah", and Lutherans used the word "Imana" at the beginning. This made many people forget about God and his help, while he used to bring all Rwandans together: he used to be the main knot which was shared by Rwandans in their belief and living conditions.

Before, the rites of appeasing the ancestor's spirits (guterekera) and performing a cult to Ryangombe (kubandwa) brought the living and the dead (ancestors) together, in order to maintain good relations between them. When new religions were introduced, they opposed too much those rites which brought Rwandans together. The example is the rite

of performing a cult to Ryangombe (kubandwa) in which all neighbours participated in general without distinguishing Hutus, Tutsis, Twa.

There are many examples of bad changes in behaviour: such as applauding for the King (by 1920). Catholic said that their King was "Jesus"; the teacher or the assembly's leader felt that he had to imitate the White Father's way of getting dressed (with a dress, a hat, a rosary on the chest).

The way in which new religions preached was not very clear and destroyed Rwandans' belief and culture. Even if some people were, very lucky because of following that, there are some others who put the tradition religion and the new religion together and others who remained in distress and standing like a tree.

Disputes generated by new religions.

Such disputes are of many kinds. There are disputes between members and non-members. At the beginning those members were called "Rwanda's enemies" and everybody was against them and they were even disregarded. But in 1907, christians who were kept at distance were restored their rights by Kabare and became like other Rwandans.

In the 1920s, after the Fathers had established themselves because they were supported by Belgians, it was those who were not going to them who started being suspected, disregarded, starting by King Musinga. Those who were not doing anything to be well seen by White People were called "Members" (Abayoboke), and they were in conflict with "Lost people" (Abahababyi), which means those who were in good terms with Fathers and other White People and who told them the Royal Court's secrets.

There were also disputes between religions themselves: such as Catholics and Lutherans, Catholics and Muslims.... They were disregarding each other, fighting for getting a good position within the country and many members, and having disputes on land properties. They instilled those disputes into their members.

Religions and Colonization

Since Belgians came to Rwanda, Catholicism considered itself and was considered as a Government religion, and this especially appears since 1931, at the time of the King's word (irivuze umwami). Fathers gave advice to colonial authorities, and participated in enforcing some instructions: such as appointing or dismissing some chiefs.

Another thing which proves collaboration between the Catholic Church and Government is how White People up to the Governor of Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi (who was called Mburamatari) actively participated in religious feasts such as the marriage of Rudahigwa and Gicanda (1942), the baptism of Rudahigwa and His Mother Kankazi (1943), the ceremony of sliding into the finger the ring sent by Pope Pius XII (1947), the Catholic Church's Jubilee of 50 years in Rwanda (it was celebrated in Astrida, Butare in 1950).

The fact that the Catholic Church was supported by colonizers was accompanied by oppressing other religions, even if some of them progressively got assistance within the framework health and school education.

The other role of religions will appear in other parts on schools and the way of getting rid of colonization from 1952.

1.2.4. School education

In Rwanda like in any other country which was colonized, school education itself brings in something new. There is a way of conception, the a way of getting some ideas better than those who have not been to school, new technology and sciences. Schools also change behaviours. At the beginning of school education, all Rwandans did not understand its value. In general, authorities despised it first, so that they were careful not to sent their children to school. Its value was progressively noticed starting from 1912. Usually, school education creates unequalities among people, because some have learnt at school and others never put their have foot into school.

In Rwanda, religious schools, especially those for the Catholic Church, are more numerous than public schools or those for other religions.

We shall examine school matters in two categories:

- **1900-1930** : the first school started m1900: Save and Nyanza, which were launched by White Fathers. In the year 1930, there was an agreement governing primary schools between Government and Christians' Missions;
- **1930-1959** : after explaining the events of 1930. It is also known that they took place in 1959.

1) 1900-1930:

At that time, it was the catholic schools which had value, which were important. At the beginning, school education was aimed at converting Rwandans into catholics; 'What was the most important thing for Fathers was to get many members before Lutherans and Muslims. That is why there were very few lessons at school, because Fathers were more interested in religious matters than teaching Rwandans new technology and sciences. The following were taught: writing, reading (but reading religious books), calculation and Swahili in some places.

While looking for members, Fathers also looked for people to help them start preparing them to that work

This required them to set up special divisions (sections spécialisées) within primary schools, in charge of preparing teachers and children to sent to the seminary. The first Rwandans who went to the seminary were sent to (Rubya in the west of Tanzania of today). The first minor seminary was built in Rwanda, at Nyuruhengeri (Kansi of today) in 1912. Later, it was shifted to Kabgayi in 1913. The senior major seminary also started at Kabgayi, with students from Hangiro (Tanzania), then was shifted to Nyakibanda in 1936 with students from Rwanda, Burundi and Congo.

The first Rwandese priests had the same religious knowledge as that of White People. The example is Father Gallican Bushishi who, after being ordained in 1920, was immediately appointed to teach theology (religious technology) in the senior seminary with White Fathers. Those schools which prepared priests made no distinction between Hutus and Tutsis; even though there are people who often write

that those who were ordained during the first years were only Hutus. It is nothing but a hasty assertion.

In the year 1913, at Kabgayi and Rwaza, Fathers opened schools intended for Tutsis near those in which Hutus were studying. They taught them to write, to read (in religious books) and Swahili. No religious teaching was provided for alone.

In the year 1914, in Kigali, White Fathers had a school intended for Tutsis near schools for Hutus. That school was called the school for people designed for religious life. That school closed in 1932, and it provided education to chiefs and chief-assistants.

Reasons why it was established schools for Tutsis were the following

- The first reason was to enforce instructions from Cardinal Charles Lavigerie who established the Society of White Fathers. He ordered them to convert people into christians, starting from the chiefs and being helped by them, in order to get too many members without difficulties. When White Fathers arrived in Rwanda, while following such instructions, they thought that the chiefs were only Tutsis when it was not the case even if in the great part of Rwanda those who were high rank chiefs were Tutsis (see for example Appendix 3).
- The second reason for establishing schools for Tutsi was that when they just arrived in Rwanda, Fathers put into action the content of the documents from White People who came with the aim of discovering the sources of the Nile or aiming at something . else : such as Speke, Von Gotzen and Kandt.

In those documents, they wrote making it up that Tutsis were more intelligent than Hutus, that it was Tutsis who could govern, that there was nothing astonishing because they had a relationship with White People, as they came from Egypt, Caucasus, Ethiopia....This is called "hamitic hypothesis" (hypothèse hamitique) : which says that

good things which are in this great lakes'region cannot be ccarred out by people who are too black, but are made up by Tutsis with other people who are like them.

Public Schools

▪ **Nyanza School**

This school started in 1919; before that year, White Fathers had a school there, which closed because of the war. It was the first school to be established by the Belgian Govenment and was intended for Tutsis. But it was often called the school for " the chiefs'children", and some people added "and other Tutsis `children". It closed in 1935, after the secondary school of Astrida "School" (Groupe scolaire) had just started.

That Nyanza school had the following functions : to teach those who would become chiefs, secretaries (secrétaires), and teachers who would reach in public schools.

In the year of 1959, among 48 chiefs who were governing, only 14 had studied in Astrida (Butare), and others in that public school of Nyanza as well as in other schools. At that time, most of chief-assistants had studied in that Nyanza school. It is clear that this Belgian Government's school, which was in the category of primary schools, had an important role in the way of governing Rwanda.

▪ Other schools

On 1/01/1930, the Government of Rwanda signed an agreement with the Christians' (Catholics and Protestants) Church on subsidized denominational education (enseignement libre subsidié).

Because of that, the number of students progressively increased too much in Catholic schools. And there was no bad consequences on the unity of Rwandans. But one of the things which disturbed that unity is the school which was called "Astrida School" (Butare) and supervised by "Charity Brothers" (Frères de la Charité) and which opened its doors in 1932.

That secondary school which was supervised by Monks and assisted by Government (subsidized) in particular was aimed at preparing Belgians' assistants at different levels doctors in medicine and veterinary surgeons, agronomists, secretaries and people who would become chiefs (administration section / section administrative).

Apart from that administration section in which were studying the chiefs' children, students in all other sections were mixed (Hutus and Tutsis). But from 1932 to 1959, Tutsis were often the majority. Ascertaining that some were numerous and others few is based on statistics from the register for students who were received every year, in which it was also mentioned that they were Hutus or Tutsis (see Appendix 1).

All those who completed their studies in that school, Belgian authorities and Brothers who had educated them had taken too much care of them, so that they kept being "Elites Elites" / Indatwa (this was their name), thus being superior to other Rwandans. When they completed their studies, they were immediately given a job to work with White People. They were offered accommodation, in cities like Kigali and Astrida (Butare), where they were living in special areas so that they could not mix with other Rwandans.

Those from seminaries had no known profession. Apart from some of them who were Tutsis and who were helped by their relatives in order to be appointed as chief-assistants, and few others who became teachers in primary schools, most of them remained jobless. Those who could do it went outside, like Usumbura, Bukavu. That fact of being jobless for those from seminaries generated something like jealousy, because colonial government was not taking care of them. Instead of doing that, they were kept at distance (frustration / marginalisation). That inequality is one of the reasons which generated disputes between the elites (élites) before 1959.

In the year of 1948, there was a reform of primary schools in Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi. One would say a lot of things about that reform. What we can talk

about in a few word is the reason for inequality between boys and girls. While boys could study in technical and generalized (enseignement généralisé) sections, girls had mainly to go special sections in which they learnt very few things, which would help them know how to take care of the household in a way which is suitable for a wife and a mother. The example is that they did not learn French : it is by 1955 that such schools tried hard to teach some French.

After the National High Council took office in the month of February 1954, the issue of inequality in schools between Hutus and Tutsis in secondary schools was discussed by the "elites" (élites), and it was finally submitted to that Council. This one did not draw any conclusion on that issue, because it was a consulting Council while that issue had to be solved by White People Authorities. Another thing is that schools were supervised by religious people at that time.

Some of the main problems which disturbed the unity of Rwandans from the beginning are forced labour (corvées) and inequality between Rwandans as regards schools and government. It is known that it is school education which helps people to get a job more easily than those who have not been at them, especially technical schools.

CHAPTER II. FORCED LABOUR DURING THE BELGIAN COLONIAL PERIOD

Forced labour was caused by the following main reasons. Before all, colonizers were aiming at their own interests of drawing different things by using Rwandans. Some had to help them governing, convey to the people White People's instructions and control their enforcement. Those who did not carry out that forced labour were punished; even chiefs were sometimes beaten by White People. Others (i.e. those who were governed), that forced labour was too hard for them.

Belgians had bad ideas on which they were based to oppress Rwandans

- They despised the black man for many reasons, two of which were the following they said that the black man was stupid and not intelligent, and that for instance he could not take the initiative in doing something that would be useful to him; that he was too lazy and must be forced to work and, if necessary, beaten for that.
- Belgians did not want to spend their money to develop the country. They did that because they knew that the country of Rwanda was under SDN's and UNO's supervision, and that they would finish by no governing it any more. Also in economic and financial management, they knew that it was important to be capable of doing very little while aiming at much profit. For that reason, they used Rwandans without using much money from the Belgian Government. Almost all the money which was used was emanating from the people's forces, or the people worked without remuneration, chiefs being paid with money collected from taxes.

- Each citizen found that forced labour very hard, and felt its bad effects, even if it was aimed at helping him to get food such as growing cassava, sweet potatoes and so on.

2.1. FORCED LABOUR (Corvée)

Let us examine first what it was. Forced labour was hard labour without remuneration, which was introduced by the White People's administration.

Examples of activities which were carried out

- making and maintaining roads,
- growing trees (300 young people had to grow at least one hectare of eucalyptus around 1930);
- building houses for administration and transporting building materials (trees, bricks);
- digging over-flow ditches, etc.

Who carried out hard labour ? It was men who paid taxes. Around 1930, those who were requested to perform hard labour for Government and to pay taxes were called "Adult Healthy Man (Homme Adulte Valide : H.A.V.)": i.e. young people and men who were strong. There was another category of people who were exempted from performing hard labour : it was the category of people who were called "Notables" or Honourable people who were on good terms with the chiefs and the King, those who were working for White People, be they from Government or from religions, teachers, liturgical advisors, and often those who were living in what people called "extra-customary centres", i.e. civilized people including black foreigners.

Those who supervised hard labour

During the White People's period, those who supervised hard labour in public were the King, the chiefs and chief-assistants. But in reality, in the daily practical life, hard labour was mainly supervised by chiefs of line and town criers.

Note:

- The authority provided for by Belgians' laws was limited to the chief-assistant;
- The chief-assistant was assisted by chiefs of line who, in their turn, were assisted by town criers;
- Chiefs of line and town criers were not remunerated, but this did not prevent them from carrying out their work with zeal because they were getting profit from it : that work exempted them from carrying out hard labour. People under their supervision

(ingabo) went to cultivate for them and invited them to drink beer when they had got some. In some places, the town crier was called "Stomach which eats much dew" (Ndayuhurume / inda yuha urume / ikime) : it was because he went to call the people very early in the morning, encouraging them to bring their hoe and basket in order to carry out hard labour.

Bad effects of forced labour

There was the use of force in forced labour supervision, which was accompanied by oppressing the people who were always worried of being called to carry out that hard labour, and who had not even one day to work for themselves. The fact that the chief assistant could not be available, because he had a lot of work, made chiefs of line go beyond the limits and gave themselves the right which exceeded the work set to them by chief -assistants.

Those who supervised Rwandans at the low level, i.e. chiefs of line and town criers, were not remunerated. So, it is clear that they were remunerated by the people. This made some people say that : "the people wanted to carry out any other,, activity but not

forced labour", i.e. that because forced labour was too bad, the people tried hard not to carry it out; and preferred to work as night watchmen at the chief's residence for example.

The bad effects of forced labour which were added to tax payment and other corvées such as cultivating fallow land obliged many Rwandans to flee from the Belgian rule and mostly go to Uganda in order to work for money; i.e. to look for money to pay taxes, to buy clothes and other small things.

Around 1930, there were 50,000 Rwandans (i.e. one young man or one man on six) who emigrated to Uganda every year, and almost all of them came back and went back again. Until the year 1959, Rwandans who were known as having been to Uganda were numbering 350,000. 35,000 others had gone to Tanzania (Filip Reyntjens, Power and law in Rwanda, p.141). All those who went to Uganda or Tanzania were not doing it because of forced labour only. They were also fleeing from other things : corvées, cultivating fallow land, growing coffee, tax and punishments which were provided for those who did not carry out those corvées.

Even if Rwandans knew that White People were at the origin of that forced labour (the example is that they used to call it "the White People's work"), they did not ignore that those with whom they had daily problems were Rwandese authorities.

Let us remember that there was Labour Code : it is Article 48 of the legislative ruling (ordonnance législative) of October 4, 1943, which stipulated that the general programme for compulsory works should be fixed every year by the Governor (who was called Mburamatari), so that no citizen could be forced to carry out public works for more than 60 days per year; it was, however, provided for that those 60 days could be extended because of the works which were necessary in order to remove or fight against obstacles to common life.

2.2. CORVEES

What they were

Corvées were works which were carried out by governed people for governing people, because of that only relationship of government, or which were carried out by poor people for rich people without remuneration.

What were those corvées ?

There are some people who, in their writings often confuse corvée with tax (be it for warriors or for the land property). There were also people who confused corvée with clientship or forced labour during the White People's period. In reality, the main works which were carried out for a governing person before the White People's arrival were the following : to cultivate, to build (as an example, there were people from Bugoyi who went to build houses at the Royal Court) , to work as night watchmen , to light fire, to collect fire wood (to look for fire wood), to fetch water, to remove cowpats and to carry in hammock.

When did corvées start ?

In reality, it is not easy to know when exactly corvées started in Rwanda. There are some people who ascertained that corvées started under the reign of Rwabugili (Kimanuka Tharcisse, Corvées and forced labour in Marangara from 1916 to 1959, Degree dissertation, Ruhengeri, 1983). There are others who ascertain that corvées were introduced by White People; saying that even the word corvées is derived from swahili "kuleta", or French "Government" (l'Etat) which became "corvées" (uburetwa) and which means "they are for Government". It is also possible that the word is derived from old Kinyarwanda, as the S.T.R.L's Dictionary (DIMO : monolingual dictionary / dictionnaire monolingue)) in Butare shows that : it is written in that Dictionary that "corvées" is an old word which meant " the number of days during which the person who performed corvées (umuretwa or ikiretwa) worked for the chief of land". That dictionary has also a proverb saying that "the colline of corvées becomes dry early" (umusozi w'uburetwa ukama kare).

Even if nobody can really ascertain the origin of that word and when it was introduced, works which were carried out like corvées existed under the reign of Rwabugili. It is known that Rwabugili brought some changes in the way of governing Rwanda. This made that works similar to corvées were spread in some parts of the country, such as in Bigogwe and Cyingogo where people say that it is Seruteganya, Rwabugili's pet, who would have introduced corvées there (Rwanda's history and chronology; see especially Nkurikiyimfura J.N, The Cattle and the Rwandese society, pp. 89-91).

How corvées changed during the colonial period

During the colonial period, corvées took progressively a new image both for the number of days during which they were carried out and ransoming (rachat), as well as the value they took among general forced labour, and even the way they were spread here and there.

Regarding the number of days, many writers, especially Belgians, were selfish on that question of days, in order to let people know how they restored their rights to Hutus. They ascertained that there were two days for corvées on five days of which

the Rwandese week was made up. In fact that was true, but Belgians progressively changed

that as follows.

Belgian authorities reviewed twice the number of days for corvées. In the year of 1924, they fixed corvées to 42 days in one year in order to have two days on 7 days of which the modern week is made up. They even introduced books in which they wrote how people who had to carry out corvées were implementing them.

In the year of 1927, the Resident of Rwanda devoted only one day to corvées on seven days for each family from which they were required, or not more than thirteen days in one year for each healthy young man and man (H.A.V.) . What was required from a household before was now required from each individual on his own. In such a way, Rwandese authorities during the colonial period gained much new manpower to work for them without remuneration. And we should remember that at that time those authorities had no salary before the 1940s. It is clear that such a review increased worries for those who were performing out corvées.

From the year of 1936, the colonial government allowed Rwandans who were working in White People's enterprises to replace corvées which were carried out for Rwandese authorities by paying money instead. From the year of 1938, following the decision taken in 1937, the corvées replacement was fixed at one franc per one working day (umubyizi), i.e. 13 francs in one year.

In 1946, the corvées' replacement was fixed at 19.50 for 13 days i.e. 1.50 franc per day.

Categories of Rwandans who could have the right to replace corvées by paying money:

- Government employees;
- Non day labourers, who were working for enterprises or private White People
- Teachers of catechism;
- Pupils in the last three years of primary school;
- Rich Tutsis, i.e. those who owned at least ten cows;
- People who went abroad to work for money and who left their chefferie for at least nine months in one year.

Worries which corvées caused to Rwandans who were requested to carry them out is well understood when you put it with other different colonial works such as forced labour and cultivating fallow land, and we can also add other things that were required, i.e. the milking cow, cows for travel, cows which were offered to be slaughtered for White People and their suites, chickens, eggs, bananas.... Among things which were paid, the most painful was the tax.

2.3. CULTIVATING FALLOW LAND

The meaning of this word

Fallow land (ubw"amashiku") was a place in which people cultivated by force fields (measured lands) indicated by the colonial administration and in which were grown crops chosen by that administration in order to fight against famine. Cultivating fallow land also means the work itself of cultivating by force such fields. Crops which were grown are sweet potatoes and cassava.

The word fallow land (shiku) is derived from the verb "to tear up with teeth", which means, in agriculture, to cultivate fallow land pulling the hoe with force (Adiaenssens J., The land law in Rwanda, Butare, 1962, P.61). But fallow land (shiku) could also be cultivated on a very dry land (ku mpama), the main thing being to be located near the road or in front of it. Putting fallow land near the road was due to the fact that they wanted the White People authority or the chief to appreciate the local chief -assistant's zeal.

Fallow land had another name : it was sometimes called "akajagari" which meant common fields in which were cultivating many people, but everybody having his part / portion. That part was his before being harvested by the person who was cultivating it, because after harvesting , it was owned by the sous- chefferie governed by the chiefassistant.

The beginning of cultivating fallow land

Cultivating fallow land started to be used in the year of 1926, and were tried for four years. In the year of 1930, cultivating fallow land became an important obligation; it is in that year that the corvée of growing cassava (which some people called "the multitude of cassava", "campagne manioc" in French) created a mess of carrying cassava cuttings and grow them . This caused chaos here and there, such as in the chefferie of Bumbogo and one part of Uburiza (Tare, Mbogo and Musasa): see Diaires for Kigali and Rulindo missions 1930).

The use and bad effects of cultivating fallow land

Colonizers had ordered cultivating fallow land because of the people's own interest : we should remember that in the years of 1924 -1925, the famine called gakwege caused havoc. White People were thinking that cultivating fallow land was going to irreversibly solve the problem of famine. Without doubting that, in general, fallow land harvest was very useful, especially cassava. But that did not prevent Ruzagayura famine (which some people called "Matemane" or "Rudakangwimishanana" /not afraid of white

clothes), from the year of 1942 to the year of 1944.

In every possible way, cultivating fallow land was too much hated by the people. It required too much force for a very poor harvest, and even sometimes there was no harvest at all. The example is when a chief of line told a peasant who was cultivating one part of a field (measured field) that he was requested to finish

cultivating it within two days, and when that peasant took the soil from the cultivated part and covered the uncultivated part with it, so that you thought that the whole field was cultivated when seeing from far away. The wife and children had also to cultivate fallow land, even when her husband was absent for a long time to visit friends or to look for food.

Another reason why cultivating fallow land was too much hated was that fallow land was located far from the residences of people who cultivated it. Thus, they were very tired when going to cultivate or harvest in case of good production.

We should conclude by saying that the bad effects of fallow land were due to the exaggerated constraint which prevailed over the value that people expected from it : that value was not well explained to the people.

It is after the second World War that the people in general made it clear that they had understood the value of growing sweet potatoes and cassava.

2.4. MILKING COW

A milking cow was a cow which was offered by a peasant or a family, in order to be milked for a white man (and even his suite) in the place where he was put up in a camp. Milking cow also meant that act of carrying the cow. People said : to go for a milking cow.

The milking cow was accompanied by other things offered by the people : chickens, eggs, bananas... It was the chief-assistant who ordered the people to offer the milking cow and other things accompanying it, often through the chief of line who in his turn communicated that to the town crier.

In addition to the milking cow, there were also other cows which Colonizers ordered to be offered for slaughter . They were marked with signs on their skin, for instance on their thigh, in order to recognize them and be kept aside by their owners. And Colonizers could take them when they wanted. They paid a token amount of money, so that they were considered as if they were bought.

2.5. COFFEE

The first people to have introduced coffee in Rwanda are White Fathers. Those missionaries needed coffee for drinking. From the year of 1903, they started growing it in Mibirizi mission, then it was progressively spread through the country. But coffee started to be well known in the 1925s, when the Belgian administration ordered the people to grow it.

From the years of 1933/ 1934 , Rwandans started growing coffee as an obligation, there were even people who did it unwillingly because they got no profit in that.

In general, people did not take great care to grow coffee.

Some of the main reasons were the following

- Soil : people did not understand why good soil was allocated to coffee, other crops being grown anywhere else;
- At the beginning, the way of growing coffee was like a trial, and the people could not manage with it. The example was like growing coffee together with banana trees, and then cutting those banana trees in order to leave coffee alone;
- Works related to coffee are many and very hard; there is nursery, digging holes, planting coffee shrubs, watering them, mulching them, removing insects from them such as "antestias" (a peasant had to prove to the chief-assistant or the chief of line that he was taking care of coffee by showing him a basket full with insects he had caught : there was not yet any medicine to kill such insects), manuring them, harvesting coffee, drying coffee...
- It was not easy for the people to support such a trouble while they did not understand the coffee's value : they were getting very few money from it. That trouble added itself to other corvées.

2.6. TAX

Nobody would deny the value of tax. There was a **tax for the King** even in the days gone by before the White People's arrival. There was a tax for the warrior which was paid by Hutus and Tutsis. Such a tax was paid through the chief of warriors. It was paid by each house (minor lineage) : some people called it the family.

The tax for the warrior was made up of the following : spears, arrows, arrow-cases, bows, swords, axes, small bells, lancets, etc.

The **tax for land** was paid by Hutus and Tutsis. It was paid every year by each house. And it was made up of crops that could be stored : dry beans, peas, hoes, éleusine. It was called "a basket". It was collected according to each house's / family's capacity from one to many baskets.

Regarding the tax for land, there was also the rite of offering premisses to the chiefs: one basket of harvested crops.

Apart from the tax for warriors and the tax for land, there was also a tax related to special activities; there were too many and nobody can enumerate them here. But we can, for instance, mention the following:

- Offering a cow for the Royal Court (a cow with its heifer) which was offered by cattle breeders, especially through the level of warriors' units and herds of cows owned by the Royal Court officials.
- Chicks with a sheep and a bull to be used when consulting a sorcerer;
- Beekeepers offered pure honey (imitsama/ du miel pur);
- Hunters, such as Twas living near the forest, offered things related to hunting : hides of leopards and primates;
- Potters offered jugs, pipes, etc.

2.6.1. The Colonialists' tax

In the year of 1912, Germans began to take a census aimed at making the collection of taxes easy for them. Such a census did not reach any result because the first World War (1914-1918) did not allow it to be completed.

Soon after their arrival, Belgians started collecting taxes. In the year of 1917, the Belgian tax started being paid.

From 1917 to 1927, the tax was required from every valid young man or man (H.A.V.) who had to pay three and a half francs (3.50 francs) only. But later the tax was paid following the economy of each Territory : in 1927, seven and a half francs (7.50 francs), in 1930, thirty francs (30 francs), in 1945, forty-six francs (46 francs). Those amounts of money were general averages for all Territories.

The tax was one of the strong pillars that supported colonization. The easy way of oppressing the people in the economic sector was to make them pay taxes. This was done by all colonizers without any distinction. They did that because they wanted money, or goods bought with token amounts of money (such as cows and hides); or to get manpower (main-d'oeuvre). For example, in 1920 in Belgian Congo, Congolese including miners had the crucial problem of getting native workers.

It is at that time, from 1925, that Belgians had recourse to Rwandans and Burundians, and here started the story of Gatanga.

Here, Belgians exaggerated the collection of taxes, so that Rwandans and Burundians were obliged to offer themselves in order to try and get money from the places that were shown to them, i.e. from mines, others joined missionaries, without also forgetting those who went to British colonies.

2.6.2. The bad effects of the colonial tax (1916-1962)

The tax was increased progressively without following the economy of those who were required to pay it. In addition, before providing for the Rwandese authorities'salary in the colonial budget in the 1940s, these authorities were governed by the corvées'replacement and money that was deducted from the tax according to how much was the collected tax. In order for those authorities to perceive more taxes, and thus get sufficient remuneration, they pestered any young man and man, and were not even afraid of a child aged from fourteen to sixteen years. Sometimes such children were even undressed in order to check whether they had reached the age of puberty. That fact of harassing those who had to pay the tax reached a high step, which should not be forgotten in the bad effects of corvées during the Belgian colonial period, especially between 1931 and 1946.

Another thing that shows the bad effects of the colonial tax is that the amount of money which was collected from a Healthy person (H.A.V.) in any Territory was the same for all people, without distinguishing rich people and poor people.

2.7. PUNISHMENTS FOR THOSE WHO DID NOT ENFORCE FORCED LABOUR

Forced labour could not be enforced if they were not punishments which were provided for. Some of those punishments were harder than others. One would explain them according to how they were applied to many Rwandans.

The first one is the flogging which was applied to many people. The low number of floggings was eight, and was applied to any person who had not well mulched coffee plantations or who had not finished the field of cassava. He laid down naked on his belly and then was flogged eight times. The white man who distinguished himself in that was called "remove your clothers" (kurimpuzu), because he ordered that people who were flogged had to remove clothes from their buttocks, so that the flogging enter into the skin. The flogging made Rwandans suffer, and made people who were using it and those who ordered them to use it feel that they were superior, and those who were flogged feel that they were inferior.

The other punishment is the fine (amende) that often consisted in paying money as there was no concrete basis of the amount of money to be paid by the person who had not enforced given instructions, and because there were no means to control the fine implementation, that punishment was often accompanied by really going too far (dépasser les limites), due to the will of the chief of line, of the chief-assistant, of the chief and the White People authorities.

Imprisonment for days, months or years was introduced by White People. Apart from bad actions that were determined by the Penal Code relating to punishments, Rwandans were mostly imprisoned because they had not paid the tax.

Dismissal : is to be dismissed from government. Chiefs and Chief-assistants were mainly dismissed because they had not joined colonial administration either because they had no capacity to do it or because they did not want to do it (refusal to offend their warriors).

We can remind that Fathers made Rwandan authorities be dismissed when they noticed that they were becoming obstacles to their work of converting Rwandans into Catholics. It was one who appointed authorities who also had the right to dismiss them : he was Belgian. Among other things established by the decree of July 14, 1952, we would say it also gave the Kings of Rwanda and Burundi autonomy of showing to White People those who could be appointed as authorities and who could also be dismissed.

To be relegated (etre relégué) : Rwandan Authorities who were relegated by Belgians were not many. They were few but important authorities starting from King Musinga who was relegated because he hated White People and Catholic Christians. In reality, he was relegated because he did not want and could not handle to them the whole power as they wanted it, and because he could not rally to Belgians and Fathers.

Some other chiefs were also relegated : Gashamura, the head of the King's Secret Advisors (Abiru) who was relegated to Burundi (Gitega) in 1925, and who died there after one year; there is also Nyamurasa Kabano IV, the king of premices in Bumbogo, who was relegated to Kinyaga in 1929. That relegation of authorities who

could not work with Belgians did not start here in Rwanda, because there was already a law governing it which was enforced even before in Belgian Congo. And they are also other colonizers who did that.

2.8. CLIENTSHIP

What it was : clientship was an accepted agreement even though it was not written, between a Patron (the cows'owner) and a client who was looking for cows and forces and be friendly with others. The client was often doing different works for his Patron. Clientship was the way of both social and economic relations which Rwandans used to maintain before the White People's arrival, and which continued during the Colonial period but changing progressively. Many writers, be they White People or Rwandans, tried hard to compare it and even to confuse it with what they call "feodality / féodalité" in Europe of the XIth - XIVth centuries (Middle Ages).

Apart from the fact that specialists in history demonstrated that such "feodality / féodalité" is multifaceted and is not like clientship.

Some of the elements which show the difference between them are the following •

- Feodality / féodalité was based on land, while clientship was based on cows;
- Regarding politics, people who were called "clients" in feodality / féodalité are often compared to servants, they were belonging to the person who had given them accommodation in his land property (who protected them against attacks), who was called the "lord" (seigneur), and who is often compared to the "Patron" (shebuja) in Rwanda. However, in clientship, there were good relations between the Patron and his client, and the client was not obliged to live in his Patron's fief or land property. In addition, both of them, the Patron and the client, were the King's people, and under the authority of the same or different chief of warriors. In feodality / féodalité, one who was a "servant" was fully depending on his "lord"; while in Rwanda somebody could be the King's and the important chief's client : people said that he had "two gates", so it is clear that a person could have many Patrons and this was called "having many gates".

2.8.1. Clientship before colonization

Clientship was comprising social, economic, administrative and cultural sectors.

Within the social sector, clientship created harmony between the client and his Patron, and even between their families. There was something essential in their relations : being honest one towards the other. That harmony and that honesty appeared in a lot of things: such as helping each other in good and bad events or in the battlefield.

Within the economic sector. In Kinyarwanda they said that "one's relationship with a cow is milk", which means that a cow must not be only a decoration, even though cows

owned by the royal Court officials were displayed while reciting pastoral poems, the main thing was the value they had for their owners . One who had cows was considered as a rich person, and one who had not cows as a poor person. One who became a client had no cows, but he was given some later, and became rich especially after their number had been increased.

Because the cow still had value in Rwanda, one who owned cows was proud of it and respected by other people.

Also one who owned cows, or who was usually rich, had to be protected so that those cows not be taken from him (and people were always waiting for taking properties from weak individuals).

Within the administrative sector. The cow had an important role in Rwanda's expansion. The cow enabled the King and the chiefs to have subjects (sujets) to support them. This was the meaning of the song with the strings called "Rukinagiza" which said that "the King is supported by his subjects". The cow's role within the administrative sector also appears in politics that existed of differentiating cattles of cows owned by the Royal Court officials, which were often mixed with units of warriors and administration.

Within the cultural sector. Clientship was also a school in which people learnt how to maintain good relations with others, to discuss, to stay up, to know history, and so on, thus the client and even his Patron became intelligent. Clientship had therefore an important role within the cultural sector in the same way as the cow on which it was based had special value within the cultural sector, and was one of the elements that have characterized the Rwandese culture.

Even though honesty between the vassal and his boss was a main thing, it happened that a Patron mistreated his client or misbehaved, and at that time the client could leave him and become a client in another place : that fact of leaving his Patron and becoming a client in another place was called "to leave his Patron" (quitter son patron).

Some people often say or write that clientship was a tradition between a man and his sons who replaced him in clientship. All the sons were not obliged to become client in the place where their father was a client. When a client looked for somebody who will replace him in clientship, he chose one among his sons. Being given a heritage or taking over the cow got from clientship made it become like a tradition between the cows'owners and the families from which they had got them.

Young men and men in Rwanda were not all in clientship. There was a big part of Rwanda which was not following the cows'way, but the way of which was rather based on land : this was landed estate (see next paragraph). There is a research which proved that at the beginning of the 20th century, there were more Tutsis in clientship than Hutus for example in Butare (see Saucier J.F. , The Patron-client relationship in Traditional and Contemporary Southern Rwanda, New. York, Columbia University, 1974). That researcher demonstrated that only 8.2% of 207 questioned persons'grandfathers Were clients, 6.6% of whom were Hutus, 12.3%

being Tutsis), and 16.0% of their fathers (16% were Hutus, while 19.3 % were Tutsi).

Three things are clear

- Clients were very few;
- There were more Tutsi clients than Hutu and Twa clients;
- Clientship was increased during the colonial period : it became more strong.

Another thing is that anybody, be he Hutu , Tutsi or Twa, could be the King's client without going through the chiefs'level.

Even if there was much clientship in some parts of the country in the 19th century, this does not mean that there had been clientship for a very long time, because there w^ere other places in which clientship had just started such as in Kinyaga (see Newbury C.; The Cohesion of oppression. A century of clientship in Kinyaga, Rwanda, Madison, University of Winsconsin, 1975): clientship was reinforced there by Rwabugiri and his subjects (sujets) . Also all the cows were not in clientship. Those who had no Patrons could be owning their cows which were called "cows not acquired through clientship " (imbata) : i.e. cows earned by client themselves or which they got through other means, and not through clientship.

2.8.2. Clientship during the colonial period

The Clientship's image changed during the colonial period.All changes that took place cannot be exhausted. Among thé main changes may be mentioned the following:

- There were people who were not in clientships and who became clients for Rwandese authorities in order to be protected by them and prevented from performing colonial forced labour;
- To the works which were usually carried out by clients were added other works by their Patrons : the clientship works mixed with the colonial ones, and this created injustice towards clients (exploitation) and made clientship progressively open to criticism.
- Some clients'works were replaced by giving money to their Patrons.

Clientship was so criticized that Rwandans and White People discovered that it was not up-to-date and was to be abolished. But it took time. In the year of 1941, some Rwandans informed the King about their worries about seeing their client neglecting the clientship agreement. In 1945, King Mutara Rudahigwa himself took the decision to inform the Governor of Ruanda-Urundi (Mburamatari) Jungers that the best solution was to abolish clientship. And almost all the chiefs had approved such a decision in their meeting on October 29-30, 1945. As to Jungers, he adopted that the best solution was to go slowly; that delaying of the clientship abolition did not bring any solution to the problem, and the Governor had not established any programme aimed at finding a solution to it.

Governor Jungers ordered that an investigation be led on clientship, but most of Rwandans adopted that it was necessary to abolish clientship because it had lost value. Rwandans considered a cow as a domestic animal which was very useful to

them at the economic level. Clientship was also leading to many trials. And it was not possible to deal with such trials at the same time as the White People's forced labour or to actively participate in development.

In the year of 1947, three Rwandans, Rukara S., Rwamasirabo S., and Sendanyoye G., who had studied in the Elites'school (Astrida School) published a document showing that clientship was bad, not adapted to the current situation of Rwanda, and had therefore to be abolished ("The Buhake, an essentially Rwandese custom", in case law Bulletin for local tribunals in Ruanda-Urundi, 1947 p.102-136)/("Le Buhake, une coutume essentiellement munyarwanda", in Bulletin de Jurisprudence des tribunaux indigènes du Ruanda-Urundi, 1947 p.103-136). In the letter n° 33/52 of May 10,1952, King Mutara Rudahigwa proved beyond doubt that it was necessary to abolish clientship.

He was putting forward the following reasons

- Clientship was no more adapted to the wishes and the period in which Rwandans were living;
- Clientship was an obstacle to economic development;
- And if it was not stopped on time, clientship was going to create disorder among the people.

This was the reason why he communicated to people that it was necessary to take concrete decisions to abolish clientship, but they had to look for a way of doing it. Such decisions had also to be communicated as soon as possible to the Chiefs and chiefassistants.

Until that time, Belgian Authorities opposed the abolition of clientship. King Mutara Rudahigwa continued to ascertain that clientship must be abolished. He proved that in the National High Council (Conseil Supérieur du Pays) in these terms : clientship is an obstacle to the country's development, that discriminates the people while being oppressed by their Patrons who are superior to them, and there is nothing more than abolishing it without being afraid of the bad mood of some people whose aim is to protect their own interests only. (National High Council / Conseil Supérieur du Pays, Minutes for the 1st session, 15-24.2.1954, p.28).

The King and members of the' National High Council adopted that clientship had to be abolished without hesitation. Royal decree n°1/54 of May 1,1954 abolish clientship in the whole of Rwanda, but its implementation started in Nyanza Territory (see the text of that decree at the end of this document).

After that abolition of clientship, clients began to share with their Patrons from May 15,1954. That sharing made things very easy for most of clients and Patrons.

In general, from 1916 at the Belgians' arrival in Rwanda, something that bothered all Rwandans, made them the others'tools, was the colonial forced labour which we mentioned before, and not clientship as it was often said, written and sung from 1959 and later until today.

2.9. LANDED ESTATE

In the north of the country (Gisenyi and Ruhengeri), there was no clientship, there was rather another way through which a rich man who had a big land enslaved people who had no land, and this was called landed estate (ubukonde).

Umukonde (the landed estate's owner) had abagererwa (people who used a pasture as a farm) who lived on his land, cultivated it but performed some works for him, and who had to give him a part of harvested crops.

During the Belgian government, some Rwandans were sent to govern in those northern regions. They took land, and gave it another image of landed estate (ubukonde): they brought people they wanted to live there. Such a landed estate was called by some people "political landed estate"/ "ubukonde politique", to differentiate it from the traditional landed estate.

The National High Council had started to examine the landed estate issue after 1954. but it did not finish it. The landed estate was still existing in the 1960s, and it even continued later.

CHAPTER III. THE WAY OF GETTING RID OF COLONIZATION (1952-1962)

Those ten years are important in the history of Rwanda. Understanding the events which took place during that period is one of the actions which would help somebody to know history at the political and social level among Rwandans themselves. It is the reason why it would be better to consider those who participated in changing the country, and examine major problems which progressively appeared. People and organizations who had a role in that are the following:

- The people (rubanda) had many problems which had just been beyond them;
- Rwandese authorities, starting from King Mutara Rudahigwa had got tired of the colonial constraint, and were waiting for independence;
- Colonial authorities had the plan of governing the country for many years;
- Those who had done studies and who were in the category of those who were called "elites / élites", i.e. indatwa, chosen people (indobanure); they were also called "civilized people" / "évolués". It was mainly those who had studied in seminaries (minor and senior seminary) and in Astrida School.
- UNO : from 1948, the UNO began to send people who had to control how Belgians were governing, because that Organization had made with Belgians, on October 13, 1946, a Trusteeship Agreement (Accord de Tutelle) on Ruanda-Urundi;
- The Catholic Church : it had just finished festivities to show that it was the leading Church in the country and participated in political government (religious marriage of Mutara Rudahigwa and Rosalie Gicanda, the baptism of the King and the queen mother, consecrating Rwanda to Christ the King, being offered the ring from Pope Pius XII, the high celebration of the 50th Anniversary after the Catholic Church had been established in Rwanda which took place in Astrida in 1950), and the good position which the Catholic Church had started to give to

laïques in its duties, as well as the arrival of other religious societies because until that time White Fathers had been working alone.

3.1. THE PEOPLE'S ROLE

From the end of the Second World War (1945), the people's life in general slowly improved slowly . The reason why the people were feeling more better was because there was zeal in providing care to people, which made diseases decrease (such as pianibinyoro- which disappeared), increasing production of sweet potatoes and cassava which were grown in fallow land. There was also a step of increasing the number of secondary schools (which were very few) because of the 1948 educational reform.

Even if there were those few things that help the people to develop, major problems in general still remained : forced labour which was always worrying the peasant and prevented him from making other plans to develop himself, the bad culture of leading people like domestic animals, who just followed because an authority had requested them to do so (it was "ndiyo bwana" / yes, sir !)...

Until that time, there were no disputes between people called Tutsis or Hutus. They began to appear in the 1953s/1954s after electing counsellors for the sous - cheffeeries'councils up to the National High Council (see below).

3.2. RWANDESE AUTHORITIES

In the 1944s - 1945s, King Mutara Rudahigwa showed the will of getting rid of the Belgian government. This made Governor Jungers think about dismissing him (removing him from government) as it had been the case for his father, Musinga : the idea was to replace him with somebody who had studied in Astrida School (Elite/ Indatwa), who had been taught the White People's culture. He was sharing that idea with Brother Secundien, the headmaster of Astrida School. It was that Brother who had drawn the list (liste) of the names of people who could replace Rudahigwa as a King. Those who were mentioned included Bwanakweli Prosper and Ndazaro Lazare.

In the year of 1948, when the UNO's envoys visited Rwanda, Belgians hoped that the King was going to accuse them to those envoys. But Rudahigwa had heard about it, forgot about them, and rather said that he was happy with the Belgians'way of governing, and even requested the chiefs not to say anything bad about them. Thus, those envoys' report was very positive as regards Belgians. That policy carried out by the King made Belgians give him the reward of visiting their country in 1949. It was the first official visit carried out to Europe by Rwandans. It was a miracle.

Even if the UNO's envoy's report was very positive towards the Belgians'way of governing in general, it criticized two major things in it : the first was the delay in education, the second was that there was not any concrete programme, at the political and administrative level, which was aimed at leading Rwandans to their autonomy (autonomie) and to independence (indépendance) later on.

Rudahigwa continued to be on bad terms with Belgians, because he could not get the meaning of development, he was like that bird which fled and knew where barley was being harvested. He went back to Belgium in 1955. Then he went to the International Exhibition (Exposition Internationale) that took place in Brussels in 1958 accompanied by dancers (intore / danseurs) and drum players (abavuzi b'ingoma / tambourinaires). Rwanda was proud of that. He had changed when he came back from Europe, and he wanted independence for the country. This created misunderstanding between him and Belgians, and there were many disputes between them. The situation had not improved when he died unexpectedly on 25th July 1959. He died in Bujumbura at the age of 48.

As to the chiefs, they continued in the same line of making people perform the colonial forced labour, while looking for means of subsistence. Chiefs and chief-assistants had become Government employees (fonctionnaires), who were paid salaries by White People and appreciated or not appreciated, thrown into confusion, and even sometimes beaten.

Chiefs who were appreciated by Government were given the classification mark "elite" / "élite, i.e, indatwa / inyamibwa, and they were very tough towards the people who did not appreciate them.

Some of the chiefs understood well the bad effects of colonization and what it requested them to do, and this made them want independence.

The general colonial atmosphere was an obstacle to Rwandese authorities. They had no real power : the legislative power, the executive power and the judiciary were all in the White People's hands. Even the King himself, the National High Council which he chaired from 1953 and which was a consultative council, could not take decisions.

3.3. COLONIAL AUTHORITIES

Belgians had no specific programme to develop Rwanda in a fast way. Be it in the educational sector (see the paragraph on education), be it in the economy sector and political sector.

Regarding economy, the Government of Ruanda - Urundi wrote a big book containing provisions for a period of ten years. That book was entitled "Ten-year plan for RuandaUrundi economic and social development".

At the political level, there was a decree of 14th July 1952 of the King of Belgium reviewing government in Ruanda - Urundi. Some people wrote that this decree was extraordinary, because it brought democracy in Rwanda. However, it had bad consequences : let us explain in a few words.

One of the main things that were established by that decree is the council at the level of the sous-chefferie, the chefferie, the Territory and the National High Council. Such councils were for Rwandese authorities and other few people who were added in them. Councils in those institutions were consultative, and it was Belgians who took last decisions.

All councils, except that of the sous-chefferie, were clearly dominated by Tutsis: due to the fact that in the basic council for the sous-chefferie to which the other councils were connected, councillors were elected from the list of names published by the chiefassistant himself. It is logical that he, in general, chose those who had a relationship with him or his pets and friends. And most of all of those were Tutsis. That decree made people be more curious of authorities than before, considering them as Hutus and Tutsis

the press was not left behind. Hutus who had studied and who had been kept away from government by the colonial policy, were not trusting that decree because it was increasing power for the King and the chiefs, and they were therefore afraid of being finally more oppressed.

In every possible way, that decree did not bring anything very interesting to Rwandans within the framework of getting to independence, even though the National High Council was really the forum in which Authorities and other Rwandese "elites" could discuss about the country's problems. They took some decisions which proved their will and tendency to develop the country. This appeared in the abolition of clientship in May 1954 (see Appendix 2 : the abolition of clientship).

The other thing that was evident, even if it did not take place in the National High Council, is that the chiefs met in Nyanza and decided to resign, in order to allow Belgian authorities to replace them by those who were considered as worthy of governing, perhaps through elections. For unknown reasons, Belgians sabotaged that decision, but now there is no doubt that the said decision finally took place, and there is also no doubt that the fact of not implementing it prevented Rwandans from something which was going to bring them together in government, be they Hutus or Tutsis. This happened in 1958.

3.4. ELITES (élites)

The elites we are talking about and who participated in getting rid of colonization are the following :

- Those who had studies in Nyanza school (in the middle of 1919 up to 1935) and who were called "Bwanakweli's" people, who was Lenaerts, a Belgian who supervised it for a long time;
- Others were people who had studied in the teacher training school (école de moniteur / "normale") : it is people who had studied in the teacher training school of that time;
- But especially those who had studied in the minor and senior seminary as well as in the "elites" (Astrida School).

We explained before why there was inequality between people who had studies in the seminary and the elites (indatwa). Problems based on that inequality progressively took

a long step now that we are examining the following:.

In general, the elites in Belgian Africa were not happy with the position they were given by colonizers, especially regarding salaries and being kept away from public places (places to which they should have access, playgrounds, cabarets, cinemas...) This was injustice based on colour that differentiated White People from Black People. Belgians had established a card called "Registration card" (Carte d'immatriculation) which was intended for being issued to a Congolese, a Rwandan or a Burundian who had distinguished himself in respecting White People, imitating them in his gestures, his behaviour, and who had split up with the traditional culture. And he had to have been like that for many years without any slight breach. In the 1950s, very few were given something called "Card for civic merit", which was an award given to a black man who had well served colonization. Some people were given it after more than 20 years of zealous work and behaving as if they were adoring the white man for all that time inscrupulously. But nobody had yet succeeded to get the "Registration card" when Rwanda and Burundi got independence; however, there were people who wanted it.

Elites had desires to make a step towards development together with the White People. Later came the atmosphere of fighting for independence. That idea of fighting for independence was mainly shown by members of the National High Council. We explained earlier how that Council was set up. Let us examine what it said, in a few words, about independence. We find this in the much talked-about document called "Perfecting" (which means : in reality, this is how the situation is and should be). That document was published in January 1957. It was intended for the Belgian Government.

3.4.1. Perfecting (Mise au point)

The origin of that document and its content. Members of the National High Council, in 1956, had just understood the country's main problems in the way to autonomy (autonomie).

They found that there were still many obstacles in the way of getting rid of colonization. This brought them to ask those whom the UNO had appointed to govern them, i.e, Belgians, how was the situation and where it was leading. They asked for something that could make them hope that they were not going to wait for more than a hundred years. This appeared in the following four points:

- Education (teaching): Gatagara College which had began to be built, after King Mutara Rudahigwa tried hard to get it, Belgians and Jesuits who were in charge of it took it to Bujumbura. This caused much grief to the King and many Rwandans, especially the elites. Within that framework, no secondary school could send students to the University / Université which was neither existing. In general, the education level was low compared to how it ought to be while getting read for independence.
- **Regarding leadership**, they asked for more participation : for instance, King Rudahigwa had to be a constitutional king (roi constitutionnel). The National High Council was to be more autonomous so that it could take decisions, and

Belgians not be ashamed and afraid of instilling democracy based on elections by Rwandans who had reached the voting age (universal suffrage).

- **A specific programme in the economic and social sector.** The main thing which was asked for was to set up joint enterprises shared by both Foreigners and Rwandans. In fact, very few ideas were given about the economic sector : it is clear that the elites had not been taught economic matters and they mention it themselves in that document.
- **To eradicate the ideology of discrimination based on colour.** Such discrimination was against human rights. Injustice based on colour was noticed in schools, in political institutions; there were rules governing discrimination so that a white man who was in any low position could give instructions to a Rwandan in a higher position, who had done more studies than his and had even more experience. There was a terrible gap between White People and the Rwandese elites. They said that there were newspapers that gave them the connotation of conflict between races, and they expressed the wish that there should be a place for an independent Rwandese press.

"Perfecting" (Mise au Point) does not mention the problem of Hutus, Tutsis and Twas. The main objective of those who wrote it was the country's interests. Also not taking into account that the National High Council had requested that the terms Muhutu, Mututsi, Mutwa be removed from usual documents. But Belgians found it necessary to solve the problem of Hutus and Tutsis before examining the problem of independence : this means that they were aiming at something else as we shall see later. That "Perfecting" (Mise au point) was like outbreaking political problems, and some among the elites, especially Hutus, were sceptical about such a document : they thought that autonomy , which was asked for in it, was going to hide injustice from which were suffering "the grassroots" (le bas peuple, "the majority people"). That document, aimed at the country's development and autonomy, must be put in the number of other similar documents which were sent to colonizers here and there and which lend a hand to nationals, by asking for getting rid of colonization. That "Perfecting" (Mise au point) is characterized by ideas which are well analysed, quiet, not disturbing colonizers and not sowing dissension. It is different from other documents that came after it such as "The Hutus' Manifesto" and the declaration which was signed by those who called themselves "High clients in the Royal Court". Those documents will be examined later.

One who would ask himself whether the document "Perfecting" (Mise au point) was useful or not would get the answer that Belgians did not do anything which made happy those who wrote it (some of the members of the National High Council) or which could be helpful to the country. That document was rather a pretext on which Belgian authorities went by to be in conflict with the National High Council. It was also a pretext for those who wrote "The Hutus' Manifesto". Among people who worked out that "Manifesto" are mentioned two Belgian Fathers. It is possible that it was also aimed to protect colonial interests which were hampered by the ideas contained in "Perfecting" (Mise au point).

3.4.2. The Hutus' Manifesto

The origin of that document

It was published on 24th March 1957. In fact, it was a name for advertisement which journalists gave to that document, and which its signatories called : "*Note on the social aspect of the indigenous racial problem in Rwanda*" (Note sur l'aspect social du problème racial indigène au Rwanda). That document came after the one we talked about before, and which is "Perfecting" (Mise au point) Even if both of them were written at the time when people bustled about getting rid of colonization, and were overwhelmed with many usual problems of economy, education, freedom, the document "The Hutus' Manifesto" made clear another conception of the problems which existed.

That conception was that problems had existed, were existing, the way of solving them all had to appear in the mirror of ethnic groups. If we take that conception into account, relations between a Hutu and a Tutsi were containing all Rwanda's problems.

Before examining the main problems which are included in that document, let us say something about people who worked it out and those who signed it. Regarding people who worked out that document, some people ascertain that they included Grégoire Kayibanda and Calliope Mulindahabi in collaboration with two Belgian Fathers. They say that it was written at Kabgayi. It is possible, but nobody is ascertaining that. The following are people who signed it and the schools in which they had studied

Senior seminary

1. Grégoire Kayibanda
2. Isidore Nzeyimana
3. Joseph Habyarimana (Gîtera)

Minor seminary

4. Maximilien Niyonzima
5. Claver Ndahayo
6. Calliope Murindahabi

Teacher training school

7. Godefroid Sentama

Primary school

8. Joseph Sibomana
9. Sylvestre Munyambonera

It is clear that two thirds of people who signed "The Hutus' Manifesto" had studied in the seminary. Let us remind that those who had studied in the seminary had been abandoned by the colonial government (except some of them who had become chiefassistants because they were Tutsis), as well as by Fathers even though they had studied in their schools. However, Fathers had recourse to them because they needed them in their activities. Among those nine people, two thirds were working at Kabgayi : so, during the noon break time, or after the meeting of "the Legion of Mary" (Légion de Marie), or after mass, they could meet together and talk about their political, economic and social problems. Even if Fathers had

given them some small jobs, they always had a feeling of dissatisfaction, because they noticed that those who had studied in the Elites (Astrida School), who were also called "Charities" (Abashariti), were too far living more properly and more respected than them, while sometimes they had not more knowledge than them to work with colonizers. Even among those who had studied in the seminary, they were some who proved their knowledge and capacity by carrying out good services for White People in the banks and elsewhere, but it was just standing on their own two feet.

Concrete points which are included in the Hutus' Manifesto

- They are six elements that were used as a pretext to keep Hutus away:
 - 1) "It was said that Hutus had once been chiefs in the past".
The Manifesto replied that these were only words without foundation ;
 - 2) " The Tutsi was born to govern and he looked like that";
 - 3) "Hutus who have done studies do not do anything to help other Hutus".
 - 4) "Hutus should stand for elections and forget about believing that they are not capable of anything";
 - 5) "It was said that governing people will do whatever they want and make the people stupidly run after them, only follow without hesitation";
 - 6) "Only to say that the main' thing is the unity of Rwandans, which would help them easily get to independence, and to forget about the Hutus' problems which caused chaos".

The situation for the problem of ethnies : the problem is that the Tutsi, because studies were given up to him, he was also given up government, economy, good living conditions and knowledge.

- How problems can be solved quickly. For the solutions to be helpful, it is necessary that the country's political and social general situation be changed quickly and starting by its roots, not only metamorphosis or tricking.
The following replies were given

- 1) To forget that Tutsis (Hamites) are essential, this being taken as the country's culture ;
- 2) At the economic and social level. Because the Tutsis' government is against the Hutus' progress, the solution would be the following
 - To abolish forced labour ;
 - To establish laws which accept and support any private individual's land property ;
 - A loan fund for peasants (to develop modern agriculture and cottage industry) ;
 - At the economic level, Belgian Africa must cooperate with Belgium ;
 - Freedom of the press and before the courts supervised by Tutsi chiefs.
- 3) At the political level. In order to make so that when the white man's colonization will be abolished, it cannot be replaced by the Hamite's

(Tutsi) worse colonization for the Hutu who was also the native, the following would be done

- Laws applied by Belgians in Rwanda as well as cultural values must be written in a book which is known, so that they may be reviewed according to the development evolution ;
- To include Hutus among Government employees in a concrete way : to appoint them as chiefs, chiefs-assistants and magistrates ; • Regarding national services which Rwandans are entrusted with, it is necessary to use elections to enable the Hutu to get a post in them and to remove bad consequences which follow from monopolizing government endlessly (somebody being a chief and magistrate for too many years) ;
- To remove the chiefs of district from the chefferies' Councils among those established by the executive Decree and so on;
- To change the procedure of electing members of the National High Council, former members being replaced by envoys elected chefferies. Each territory sending its representatives following to the number of people who live there and who pay the tax, without forgetting White People who have decided to live definitely in that territory.

4) Regarding school education

- Because the diploma (diplôme) will be necessary in the next few days, it is necessary to take care to make Hutus and Tutsis equal following the ethnic group which is written in the identity card, instead of studies , especially secondary studies , to be given up to, Tutsis alone ;
- Among those who go to study abroad on "scholarships" managed by the National High Council, with Hutus who are included. And this, be it money and grant holders, the Belgian Government must follow it up ;
- High education is necessary ; Rwandans must be sent to Europe and Belgian Congo, without hastening to build high schools in Rwanda, especially that they said that economy was poor. Instead, priority was to be given to cottage industry and technical schools which the country needed more ;
- It must be build "popular social foyers" (foyers sociaux populaires) which will be meeting points for rural girls and women, as they do not have the capacity to go to aristocratic schools, i.e. "housewife training schools" (écoles ménagères), "teacher training schools" (écoles de monitrices).

In short, those who signed the Hutus' Manifesto were asking for something which could make them develop, together with all Hutus in general at the administrative, economic and social level, being based on education.

There are a lot of things to say about the Hutus' Manifesto document which was designed for the Vice-Governor (Harroy), but what we would insist on are the following

- Some complaints were legitimate such as not to keep away some of the authorities, to differentiate the three powers so that they are not held by one person, not to make discrimination in education, to fight against forced labour, to allow each individual to have his own land property which cannot be illegally occupied by any other person, to establish cottage industry and technical schools, to build "foyers" (foyers) for rural girls and women

Among the issues got straight by the "Manifesto" were those which it shared with "Perfecting" (Mise au point). But there were also some differences between them which appear in the following points

- The Manifesto was careful to say something about the bad role of colonization, if we consider how it appeared in Rwanda.
While voluntarily ignoring that role, it communicated that the origin of the, problems which existed in 1957 was anyone Tutsi. However, all Tutsis were not governing.
- Consequences of the Hutus' Manifesto include creating sectarianism among Rwandans, since Tutsis were taken as having been the origin of problems characterizing injustice towards Hutus. That conception was accompanied by the gesture which appeared until independence and even later.
- Another thing is that the Manifesto reassured White People when they heard that it was not them who were requested to answer those questions, and not even them who had created those problems. Let us remember that White People from Europe and Northern America were in conflict with Soviets (USSR/URSS)
That time was what people called the "cold war / guerre froide" period (the beginning of the war). Soviets were supporting independence for colonized countries, while Europeans were sticking on their colonial interests. The ideas and the words contained in the Hutus' Manifesto were not worrying a European at all. It is therefore obvious that some of the Europeans were supporting that Manifesto.

But there were also people who were not happy with it. Those included people who had called themselves "Royal Court high clients " who spread the letter of

17th May 1958 which said that, considering the history of Rwanda, there was no relationship between Tutsis and Hutus apart from that of clientship.

From 1957, the problem "Hutu-Tutsi" progressively took a long step, appeared in societies which were created later and which were called "associations/associations" or "move ments/mouvements", and made people forget about the main problems such as economic, Social and independence problems which were concerning all Rwandans. In 1959, sectarianism was also noticed within some political parties.

3.5. U.N.O.

After the Second World War, on 13th December 1946, an agreement on governing Ruanda-Urundi was signed between the U.N.O. and Belgians : Belgium accepted to govern that territory, while the UNO would be supervising those White People's way of governing.

This made that every three years the UNO had to sent its envoys to check the educational, political, administrative and economical evolution etc. The main thing was to know whether the step made at those levels was leading at least to autonomy.

As we said it before, the first envoys sent by the UNO came to Rwanda in 1948. They were just checking the situation, getting information from Belgians and Missionaries, _ and Rwandans also outlined their ideas, but did that in writings which were given to them and which were called "petitions"(pétitions). They talked about problems which existed at that time, but they also criticized the Belgians'working procedure which was characterized by delaying the country's development. Among those who distinguished themselves at the beginning in accusing Belgians to the UNO were François Rukeba, Kabondo and Jovite Nzamwita.

After the UNO's envoys had submitted their report, the UNO appreciated Belgians for some of their actions, but it also insisted encouraging them to promote more the sectors which were really held up and neglected such as : education (specially secondary high schools), political development aimed at preparing autonomy.

That pressure (pression) made Belgians somehow change positively by little and generated what they called "Ten-year plan", which means a ten-year development plan. As well as the decree of 14th July 1952 reviewing the way of governing Ruanda-Urundi. Within the UNO were countries which were not supporting ideas of getting rid of colonization through what was called" nationalism" and "patriotism", which meant fighting for the country's interests, so that you can support ideas which are praising it. There were also other countries which were supporting that way. When the situation became critical, from the time when Rudahigwa died, the UNO's role in solving Rwanda's problems started decreasing while Belgians were inside the country controlling its daily evolution, for those who knew very well people who were leading Rwandans to progress, who wanted things to change quickly, and it was also them who knew how to lay traps and defuse them. And when the UNO's envoys arrived in any place, Belgians had

already left that place. The example is what was called "Gitarama coup" of 28th January 1961, which deposed monarchy and instituted the Republic: that "coup" took place when the UNO's envoys had just arrived in Usumbura to examine the problems in Ruanda-Urundi.

3.6. THE CHURCH'S ROLE

There is a lot to be said about the Catholic Church, but we shall insist on the political context, by examining the role it had during the period of getting rid of colonization. The Church usually means the family of baptized people which is spread throughout the whole world and supervised by the Pope and his assistants. We shall not talk about this Church in this paragraph reserved for the Catholic Church. The Church we shall insist on is the Church for leaders (the Pope, the Bishops and their assistants), as well as the means they use to spread the Word. This is what is called the Church as an "institution" (institution) : so it is the only one we are talking about.

In Rwanda, that Church had an important role at the political level, due to the fact that it was respected by colonial and Rwandan authorities, and even by King Mutara Rudahigwa. After Rudahigwa was enthroned by White People, he went to Kabgayi the following day to recognize Bishop Classe's authority. This continued until 1957, when it became evident that Rudahigwa had decided to fight for Rwanda's independence. He was not on good terms with some of those leaders. Some White People, including Missionaries, started to suspect him.

The stain which came to tarnish good relations between Rudahigwa and some Catholic Church's leaders, was mainly due to the fact that fighting for independence was given up to people who were called "communists" : while communism meant not believing in God (atheism / athéisme).

Since Belgians came to Rwanda in 1916 until NRMD / MRND was enthroned in 1975, the Catholic Church became as if it was a Government Religion (Religion d'Etat). What that Church said could therefore be understood by governing people, especially because it had a big role for the country in the following areas : education, health, economy, politics.

Within the political framework, regarding problems which existed during the period of getting rid of colonization and disputes which came with that, Missionaries abandoned their usual conception and took a new one : before, they ascertained that they had to convert Rwandans into christians being helped in that by Tutsi chiefs. Since 1959, the new conception that appeared was that of collaborating with Hutus. So, there is nothing astonishing that among monks there were those who supported Parmehutu and even Aprosoma, saying that it was holding the Hutu majority.

Before sectarianism appeared in 1959, there were Rwandese monks who had put forward the new ideas of promoting the country and its culture : one would mention Father Alexis Kagame's writings, especially the writing called "Rwanda and its King" (Le Rwanda et son roi) dated from 1945, and Father Louis Gasore who was encouraging the elites (civilized people / évolués) to be on good terms and

collaborate with one another with a view to developing Rwanda. One of his writings was used by those who invented "Perfecting" / "Mise au point" (this was communicated to us by Michel Kayihura). Those two Fathers' writings were within the line of what was called "nationalism / nationalisme".

On 11th February 1959, Bishop André Perraudin, Vicar of Kabgayi, wrote to his Christians a pastoral letter of Lent (called "Super omnia caritas", which meant "love before anything else"). One thing which some people were not happy with was that he wrote that in Rwanda there were a difference and inequality which were mainly based on the fact that Rwandans had different ethnic groups (ethnies), that one ethnic group had oppressed others in the existing institutions, that such inequality and oppression were traditional, and that it was not necessary to judge those past events by trying to find out their origin.

That letter supported those who had signed the Hutus' and Tutsis' Manifesto. It is clear that he was careful not to say anything about inequality that was exaggerated by colonizers because of their own interests. So, he did not denounce them, as those who signed the Manifesto did not say anything about the bad role of Belgians in inequality and sectarianism between Rwandans.

Bishop Aloys Bigirumwami was not considering this in the same way. In the paper "Christian testimony" dated the 5th September 1958, he had published a writing ascertaining that the fact that there were Hutus, Tutsis and Twas was not a problem, that the inequality which was a problem was that of Economy, as well as the fact that people from the grassroots did not have access to government.

That writing by Bishop Bigirumwami was not given the value it merited, so that Church leaders follow its line which was not that of sectarianism.

Even among people who analyzed history at that time, those who thought about mentioning it were very few.. However, it was also written by a Catholic Church leader who was senior to Bishop Perraudin, because he was the one who had consecrated him as a Bishop in 1956. That line was not proper to Bishop Bigirumwami alone, but he rather shared it with many of the Rwandese Fathers. Be that as it may, it was not that line which he followed later, because there was a special power, that came from the side of those who were supporting sectarianism which was based on their own interests: there were colonizers themselves, and there was the group of Missionaries, be they White Fathers or others who came to help them after 1952.

Members of that group had also relations of employees' associations in Belgium (MOC, JOC), with employees in newspapers such as "La Cité " (the City) and "Vers l'Avenir" (Towards the future) and important Catholic movements. In those channels were trained famous writers such as G. Kayibanda (Parmehutu), and A. Munyangaju (Aprosoma). Those Belgian newspapers did not let up supporting Parmehutu's ideology before and after independence.

There were writers who took that situation as if sectarianism which existed in Belgium between the Flemish and the Walloon was removed from there and brought among Rwandans, and generated sectarianism between Hutus and Tutsis.

And even some of them coming to the point of saying that Flemish were supporting Hutus while the Walloon were supporting Tutsis. All those were lies from people who did not know anything about Rwanda. Among those who were supporting Hutus were the Swiss, the Italians, the Flemish, the Wallon

After political parties were established, both Bishops, Bigirumwami and Perraudin, wrote a letter to their priests, strongly recommending them and requesting them to be careful to separate from the UNAR's programme and procedure (the letter of 24th September 1959) because that party had a relationship with communism and islam (that was it !).

Again on 11th October 1959, those Bishops wrote to their priests a secret letter requesting them to be careful about bad declarations made by the "Hutu Social Party" (the Hutus'Party) : which was APROSOMA, as it went on changing its names. People said that this political party had nothing christian in its writings which were characterized by hatred and was based on ethnism.

The Church's leaders criticized different things, some of them together, and others individually. What one would wonder about is keeping silence at the critical moment: nothing was said about Parmehutu which was aiming at ethnism, nothing was mentioned about Colonel Guy Logiest's government in which there was however much nastiness, killings, putting Rwandans in conflicts, use of force, rushing things, and many others. Apart from that silence, there were writings or instructions which were given when it was too late, thus being of no help. Instead of going straight to the problem, they were rather tolerant.

There are many obstacles which made the Church not play its desired role. The main one is the important dispute which took place between Missionaries and native Fathers. For some, there was too much hatred. There were also many different reasons for that there was collaboration between Missionaries and Colonizers, there was the fact of despising Black People (including Rwandese authorities), they were considering Rwanda as their own field especially because it was also them who were bringing money.

Trying hard to get rid of all that made Black Fathers not devote themselves to the unity of Rwandans. Some were not enough intelligent to understand political problems, even though there were some who actively participate in any particular party.

But there were also Rwandese or White Fathers who tried hard to fight for human rights in very bad periods such as in 1959 and later.

There were some who devoted themselves to refugees and victims of 1959-1960. But there were also others who supported the tragedy of killings and hatred by their words and actions.

What we have just analysed in short proves that it is not enough to say that the Church's role was bad or good One would conclude by saying that the Church had all necessary means (means and influence) to play a concrete role in preventing the bad events that took place from 1959 to 1994.

3.7. POLITICAL PARTIES

Before 1959, there had never been political parties (partis politiques) in Rwanda. Even if the word "ishyaka" had existed a long time ago and meant "having more zeal than others", or "having zeal to fight for something in which you believe and like". However, even a long time before, there were also disputes at the government level, and there was nothing astonishing in that. There are examples showing how disputes generated conflicts including killings (Rucunshu is an example) and other important conflicts, even though they did not include killings : between 1920 and 1931, there was a conflict at Yuhi Musinga's place between those who tried to be well seen by White People and who were called "Abahababyi", which meant those who accused others, and those who were called "Abayoboke", which meant people who were supporting the King.

Those two parts were made up of groups that were fighting for their own interests in factions (factions), and they were therefore not considered as political parties of today. Such disputes and conflicts were not based on ethnic groups, regions, professions and religions as it was noted in the 1959 political parties.

The 1959 political parties

Those political parties were of two kinds : there were political parties which some people called "national political parties" (partis nationaux), i.e. political parties which had many members, which were spread throughout the country or in its big parts, and which had concrete means to spread their ideas with important leaders.

Let us say which were those political parties and when they were established:

1. APROSOMA	Association for the Masses's Social Promotion (Association pour la Promotion Sociale de la Masse)	15/02/1959
2. UNAR	Rwanda National Union (Union Nationale Rwandaise)	13/09/1959
3. RADER	Rwandese Democratic Rally (Rassemblement Démocratique Rwandais)	14/0/9/1959
4. PARMEHUTU	Party for Hutu Emancipation Movement (Parti du Mouvement de l'Emancipation des Bahutu)	09/10/1959

There were also about twenty other political parties which were not as important as those we have just mentioned. Even when you carefully examine them, some of those small political parties depended on those four big ones.

1) ABAKI Alliance of Bakiga (Alliance des Bakiga)

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| 2) ABESC | Association of Hutu evolving for the suppression of classes (Association des Bahutu évoluant pour la suppression des castes) |
| 3) ACR | Rwanda Farmers Association (Association des Cultivateurs du Rwanda), |
| 4) APADEC | Association of the Christians Democratic Party (Association du Parti Démocratique Chrétien) |
| 5) APROCUMIN | Indigenous Traders' Association (Association des Commerçants Indigènes) |
| 6) AREDETWA | Association for Twas Democratic Development (Association pour le Relèvement Démocratique des Batwa). |
| 7) ARUCO | Alliance of Ruanda - Urundi and Congo (Alliance du Ruanda - Urundi et du Congo) |
| 8) ASSERU | Rwanda Breeders' Association (Association des Eleveurs du Rwanda) |
| 9) MOMOR | Rwandese Monarchist Movement (Mouvement Monarchiste Rwandais) |
| 10) MUR | Movement for Rwandese Union (Mouvement pour l'Union Rwandane) |
| 11) PAMOPRO | Progressive Monarchist Party (Parti Monarchiste Progressiste) |
| 12) PSCR | Social Christian Party of Rwanda (Parti Social Chrétien du Rwanda) |
| 13) UAARU | Union of African Cattle breeders of Rwanda (Union des Aborozi Africains du Rwanda) |
| 14) UMAR | Union of Rwandan Masses (Union des Masses Rwandaises) |
| 15) UNAFREUROP | Afro- European Union (Union Afro-Européenne) |
| 16) UNINTERCOKI | Union of Kinyaga Common Interests (Union des Intérêts Communs du Kinyaga) |

NOTE:

There were also other small political parties, like the one that fought for Gisaka self-government of Gisaka.

As one has a closer look to the objectives of these political parties and their structures in general, one sees that they were based on the following: interests of all Rwandans, professions, ethnic origins, regions, churches, stretching the boundaries of Rwanda, the system of government (either monarchical or any other political system).

Another aspect that is worth mentioning is the fact for some of these parties it was not easy for their members and even for their founding fathers to clearly understand what they were all about. Examples are: "party association" ... or "movement party" There were also some associations which called themselves "associations" but which actually behaved like political parties, and went to elections in a bid to obtain a political mandate.

Those political parties were eventually made possible by the go-ahead given by the Belgian Government in its decree dated 08 May 1959 that authorized the formation of political parties and which was to come into force as of 15 August 1959.

Small parties eventually disappeared shortly after municipal elections held in 1960. They got a small number of votes, and were therefore excluded from power sharing, and eventually disappeared. Only big parties remained.

But not all of them were able to stay politically active. Two dropped: these were RADER and APROSOMA.

RADER withdrew for two main reasons: it had no grassroots support as it was mostly a party for "intellectuals", educated people and a small number of members from the general public. Furthermore, its leadership did not have a clear-cut stand and would rely on either one political trend or the other. They would rely on PARMEHUTU and APROSOMA today, and shift to UNAR the following day, while seeking Whitemen's support at the same time. It was common knowledge that, before 1950 RADER's top leaders did not get on well with King Rudahigwa. Politically, this position caused most Banyarwanda, who still strongly supported monarchy, to feel hatred for RADER leadership.

APROSOMA eventually disappeared from the political scene under republican era. It even resolved to change its name several times thus misleading its membership whereas it had attracted many people from several circles when it was formed. Another reason is that its chairman, John Habyarimana Gitera, did not define a clear-cut political line for his party: he changed his views quite often.

Though he defended common people's interests at the beginning, as this ideal was embedded in the name of his party, John Habyarimana Gitera eventually shifted the political front to ethnic considerations between Hutus and Tutsis: on 30 March 1958, he went to the National High Council with a delegation of people who claimed to be representatives of ethnic Bahutu, who had come to put forward the Hutu-Tutsi issue. In September and October 1958, he published press releases hostile to Kalinga and Abiru and arguing that there existed no brotherhood between Hutu and Tutsi. This ideology did not go down well with some of prominent members of the party, and as a consequence, APROSOMA split up and become very weak.

Therefore, there remained only two overtly opponent parties: UNAR and PARMEHUTU.

UNAR. As of November 1959, most UNAR prominent leaders were dismissed. All Tutsi leaders were dismissed by Col. Logiest, on 17 November 1959. This was in line with Logiest's plan to uproot UNAR from grassroots, because it was demanding independence; he replaced tutsi leaders with hutu chiefs with the help of Kayibanda, and these were instrumental in preparing the municipal elections of 1960. PARMEHUTU won these elections, UNAR had abstained from voting. Apart from abstention, those elections took place amid an atmosphere of dictatorship, terrorism and rigging. A quick evidence of this is the shooting of prominent UNAR and RADER personalities still present in the country that occurred in 1963 following attacks by Inyenzi in Bugesera. This aimed to openly wipe out (commit genocide) all opponents to the political regime then in power.

To conclude, one would say that UNAR was confident that UNO had the ability to work out a solution to the problems of Rwandans and could grant independence

without consulting Belgium; however, both of them needed to reach an agreement following the Protection Agreement of 13 December 1946. In brief, this is how PARMEHUTU eventually remained the only political party.

PARMEHUTU

We will focus on two aspects with respect to PARMEHUTU:

- Its role in Rwandan politics, and National Unity;
- All that helped them to assume and monopolise power.

Let us keep in mind that PARMEHUTU was created, like other political parties, amid the atmosphere of struggling for Rwanda - Urundi's independence like anywhere else in Africa. This was explained in great detail when we touched on "mise au point" (clarification) and "Manifeste des Hutus" (Hutus' Manifesto). In the meantime, some associations were formed, including "Muhutu Social Movement" which was created in 1957.

This is an indication that PARMEHUTU was formed more than two years after the need to group Hutus together (ethnic segregation) had started to take shape. This included the intention of fighting Tutsis mostly Tutsi-leaders.

There were people who supported this ethnic segregation: as we mentioned earlier among those were Catholic Church leaders. The others are Belgian authorities, but above all Col. Logiest. Himself, in his book (Mission to Rwanda), writes that, after conferring with Bishop Perraudin and Grégoire Kayibanda on the issue of Hutu and Tutsi relationship, he understood straight away the injustices Hutus were suffering and he therefore decided to defend them at all costs. It is clear that he had to fight Tutsis and their political parties. And he eventually achieved his goal of annihilating Tutsis.

Means made available to him : He was appointed "Special Resident", meaning that he had the power to rule according to decrees enacted by himself alone, without referring to Rwanda-Urundi authorities. Besides, he had an army made of Belgian and Congolese soldiers, equipped with rifles and helicopters which were called Kajugujugu (this word was coined at that time). On 13 September 1960, he created the "National Guard" (National Army) which he wanted to be formed by ethnic Hutus alone. He had a special and swift way of disseminating written information called "tracts" (helicopters would distribute them across the country), these were later replaced by "Imvaho" newspaper which is known to many people. It was launched at that time with the objective of countering UNAR ideology and campaigning for the ideals of his administration and PARMEHUTU ideology.

PARMEHUTU's objectives: As already mentioned, the leadership of this political party aimed to promote Hutus and they managed to achieve this (in public administration, schools, national army, and elsewhere). But this was accompanied by the exclusion of Tutsis from several organs, keeping them in the cold, scolding them openly (in official speeches), all of which culminated in throwing them out the country or killing them. The other obvious motive of party leaders was to assume power: but as is usually the case elsewhere in Africa, once they came to power,

they did their best to stay in power until this brought about post-independence misunderstanding and clashes.

This (ideal of) "fighting for the promotion of ethnic hutu" actually became a pretext to seize and monopolise power mixed with fear to lose it in the hands of ethnic Tutsi (Inyenzi).

Dissemination of their ideology among the population was accompanied by sensitizing them to always keep in mind their slogan of "Rubanda Nyamwinshi" (ethnic majority) meaning Hutus. Democracy means exercise of power by "rubanda nyamwinshi" in terms of ethnic groups, which is wrong.

This ideology was purported as ideal in administration, official speeches and conferences, and some literature like the book "Major aspects of Rwandan history" published in 1972.

The elite were instrumental in reinforcing ethnic ideology in the minds of the general public. Not all Hutus responded right away to the ethnic ideology put forward by PARMEHUTU (at the start some Tutsis were roughed by Bahutu who accused them of having killed the king). Hutu domination ideology, apart from being rooted in the minds of educated people, was slowly but surely instilled in the minds of the common people by those in power, and was manifested through the genocide of Tutsis mainly in Byumba in 1959-1960 (people hardly talk about it), Gikongoro in 1963-1964, and elsewhere in Rwanda in 1973, and indeed the terrible genocide of Tutsi in 1994.

To conclude on PARMEHUTU campaigns, we'd like to point out that until 1959, there was unity based on kingship; even though ethnic segregation and exclusion had started, some party militants like G. Kayibanda himself, agreed with the establishment of a "constitutional monarchy". Once PARMEHUTU political party was born with its ethnic ideology, unity started to fade away seriously. Clashes among and exclusion of Rwandans were maintained openly and officially and were carried out through what was called "balance" whether in schools, in employment, and in the army. Ethnic segregation destroyed some of Rwandan positive values, like solidarity which was based on: friendship, brotherhood/confraternity, clan...

Ethnic segregation has brought about what some call a virus in the Rwandan society, which caused some Rwandans to seek the solution to their problems in the extermination of their opponents.

CHAP. VI. ORIGIN OF AND RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BAHUTU, TUTSIS AND TWAS.

Nowadays, the relationship between Hutus, Tutsis and Twas has become a conflict between two ethnic groups: Tutsis and Hutus. As for Twas, they seem to have been completely forgotten.

For some people, it is not at all necessary to discuss the meaning of these denominations or the origin of the people bearing those names. However, there exist several documents, old and modern, which discuss this issue, and which are read as such. Apart from the man in the street who was or is still guided by this ideology, some political leaders use it as a means to achieve their personal interests. There are also many other people who might be happy to see the ethnic issue give rise to everlasting political upheavals.

However, we believe it is necessary to discuss and resolve this question for two main reasons:

- Firstly, because this problem has engendered divisions among and destroyed the unity of Rwandans;
- Secondly, to always have this issue as a top priority is detrimental to the country and its citizens: Ethnic mututsi keeps considering himself as a Tutsi, and sees a muhutu as an enemy; and the ethnic muhutu sees himself as a Hutu first and perceives a Tutsi as an enemy, while the mutwa always sees himself as the dregs of society. Thus, these different ethnic components cannot have a common ideal which would help them to move forward together, and could not detect a common enemy from abroad aiming to divide them or any fellow Rwandan who could harm them in a bid to satisfy his own needs, by building up an "akazu" (kin-centred management system) in public administration, in the economy or in education system.

Another reason why this problem should not be treated lightly is that since 1959 up to the 1994 genocide and massacres, ethnic Tutsi were killed because of their ethnic origin, and ethnic Hutu were killed sometimes together with their beloved ones simply because they were not in line with this ethnic segregation ideology. It is clear, therefore, that this problem exists because and as a result of what happened in the past.

That is why we are going to briefly consider the following point:

1. What is being said about the origin of Hutus, Tutsis and Twas;
2. Their numbers before whitemen's arrival;
3. Their numbers during colonial period.

4.1. ORIGIN

Some people have endeavoured to trace the origin of the words "Hutu", Tutsi and Twa. Among the most recent researchers are people like Bishop Kanyamachumbi

who published a book entitled *Société, Culture et Pouvoir Politique en Afrique Interlacustre. Hutus et Tutsis de l'Ancien Rwanda*, Kinshasa, 1995. He dedicated many pages to this specific issue, mostly making an inventory of the many documents that have dealt with it and assessing their respective value. But this book does not give any scientifically interesting conclusion as regards the origin of Hutus, Tutsis and Twas. His conclusions are only hypotheses. For him, the only obvious fact is that it is enough to trace the origin of ethnic Hutu and Tutsi in both Western and Central Africa Regions. Many researchers are taking this direction mainly because of and following archeological findings. So far, the oldest human being (millions of years of age) is believed to hail from Western Africa region. It is therefore not necessary to set out in search of the origin of ethnic Hutus in Cameroon, Chad and even in Australia as someone once alleged in "Bantu expansion"; or to trace Tutsis back to Egypt or Asian (like Caucase and Arabia) or even to Ethiopia.

This odd habit of tracing Tutsi's origin back to here and there is what has been called the "hamitic hypothesis". One of the allegations this hypothesis is based on has to do with the routes these pastoralists and their cattle have taken. Another stereotype alleges that any well-organised institution, like political administration and social organisation, can never have been done by Black People. It is rather the work of some people of white origin whose skin has darkened as a result of mixed marriages with black people. That is how some people have jumped to the conclusion that monarchy in the Great Lakes was introduced by Tutsis, while some others denied this allegation and suggested that it was rather an invention of Black People known as "Bantu", which Tutsis eventually copied. Here arises the following question: why could Bahutu, Tutsis and Batwa not sit together and think up something? If they managed to live together for hundreds of ages without being able to work together and come up with some positive innovation for their country, then this is serious problème that needs to be addressed.

This bad politics of putting Batutsi (and Masai people) above all else simply because they are allegedly related to European or Asian peoples, or to founders of the Egyptian "civilisation", and of keeping Black People or "niggers" in the cold, has had negative effects on the relationships between Rwandans during and after the colonial era. Some Batutsi actually considered themselves as superior when it comes to knowledge, administration and warfare strategies, while some ethnic Hutus saw themselves as inferior.

It is not easy to trace the origin of the words "Hutu", "Tutsi" and "Twa". That said, the word "Hutus" (giving "Hutus" in plural) does have some similitudes with some words of some languages spoken in Congo (Zaire) meaning "umugaragu" (servant, slave). The word "Tutsi" (plural: "Tutsis") seems to derive from the verb "gutuka" meaning "kuva" or to hail from or "gukungahaza" (to enrich). This is the meaning it had in the literature used before the colonial era. The word "Umutwa" (plural: "Twas") is related to the names of some Central African tribes such as: Batua, Batoa, Batswa, Bcwa, etc ... Most of them live in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It is clear that ethnic twas used to form a large group in this particular region.

What is quite certain is that being a hutu or a tutsi is to belong to a different wealth group, which also determines the kind of relationship existing between the two

ethnic groups and is also reflected at the administrative level. A well-off Hutu who would take a tutsi girl as a wife was said to have cast off his being Hutu "kwihutura". An ethnic Tutsi who would grow poorer (there were many reasons for that: cows in bad shape, the fact of being dispossessed of one's cows) would become a hutu.

People should bear in mind that both "Gahutu" and "Gatutsi" concepts exist for a very long time. They were present in monarchical family trees (Ubucurabwenge) i.e. `kings' and `queen mothers' genealogies. These "Hutu" and "Tutsi" concepts were also present in poems praising acts of bravery under King Cyirima Rujugira's reign which dates as far back as the 1650ies.

It becomes obvious therefore that when it comes to the basic problem of "Hutu", "Tutsi" no-one can say for sure what their meaning is. As for the origin of both words, so far it remains totally unclear.

Moreover, there is no point in trying to know the country Hutus and Tutsis hail from, and there is no evidence that such a country has ever existed.

Even though there is no evidence of the origin of either of them, some people venture to assert that Hutus and Tutsis are two different races, whose blood has nothing in common, whose education is totally different ...

One of the facts that may have had harmful consequences, is that this idea has been spread by some people holding degrees in education sciences who disseminated it in Rwanda and abroad. Missionaries are among the people who popularized this notion from 1900 to present time. Others are white researchers.

Some Rwandans and journalists often simply copy whatever information they come across. Many are the reasons that caused and still cause people to put down in writing and spread the idea that Tutsis and Hutus have nothing in common but hatred and misunderstanding dating back to the time when Tutsis first came to Rwanda. Some of these reasons are:

- **Ignorance:** the so-called specialists in human sciences who actually have done nothing good for Rwanda.
- Laziness : very often, authors (of this kind of literature) do not carry out in-depth investigations to be able to know the truth and produce a critique and unbiased analysis.
- Plagiarism : it deals with people who swallow any idea or theory they come across, who copy any document, believe and confirm what is written or alleged without any prior critical assessment whatsoever;
- Some set out to write with the intention of doing harm: to cause trouble among Rwandans or in the Great,Lakes region.
- There are others who stick to their wrong ideology simply because of their stubbornness : these are people who do not want other people to see they were wrong.

Some call this philosophy an "existentialist approach" which puts forward conflicting essences of "Hutu" and "Tutsi". But there is another philosophy that some people call "functionalist" meaning that conflicting relationships between Rwandans since 1959 up to 1994 are consequences of whitemen's bad politics; whitemen are

responsible. We will expand more on these ways of thinking in the following chapters.

4.2. THE FACT OF BELONGING TO THE HUTU OR TUTSI OR TWA ETHNIC GROUPS

Whoever wants to grasp the relationship between Tutsis and Hutus before whitemen's arrival should first understand that Rwanda as a country has always been expanding its boundaries, so that it would be meaningless to say that in the remote past Rwandans knew they were Rwandans unless some clarification is given. A very quick example is that of Gisaka. The Gisaka rule had been there for hundreds of years; it was defeated by Rwanda under the reign of King Mutara Rwoyera towards the 1850ies. It is clear that until then people from Gisaka did not see themselves as Banyarwanda, even though their language, culture, religion, clans, crafts, administrative and social organisations etc. were similar to Rwanda's. There were even mixed marriages and exchange of goods.

At the beginning of this century, there were some people from Gisaka who still felt resentment against Banyarwanda leaders who had been appointed there by King Rwabugiri and King Musinga . In short, for Rwanda citizenship to have become one of the characteristics of Rwandan people is something that was achieved as the country continued to expand: in some parts this occurred very long ago, in some others only recently. Here "recently" means shortly before 1910 when whitemen established the eastern and northern borders of Rwanda (Brussels Conference).

This does not mean that we support those who allege that until the Belgian rule started in 1920, Batutsi had been barred from subduing the northern part of Rwanda, Ruhengeri and Gisenyi, that until then people living there were /independent (see Nahimana Ferdinand, *Rwanda. Emergence d 'un Etat*). In fact, King's Rwanda was characterized by various administrative entities based on taxes/tribute paid in recognition of the submissiveness of a given district/region (sometimes also referred to as "country"): there were some districts / regions which were led by Abiru without any kind of interference, others had their own king, but who paid tribute to the King of Rwanda. For instance, rain kings of Bukunzi and Busozo enjoyed autonomy and were only removed by the Belgian rule between 1924 and 1930.

It is good to note that in northern areas there were native hutu and tutsi Kings who had not been sent from Ndugu. There are many reliable examples (see appendix 3)

As Rwanda expanded its boundaries she found new unifying elements for Banyarwanda (in some areas this was quite normal, however). One such unifying element was the clan. Until the 1950ies, only the clan mattered (i.e. the clan one belongs to). Lineage is the other aspect that counted, this means to be able to say: I'm the son of Mr. so and so, himself son of Mr. so and so, etc...

However, inequalities did exist between Hutus, Tutsis and Twas in general. But some people could manage to improve their situation and shift from poor to richer groups or the other way round.

Oral or/and written allegations regarding the respective numbers of Hutus and Tutsis before whitemen's arrival based on literature, either in the form of tales and legends, or in proverbs, or myths were not reflected in every day life: Hutus, Tutsis and Twas lived together, would take wives from either group, socialize, help each other, fight for their country. They shared every thing.

4.3. THE FACT OF BELONGING TO THE ETHNIC HUTU, TUTSI AND TWA GROUPS DURING THE COLONIAL ERA.

There are people who usually say, as we have seen, that all evil things were brought by colonizers or missionaries, or by both. The misfortune, injustice or the calamity (genocide and massacres) that befell Rwanda, could not have one single explanation. The role of Rwandans in what happened is obvious and can be documented.

The responsibility of colonial rulers in Rwanda's misfortune is critical. Their role is critical but one cannot say it only triggered them. Colonialism brought about the breakaway between Hutus and Tutsis that affected their thinking schemes, and their deeds and activities. At the ideological level, colonial rulers worked together with missionaries to introduce and disseminate the ideology, already mentioned above, that Hutus, Tutsis and Twas have nothing in common, that those superior to others must join White People and assist them in ruling the country and converting Banyarwanda to Christianity.

Colonialism per se and the new economic management system using paper money instead of barter, inevitably impacts on the development of a society, and shapes it up in a way that the community does not feel concerned, or is at loss. Some stood up and tried to fight against it but were defeated: they were defeated because Colonizers and Catholic Missionaries had fire arms. During the first six years of their presence in Rwanda, they used a lot of force to subdue and convert Banyarwanda to Christianity. The gap was widened by compulsory activities like hard labour (see below), school system (see above), this means that where Hutus and Tutsis leaders existed, Belgian rulers did as they wished. Here is how it all happened:

- Between 1924 and 1932, Belgians, following their policy aiming to restructure Rwanda's (and even Burundi's) administration, dismissed Hutu and Tutsi Chiefs/leaders who did not belong to powerful families or clans. There are many examples but let's take one from Bugoyi: clan leaders were dismissed by Belgians and replaced by children of Tutsi Chiefs who had attended official administration schools. In 1925, there were 57 native (Hutu and Tutsi) chiefs, in 1959 there remained only two hutu deputy chiefs out of the 19 who existed in that area before (see Kajeguhakwa Valens and Gahigi Denis, in *Amoko v'i Bugoyi n 'Abatiware baho mbere y'Ubutegetsu mbiligi*, (Ethnic Groups in Bugoyi and their Chiefs before the Belgian Rule) s.l., s.d., Kigali, 1958).
- The breakaway mentioned earlier which was brought about by a certain ideology also affected Rwandans hearts. It reached the hearts and minds of some educated people, as they had read a lot of misleading literature, without any critical mind, and some took advantage of that ideology in

order to achieve personal goals. The split between Hutus, Tutsis and Twas reached the common people who shared many problems in their every day life. Bit by bit, this split widened in the hearts and minds of Rwandans: this took a specific turn in the year 1953 after councillors' elections at the level of "Sous-Chefferies", "Chefferies", territories (sub-counties, counties and districts) and the election of the National High Council, which were established following the Belgian decree of 14 July 1952.

- One wonders what benefit the usual values of courtesy, courage, family, patriotism, etc and the new ones ushered in by White People such as christian creed/faith and virtues brought to Rwandans. One would like to know what prevented the new values from stopping the misfortunes Rwandans have been experiencing since 1959 to date, like genocide and massacres, etc. Neither animists, nor believers of the new churches practised their faith in real life. This occurred elsewhere: see the genocide committed by Nazi. The explanation is that faith alone is not sufficient to prevent evil as long as it is surrounded by an atmosphere of hatred, bad ideology, bad politics mixed with dictatorship, and more particularly so when cultural values have been uprooted and have almost disappeared.

There is a lot one can say about the origins and social relationships between Batutsi, Hutus and Twas. Let us just take the following idea: Banyarwanda must understand that maintaining themselves prisoners of their belonging to ethnic Hutu ,Tutsi and Twa groups is one of the big obstacles standing in their way to development. In fact, to remain prisoner of one's ethnic group without having any thing positive in mind, is like locking oneself up in a cave so that one cannot look outside. What matters is to live together peacefully, work together for the development of their country, so that Banyarwanda can tackle and solve their common problems, and break their narcissism and wake up to the progress the world has achieved.

CONCLUSION

SUGGESTIONS ON THE BASIC PRINCIPLES LIKELY TO BRING UNITY BACK AMONG RWANDANS

It should be understood that the ideas developed below and which would help Rwandans to better get together in unity like people striving to build one country, are only suggestions. These suggestions are not the only ones possible: others can be put forward. There are two aspects to be developed. One deals with basic principles. The second touches on what actions could be undertaken at different levels.

BASIC PRINCIPLES

1. Respect of human rights

To agree and acknowledge that all people are equal before the law, that their rights must be respected, but without prejudice to other people's rights. In this

sense every person is equal to the other. The saying that "equality does not exist" does not apply here.

2. *Patriotism and putting Rwandan citizenship first*

To do the best we can to ensure that "national identity" becomes reality again and takes root.

AT DIFFERENT LEVELS

➤ **Political level**

3. *To achieve good governance for Rwandans*

A political mandate should not be used as a personal business or an umbrella. Monopolizing power for a long time, with no changeover of political power is very detrimental. It is essential to put in place and respect clear mechanisms that determine how people can accede to or leave power.

4. *To achieve good governance for Rwandans*

- Genocide and massacres
- Not to exclude some Rwandan citizens from sharing the national cake (equity based of equal opportunities before the law).

5. *There should be mechanisms to clamp down on enemies of Unity and Justice.*
Economic level

6. To promote labour and encourage people, especially the youth, to develop income generating activities. To modernize cultural methods. Those who have the bad habit of living or plan to live at the expense of others should stop doing so.
7. To set out to reduce poverty and excessive inequalities thanks to good governance,
8. To develop a code of conduct and put in place measures to facilitate its implementation;

➤ **Cultural level**

Culture is among the things Rwandans have in common. There are some people who assert that loss, deprivation or slackening of the Rwandan culture is the root cause of the misfortunes Rwanda has experienced in the past and is still suffering from today.

There are many concrete elements in the Rwandan culture that we could use as a basis to recover national unity: social interaction, solidarity, honesty, courtesy, patience, faith/creed, language, customs and rights (see Appendix 4).

9. With respect to social interaction, the following should be done:

- To show courtesy: good deeds and conduct recognised by many people;
- Not to put one's interests first: because otherwise one becomes greedy and monopolistic;
- To support one another: one should not look at his own interests;
- To assist the needy: one example is that, in the past, new mothers would be given cow milk for free.
- To show respect: young people should respect elders (leaving them their seat when there is no spare seat...) (see Appendix 4).

➤ **Education level**

One of the ways likely to help Rwandans live together peacefully is political education. Solidarity camp programmes should continue. However, people should not sow in a thorny ground.

10. Education should go hand in hand with putting right people's morals and conscience.

➤ **Churches and the State**

11. The country must stay a lay State: it should avoid mixing up with any church institution

TABLEAU

Appendix 1 *Distribution of successful candidates to Butare School and ethnic group 1932 -1962 (RUTERANA J.M.V. Butare School, p.129*

COUNTRY	RWANDA				BURUNDI					FOREIGNERS						CASES	
	YEARS	Tutsi	Hutu	E.N.I	Total	Tutsi	Hutu	Baganwa	E.N.I.	Total	C	B	C	U	II	Total	Unidentified
1932	28	1	0	29	1	8	16	1	26							13	68
1933	11	0	0	11	0	0	9	0	9							1	21
1934	16	6	0	22	7	7	3	1	17							1	40
1935	8	0	27	35	3	4	0	9	16							2	53
1936	14	2	0	16	3	8	1	1	13	1					1	0	30
1937	17	3	0	20	8	3	3	0	14							1	35
1938	19	6	0	25	6	6	2	0	14							0	39
1939	20	11	0	31	3	5	6	1	15							0	46
1940	25	6	1	32	9	3	2	5	19							1	52
1941	15	10	0	25	6	12	5	0	23							0	48
1942	21	2	1	24	11	8	6	2	27							3	54
1943	23	3	0	26	12	4	2	1	19	1					1	4	50
1944	25	4	1	30	13	6	1	2	22	1					1	2	55
1945	29	2	0	31	10	6	3	0	19							0	50
1946	27	1	0	28	12	9	4	3	28							0	56
1947	26	4	0	30	19	10	2	0	31							0	61
1948	43	3	0	46	30	11	3	0	44	2					2	0	92
1949	43	6	0	49	39	9	3	0	51							0	100
1950	35	9	0	44	29	12	2	0	43							1	88
1951	52	18	15	85	46	9		3	58	1	1				2	0	145
1952	33	7	0	40	24	13		0	37							0	77
1953	40	8	1	49	25	13		1	39							0	88

1954	37	10	0	47	23	13		0	36	3					3		86
1955	50	26	0	76	12	17		0	29	1					1	1	106
1956	40	17	0	57	25	22		0	47		2				3	1	108
57/58	42	12	2	56	36	12		2	50		2				2		108
58/59	26	18	19	63	1	1		43	45		1	1		1	3		111
59/60	13	5	33	51	13	5		33	51							2	104
60/61	14	30	19	63	21	17		5	43	2	1				3	3	112
61/62	58	65	1	124	13	24		0	37	3	3				6		167
TOTAL	850	295	120	1 265	460	277	73	112	922	16	10	1	1	1	29	34	2 250
%	37,7	13,0	5,3	56,0	20,5	12,3	3,2	4,0	40,0	07	0,4	0,04	0,04	0,04	1,22	1,5	100

Caption : B.N.I. = Unidentified ethnic group C =Congolese B : Belgian G =Greek U = Ugandan H = Hindou

Source : Register for students registered in Butare School, 1962-1962

APPENDIX 2

Royal decree 1/54 Abolition of clientship

Article 1 :

Regarding the implementation of this law, the following words are explained as follows:

1. Clientship (Isezerano ry'Ubugake) : is a free consent, between two parties, the first called the Patron, giving to the second, whom he calls the client, one or many cows, so that he rears them, looks after them as a mother looks after her children, and regularly carries out for his Patron services which are well explained in the agreement or in accordance with the country's culture .
2. Presentation (umurundo) : is the order given to the client by his Patron to show him all his cows and select him, but once in his life.
3. Cows acquired out of the clientship agreement (Inka z'imbata) are cows for the family, which are not acquired through clientship.
4. Cows which are not acquired through heritage (Inka z'impahano) : are cows which were acquired through one's efforts.
5. Cows for warriors : are those which are not acquired through heritage or clientship, or as a reward, which are owned by people who have been warriors without getting them from anybody.
5. Special cows (Inyambo) : are cows from the Royal Court which are owned by royal court officials who directly assist the King in the country's administrative matters.

Article 2. .

The clientship agreement is completed when they have shared. That sharing shall take place between both parties who have agreed on it : the client and his Patron and starting from the lower level, i.e. the client who himself has no vassal or has not placed his Patron's cows under clientship with a view to hide them from Patron. Apart from that, when the client himself does not have another person under his clientship and that he and his Patron are both living in Nyanza Territory, one of them may apply for and be authorized to share.

Article 63.

When a client who has not other clients at his service dies, his Patron is required to share cows with his heirs by mutual consent, or in case of disagreement, this is ordered by the Court. That sharing must take place or applied for from the Court within a period of six months following the client's death.

Article 4.

In any sharing, when the client does not show his Patron all his cows, the client is given two shares, and his Patron only one share.

When the client has shown his Patron all his cows, his Patron is given only one share and his client three shares.

Article 5.

During the sharing, all the cows acquired out of the clientship agreement, or not acquired through heritage and cows for warriors which were mixed with those acquired through clientship are shared together without separating them.

Cows acquired out of the clientship agreement, those not acquired through heritage and cows for warriors which are not mixed with those acquired through clientship are not shared.

Sharing between shepherds of cows owned by royal court officials and their Patrons will take place after instructions regarding such cows will have been given.

Article 6.

The new clientship agreement is forbidden.

Regarding new clients who have not yet received cows, this matter will be examined by the Courts, which will decide whether or not they are to be given compensation.

Article 7.

Giving the clients the order to show all the cows to their Patrons is forbidden .

Article 8.

If it is proven by the Court that somebody is not looking after his Patron's cows or has hidden them to avoid sharing, his Patron's share will be determined following the number of cows before.

Apart from the provisions of Article 12, a client who has not looked after his Patron's cows or hidden them in the overmentioned way, the country will take from him all the cows he had hidden, excluding his Patron's share.

Article 9.

If it is proven by the Court that the client bought one or many cows before sharing, without his Patron's authorization, he will be requested to restore to his Patron a part of that money following the shares that have been ordered, or he will pay among cows from his share, without removing penalties provided for in Article 12 of this decree.

Article 10.

The sharing will be written in the agreement register kept by the Court of the sharing jurisdiction. They write in it the day, the place and the way of sharing, and it will be always mentioned that there is no clientship agreement any more between those who have finished to share.

Article 11.

Registers on « cows which are given or bought » which the chiefs of Districts and collines are required to keep by the King's circular n°38 of 11/11/1953 will continue to exist until they will be given other instructions, and they will be in conformity with the provisions of Paragraph 2 from a) to f) of page 3. All other provisions contrary to Circular n°38 will be punished by penalties which are provided for in this decree.

Article 12.

Offenders to this decree will be sentenced to a penalty- of one month's imprisonment maximum, with a fine of one thousand francs or one of those penalties.

Article 13.

Provisions of the Clientship Agreement of 1 st August 1941 which are not contrary to this decree will continue to be implemented.

Article 14

This decree comes into force on the day of 15 t" April 1954.

NYANZA - RUANDA

On 1" April 1954

MUTARA RUDAHIGWA

Appendix 3

Clans and Chiefs in Bugoyi before the Belgian Government

Valens Kajeguhakwa and Gahigi Denis
s.l.n.d. (Kigali, 1998)

In 1970, we heard a communiqué about the establishment of « Rwanda Academy of Culture » and were very happy of that. We decided to have a role in it. Then we tried hard to be well informed about the history of the people in the region where we were living and even in the other neighbouring regions. We mostly bended over the regions of Bugoyi, Bwishaza, Kanage and Budaha. We asked old people who were living there at that time, Hutus and Tutsis and even Twas in Rugerero, and we read books.

- Father Pagès'book called "A Hamitic Kingdom in the Centre of Africa published on 17/11/1930" ("Un Royaume Hamite au Centre de l'Afrique édité le 17/11/1930").
- Father Delmas'book called"Generalogies of Rwanda Aristocracy" ("Généralogies de la Noblesse du Rwanda").

That Rwanda Academy disappeared perhaps because of the war which made Burundians kill each other in 9172, and the tragedy which took place in Rwanda in 1973. They also stopped the research activities which we had already undertaken.

Interviewed people were the following:

7. Nyandera son of Birenga (a Tutsi mugesera), born at Bwishaza in 1900, governed Kanembwe from 1924 to 1938;
8. Marembo son of Mvuye who governed a part of Byahi and Gikombe;
9. Ruzuba : a Hutu coming from the chief of Bacyaba Archers;
10. Gicamugete : a Hutu coming from the Mukora (Bungura) chief,
11. Sehene Onesphore son of Rutebuka : a Hutu coming from Budaha;
12. Kabayiza Barnabé (ex-chief-assistant of Nyamyumba) son of Ruhumuriza son of Kanimba son of Ruzina son of Mirimo son of Mparaye : a muhenda mwega;
13. Sefura Lasislav son of Nyamushyota son of Rugina : a mugabe musinga (Tutsi). He was living at Kivumu of Kanage, was not capable of getting out of the house and running away because of pain and old age, was killed with his wife who did not want to leave him behind. They were parents of Father François Rwigenza who was killed at Muhororo in 1994;
14. Basana, the chief of Abaguta (Hunde) who was living at Rushayu in 1971. His grandfather's governed for Semirindi son of Mpinda son of Segishyamutsi son of Runyoni son of Nyakiroli son of Makara (Rwangabami).

Some of the interviewed people were recorded, while we wrote what others said and kept them in a safe place.

A. MAIN CLANS IN BUGOYI

Clans which predominated in Bugoyi and which were shared by Hutus and Tutsis were the following

I. Ababanda

2. Abacyaba
3. Abagesera
4. Abasigari i.e. Banyoro like Indara from Kibayi Commune in Butare
5. Abasindi (Abanyiginya)
5. Abasinga
7. Abanyiginya
8. Abatsobe
9. Abungura
10. Abega.

Because of multiplying too much, Hutus in those clans finished by giving themselves names coming from their lineages, and then this became as if they were new clans but they did not forget their original clans. Tutsis did not change anything in their clans, they kept bearing their clans'names. The clan was a relationship between Hutus and Tutsis especially in the religious rites and in the warfields . Among Bagoyis, there were 57 main families which had the same number of chiefs and villages. Among those chiefs (abatware / ibisonga), there were some who went to represent their families at the Royal Court or at the High Chiefs' residences. The chiefs of families were taken their government by Belgians from 1925-1926, being progressively replaced by the Tutsi Chiefs'children who had studied in public schools which were built in some districts of the country excluding the district of Bugoyi. Belgians suspended the inferior Tutsis' and Hutus'children from those schools in 1925-1926. Students who were suspended from school at that time included a Tutsi called Kagabo and 3 Hutus for Musinga's client . They went back to school when they met Musinga on the way and complained to him about the injustice they had undergone, then he went back with them to apologize for them. From that time, Kagabo called himself Kagabo son of Musinga. One of the said Hutus was called Madagari.

B. THE ORIGIN OF THOSE CLANS

1. The first are Abasigari who were also called Banyoro who got lost in the forest after they were defeated by Mibambwe Sekarongoro Mutabazi's warriors, and who could not find their way back home to Bunyoro. They were the same as Indara from Kibayi Commune in Butare .

Many clans began to move to Bugoyi from the reign of Cyilima Rujugira (1675-1708) to the reign of Kigeli IV Rwabugili.

They were coming from different regions of Rwanda : Bwishaza, Bunyambiriri (the Suti of Banega) Buhanga, Bushiru, Murera, Bumbogo, Kingogo, Lamuronsi, Bwishya. Others came from Gisaka, Ndorwa and Buyungu.

2. It was Abambari and Abahima who came to Bugoyi first coming from Kamuronsi (Sake) under the reign of Cyilima Rujugira (1675-1705). Abambari are descendants of Cyambari while Abahima are descendants of Muhima. Both of them being children of Makara (Rwangabami) and his muhunde wife who was called Gahombo. So they were Abega. Abambari and Abahima are names of lineages only. Makara's (Rwangabami) . children were born in exile. There were also his other descendants in Bunyabungo who were called Abashinjahavu. There are again his other children in Burundi who are living at Jenda (Mugongomanga). Makara was killed in Mutara by Cyilima Rujugira's warriors while coming from exile with his 3 children : Nkongoli, Ndejuru and Bukuba who died with him, while the two others survived and have descendant families in Rwanda.

Note: It is the clans of Abambari and Abahima which are predominant in Bugoyi.

3. There was another clan of people who were called "Ibiragi" ("deaf and dumb / sourds et muets") because they were speaking gihunde language which Rwandans could not understand. They were called "ibituku" (red people) or "abera" (white people) because of their very bright colour. They are living at Rubavu, Nkama, Kinigi, Murambi, Mahoko and Nyundo. They covered their houses with clods of earth. This is why they were called "abasakaza -taka" people who cover their houses with earth), and Bugoyi was also called "i Busakazataka" (the region in which people cover their houses with earth).
4. Then came Abwabiro. They were abasinga whose ancestors were from Ndorwa, but who came to Bugoyi coming from Suti of Banega in Bunyambiriri. Descendants of Mwigabiro who live in Muhira, Kizi and Rugarika, had just driven off Ibiragi whom we have talk about. Macumu son of Migwabiro who was their leader, his bravery made people call him Mugoyi (trusser / ligoteur) perhaps because he had trussed up Ibiragi (deaf and dumb). The country he had conquered was also called "u Bugoyi" instead of being called "Ubusakazataka". Abagwabiro were afraid of White Fathers when they arrived at Nyundo, because they thought they Were ibituku (red people) who had a relationship with Ibiragi (deaf and dumb) and who came to take their revenge by frightening them. Abagwabiro remained good warriors until Makombe son of Macumu killed Gicuko son of Cyilima Rujugira who was going to live at Murambi and Bwiza in Rubavu Commune. He apologized to Cyilima II Rujugira who accepted but bore a grudge against him, Gicuko's family continued to remind that to the Kings until Yuhi IV Gahindiro offered Mukiza grandson of Makombe for revenge.
5. Abatsobe from Rutarira came from Bumbogo, and it was Rutarira who took Kinyanzovu, Busumba, Ryabigize, a part of Rwaminega and a part of Bunyogwe as his landed estates. It is in Rubavu and Rwerere Communes.
6. Abungura came from Ndorwa via Bwishya.

7. Abahoma are abagesera who were sent to live at Mudende.
8. Ababanda came from Gakoma for Ababanda at Ndara in Butare.
9. Abahunde who were descendants of Shamarenga were neighbours of Rutarira who was "umutsobe".
10. Tutsi Basita came from Ndorwa and settled in Munigi (DRC/RDC)/
11. Abahuma are Abagesera. They live at Runande, Rukoko, Rwerere and Kigarama.
12. Abayovu live at Rusongati.
13. Abahungira were established at Munanira and Rubona in Nyamyumba Commune.
14. Abakora (Abagura) came from Ndorwa via Rucuru.
15. Abacocori and Abakono live at in Bigogwe. Abacocori are Abanyiginya who are descendants of Mucocori son of Ndahiro Cyamatara; Mucocori was exiled in Rwankeri forest, where he went with his cousin Birimana who gave birth to Abakomo from there: In byangabo in Rwankeri was given that name because of Ngabo who was umucocori. Those two clans continued to venture in the forest making cows graze in Bigogwe.
16. Abasindi came from Bumbogo.
17. Abashayo are Abungwa who came from Buyungu and were established at Nyundo and Rubona.

There are people from other clans who came to live in Bugoyi under the reign of Yuhi Gahindiro.

- 1) The bagahe Basinga live in Byahi;
- 2) The Tutsi Bagesera live in Minigi and Byahi
- 3) Abanyakarama take their origine from Burundi, but they would have arrived in Bugoyi coming from Kibuye, and they live on Mount Goma and elsewhere here and there;
- 4) Asto the Bugunga Banyiginya, it is Kinanira who arrived first coming from Budaha. His son Gahama made graze there the cows (INGEYO) of Rugaju so of Mutindo. Abagunga live in Mugangali at Gisenyi, in Ngoma (Goma) and Mugunga (A colline which barrowed its name from Abagunga) where the 1994 Rwandese refugees we're in a camp. Others who moved to Bugoyi at that time are
- 5) The Bagagi Bega. The first to arrive was Mpinda, nephew of Nyirayuhi IV. Nyiratunga who was also the brother of Gasasa, Wife of Yuhi IV Gahindiro. Mpinda arrived in Bugoyi with his son Semirindi coming from Gihango in Bwishaza. They started by living at Rukoko in Byahi, then they moved to Rushanyu, where they had cows which were called Abagabo, and which had been given by Yuhi Gahindiro to his wife Gasasa, who died after giving [them](#) [to](#) her brother Mpinda. It was Rugugura son of Semirindi who was taken the cows Abagabo by Kigeli Rwabugiri, at the same time as other Tutsis from that region. Rwabugiri gave the cows Abagabo to Ntizimira who called them Abazitsinda (Men who will defeat). Because of the attacks launched by abaryoko (people who eat other people) who had managed to get in Rushayu region and other regions surrounding it, and who were killing and eating people and leading before themselves others who were alive, and also because there was water in the whole region of volcanos and even because

of other blights, Abagagi who could survive returned to Rukoko in Byahi and others went back to Bwishaza.

- 6) There are Hutu Bega who live at the edge of Gishwati forest and who had a relationship with those from Bushiru.

C. APPOINTMENT OF KING-ASSISTANTS IN NORTHERN RWANDA

Cyilima Rujugira was the first to appoint King-assistants in that region. Before Belgians changed government in 1925-1926; Bugoyi governed by those 57 chiefs of land from Hutus' important families. Then the King appointed his assistants who were governing from the Royal Court Represented by people chosen by themselves and called chiefs (Ibisonga), who were Hutus or Tutsi and who were in charge of warriors, land or pasture. There were some who governed many collines and even sometimes which were not close together.

(a) KING - ASSISTANTS OF BUGOYI

- 1) Sharangabo son of Cyilima Rujugira
- 2) Biyange son of Ngomiraronka
- 3) Nkusi son of Yuhi Gahindiro
- 4) Kabaka son of Kavotwa
- 5) Rwhimba son of Kabaka son of Kavotwa
- 6) Rutebuka son of Rwhimba
- 7) Ndagiyihangu
- 8) Bisangwa son of Rugombituri governed from Kabagali river to Mugunga. His brother Nyamukobwa was governing for him.
- 9) Rwakadigi governed for Bushaku.

b) *KING ASSISTANTS OF KAMURONSI AND WALEKALE DISTRICT* 1) Munana son of Gihana son of Cyilima Rujugira

2) Marara son of Munana

3) Nyiringabô son of Marara

4) Nturo son of Nyilimigabo was dismissed from government by Belgians at the time of establishing borders in 1912.

Rugunga, who was replaced by his son Buzungu c) *KING-ASSISTANTS OF UBWISHYA*

1) Rugaju son of Mutimbo

2) Gaga son of Mutezintare son of Sesonga son of Mkara Rwangabami 3) Rwakagara son of Gaga

4) Nyamushinga son of Rwakagara

5) Sekarubera wife of Kigeli Rwabugili

6) Muhigirwa son of Kigeli Rwabugili

7) Rubega son of Nkusi son Yuhi Gahindiro

8) Bayibai son of Buki son of Muhabwa (a mugahe musinga)

9) Segore son of Nshizirungu

10) Cyaka son of Bihutu son of Nkusi son of Gahindiro

11) Rwubusisi son of Cyigenza son of Rwakagara

- Gisigati was governed by Ntamuhanga (H) who was a mwungura
- Rugari was governed by Rurenga (H)
- Kibumba was governed by Burunga (H)
- Mugora was governed by Bushemba (H)

d) KING-ASSISTANTS OF B UFUMBIRA

- 1) Murenganshuro son of Yuhi Gahindiro
- 2) Buki son of Muhabwa
- 3) Rubare
- 4) Nyindo

D. CHIEFS FOR THE LAST KING-ASSISTANTS WHO WERE BISANGWA AND BUSHAKU

a. THOSE WHO GOVERNED FOR BISANGWA

1. 57 chiefs of families continued to govern some of them representing their families at the Royal Court, at the high chiefs families.
2. Bisangwa was represented by his brother Nyamukobwa.

3. CHIEFS

COLLINES

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) Ruzinya | - Gahondo, Kigarama, Gashashi, Kanama |
| 2) Burahanda (H) | - Nyakiliba |
| 3) Bizirakuzamba | - Cyeya, Gakorâ, Kizi, Basa |
| 4) Biguma (H) | - Kiloji, Nkama, Cyanzarwe |
| 5) Gatorana son of Biguma
(he was replacing his father) | - Kiloji, Nkama; Cyanzarwe |
| 6) Ruhamankiko | - Kinyanzovu, Ruhengeli |
| 7) Kabwana | - Murambi |
| 8) Runiga | - Rugerero, Kabere, Ruvumbu |
| 9) Segacuruzi (H) | - Kizi and Rubingo |
| 10) Sebunywero son of Segacuruzi | - Bitwekere, a part of Nkama and Kinigi |
| 11) Kiromba | - Munanira, Nyamyumba, Kiraga,
Gatoto, Busasamana, Bushagi |
| 12) Kijuri (H) | - Rubavu, Rwaza, Gisa, a part of Kabere |
| 13) Rumenyamirera | - Byahi |
| 14) Nteziryayo | - Rweere |
| 15) Kamugisha (H) | - Rwerere |
| 16) Sagatwa (H) | - Rwerere |
| 17) Sekaziga (H) | - Rwerere |
| 18) Burunga (Murundi) | - Kabuga (Gahondo) |

b) THOSE WHO GOVERNED FOR BUSHAKU

It was Rwakadigi who was representing Bushaku in Bugoyi. Bushaku was still governing Bugoyi when Belgians arrived in Rwanda, they dismissed chiefs and those 57 chiefs of families from government. Hutus were removed from government little by little which remained held by Tutsis who had studied for that in public schools as we have already mentioned it.

E. HUTU CHIEFS WHO WERE STILL IN BUGOYI UNDER THE REIGN OF MUSINGA

CHIEFS

- 1) Macaca
- 2) Kajyibwami
- 3) Sebihaza
- 4) Sebacuzi
- 5) Mpeka
- 6) Sebikorera
- 7) Sengabo
- 8) Mvuye
- 9) Ndirishye
- 10) Gumiriza
- 11) Rwerinyange
- 12) Rwamigabo
- 13) Mugabombwa
- 14) Senuma
- 15) Ndinda
- 16) Sagatwa
- 17) Kamugisha

COLLINES

- Tarasi
- Kiraga
- Munanira
- Kinigi
- Nyundo
- .Kanama and Rusongati
- .Nyakiriba
- Byahi and Rubavu
- Busoro
- Gitugutu
- Kinyanzovu, Rubavu,Rwerere
- Gihinga (Kanage)
- Vumbi (Kanage)
- Kinigi
- Mwefu
- Kibumba and Buhumba
- Rwamigega (Rwerere)

F. CHIEFS OF BUGOYI UNDER THE REIGN OF RUDAHIGWA

The following of Bugoyi appointed by White People

a. Chiefs

- Gace son of Rwakadigi
- Nyilimbirima son of Nshozamihigo son of Rwabugili (1936-1938). HE was dismissed from government by Fathers because he had two wives;
- Kamuzinzi son of Rusagara
- Kayihura son of Manzi son of Segore (He was dismissed from government in 1959).

b. Chief-assistants

The following chief-assistants included 2 Hutus only, who were also appointed by Rudahigwa by the end of his reign.

They were Baganizi and Ugirashebuja who fled with Tutsis in 1959, when all these chiefs were dismissed from government.

- | | |
|------------------------|------------|
| 1. Ruhigira | Rusiza |
| 2. Sebarema | Mudende |
| 3. Ruboneka Dominique | Nyaruteme |
| 4. Murara Augustin | Bunyogwe |
| 5. Kamanzi Gérard | Rwamigega |
| 6. Soroza Alphonse | Busumba |
| 7. Kayitsinga Ananie | Kinyanzovu |
| 8. Itegeri Gabriél | Rugerero |
| 9. Ngarambe Ildephonse | Rubavu |
| 10. Sabushi Christophe | Munanira |

11. Mugunga Déo	Nyakiriba
12. Nyangenzi Révérien	Kanama
13. Rwigerezaho appollinaire	Kigarama
14. Ugirashebuja Alain (H)	Nyundo
15. Kabayiza Barnabé	Nyamyumba
16. Rutazibwa Emile	Kigeyo
17. Baganizi issac (H)	Busoro
18. Bideri Benoit	Gahondo
19. Mpamo Appollinaire	Rusongati

G. HUTU CHIEFS WHO WERE STILL IN BWISHAZA, BUDAHA, NYANTANGO UNDER THE REIGN OF MUSINGA

CHIEFS

- Batezi
- .Rwanyange son of Mushishe
- .Who was a Muhoryo from Suti son of
- Banega

COLLINES

- Murambi of Rukoko (Budaha)
- Mabanza

He was dismissed from the King's reign by Belgians

- | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|
| - Segatwa (from Ijwi Island) | Bizu |
| - Rwambibi | Shoba (Nyantango) |
| - Kibasha | Murunda |
| - Sebahutu | Mberi (Kivumu Commune) |
| - Ntabareshya | Kiganda (Ramba°) |

Among the Bagogwe remained only one who was called Rucamumpaka.

Appendix 4

**We can use culture to reestablish the unity of Rwandans
M.Kayihura**

To abandon or to be forced to abandon our culture is the origin of misfortune which Rwanda has undergone and is still undergoing.

Muslims say that " mukosa mila ni mtumwa". In fact, one who has no culture or who has abandoned it is like a worker without residence (ouvrier sans domicile). Culture has value for the country because it brings together people who are living in it (common denominator, / dénominateur commun), educates its children, and people say that "The way you are educated is better than the way you are born" ("Uburere buruta ubuvuke"). Culture leads the country's children who become proud of it, respect it, and lay down their life for it when it is attacked.

The Rwandese culture has many important things which we can restore together and which can help us make it up between ourselves and reestablish unity : Social

relations - Helping each other - Being honest - Regaining one's self - control, - being patient - good way of talking Religion Rites and Taboos.

What would we do to restore our culture's value so that it brings us together?

1. **The origin of culture.** It should be set up and be given the means of examining and making clear our culture's good elements that would bring us together - It would be based on the Ministry holding culture with its remit.
2. **Education :** Culture should be given a place within schools at all levels, be taught and considered as a good habit. That culture poetry would appoint people to teach culture.
3. **Social relations:**
 - a) Politeness : is not beauty or richness - it is rather good practice and behaviour, which are appreciated by many people. To hate disapprobation and to be honest, to have self-control when talking or acting - not to be fond of sweet things which is the origin of greediness and selfishness. "When the Rwandese child will not know what disapprobation is, so that he can control himself before controlling his colleague, we can be sure that we shall not reach any positive result".
 - b) Helping each other : - Building for one another : now that cooperatives are being insisted on, there is nobody who is acting alone "one man alone is compared to his mother".
 - c) Helping vulnerable people : milk for a mother was offered free of charge, and widows and orphans were assisted.
 - d) Having respect : young people respected old people : greeting them and leaving the seat for them.
4. **Rites and taboos**

Such as the rites of giving a name to a new-born which included bringing the mother and the baby outside so that the baby be given a name by all clans, or after work in the farm which they left because of a fancied rain then sat and shared food. Such as the rites of marriage, funerals and "premisses" : authorities and warriors were given premisses : sorghum - beans.
5. **Solidarity camps:** should continue, they are like the evenings which existed a long time ago, in which would be taught culture, history, the good way of talking, invention and poetry. In such harmony would be elements which bring people together, and they would try to find solutions to the elements which are dividing them.
6. **Gacaca :** even if Gacaca jurisdictions will deal with trials, they will also include bringing people together based on culture.
7. **Evangelization :** is not only performing Ryangombe's rites or ancestral rites, but is rather instilling gospel into culture (gospel inculturation / inculturation de l'évangile). " The church not replace taboos again".

8. **Unity day** : cultural elements which bring us together would be celebrated.

CONCLUSION: The points summarized above would be thoroughly examined by experts who would be selected for that purpose.

INFORMATION RESOURCES

- ADRIAENSSENS (J), Land law in Rwanda, Butare, 1962 (polyc.)
(Le droit foncier au Rwanda, Butare, 1962 (polyc.)
- CHRETIEN (J.P.), Ethnic groupes have history, Paris, 1989 (Les ethnies ont une Histoire, Paris, 1989).
- HERTEFELT (M;d.), Clans in Ancient Rwanda. Ethnosociology and ethnohistory elements, Tervuren, 1971.
(Les clans du Rwanda ancien. Elements d'ethnosociologie et d' ethnohistoire, Tervuren, 1971)
- KAGABO (J.) and MUDANDAGIZI (V), "Complaint from clay people. Twâs of Rwanda", Journal of African Studies, 53, vol. XIV, 1974, pp.75-87. ("Complainte des gens de l'argile. Les Twa du Rwanda", Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines, 53, vol XIV, A974, pp 75-87).
- KAGAME, (A.), Social and family organizations in the old Rwanda, Brussels, 1954. (Les organisations socio-familiales de l'ancien Rwanda, Bruxelles, 1954).
- IDEM A summary of ethnohistory of Rwanda, Butare, 1972. (Un abrégé de l'ethnohistoire du Rwanda, Butare, 1972).
- KANYAMACUMBI (P.), Society, culture and political power in interlake dwelling Africa. Hutus and Tutsis in the old Rwanda, Kinshasa, 1995. (Society, culture et pouvoir politique en Afrique interlacustre. Hut et Tutsi de l'ancien Rwanda. Kinshasa, 1995).
- KAYUMBA (A.), "The Twa", Journal from Saint - Dominica Centre, n°2, 1996, pp 6383. ("Le Mutwa", Cahiers du Centre Saint - Dominique. n° 2, 1996, pp.63-83).
- KIMANUKA (Th.), "Corvées" and "Forced Labour" in Marangara from 1916 t 1959, Dissertation for a degree in History - Geograph, N.U.R., Ruhengeri, 1983. ("Uburetwa" et "Akazi" au Marangara de 1916 à 1959, Mém. De LIC. Histoire -Géographie, U.N.R.; Ruhengeri, 1983).
("Uburetwa et "Akazi" au Marangara de 1916 à 1959, Mém. de Lic. Histoire - Géographie, U.N.R., Ruhengeri, 1983).
- LOGIEST (G.), "Indiret christianization and cristallization of ethnic divides in Rwanda, 1925 -1931 ", African History Stdies and Documents (Louvain), 1978, pp. 12 (-163.)
("Christianisation indirect et cristallisation des clivages ethniques au Rwanda, 1925 -1931", Etudes et Documents d'Histoire Africaine (Louvain), 1978, pp. 12 (163).
- NEWBURY (C.), The cohesion of oppression. Clientship and ethnicity in Rwanda. 1860-1960, New York, Columbia University Press,

1988. NKUNDABAGENZI (F.), Political Rwanda 1958-1960, Brussels, 1962.
(Le Rwanda Politique 1958-1960, Bruxelles, 1962).
- NKURIKIYIMFURA (J.N.), Cattle and the Rwandese society. Historical Evolution from the XIIth - XIVth centuries to 1958, Paris, 1994.
(Le gros bétail et la société rwandaise. Evolution historique dès XIIè -XIVè siècles à 1958, Paris, 1994).
- REINTJENS (F.), Power and law in Rwanda. Public law and political evolution 1916 - 1973, Tervuren, 1985.
(Pouvoir et droit au Rwanda. Droit public et évolution politique 1916-1973, Tervuren, 1985).
- RUHARA (S.), RWAMASIRABO (S.), SENDANYOYE (G.), "Clientship, a custom which is essentially for Rwandese" Case law bulletin for indigenous tribunals of Ruanda-Urundi, 1947,pp.103-136.
("Le Buhake, une coutume essentiellement munyarwanda", Bulletin de jurisprudence des tribunaux indigènes du Ruanda-Urundi, 1947. pp. 103-136).
- RUTAYISIRE (P.), Christianizing Rwanda (1900-1945). Missionary and political method according to Bishop Léon Classe, Fribourg (Switzerland): 1987.
(La Christianisation du Rwanda (1900-1945). Méthode missionnaire et politique selon Mgr Léon Classe, Fribourg (Suisse), 1987. RUTERANA (J.M.V.), Butare School (1929-1962), Dissertation for a degree in History. N.U.R., Ruhengeri, 1987.
(Le Groupe Scolaire de Butare (1929-1962), Mém. Lic. Histoire, U.N.R., Ruhengeri, 1987).
- SAUCIER (J.F.), The Patron-client relationship in traditional and contemporary Southern Rwanda, New York, Columbia University, 1974.

UNITY UNDER THE FIRST REPUBLIC

Kigali, February 1999

UNITY UNDER THE FIRST REPUBLIC'

Introduction.

One cannot speak about unity under the first republic without mentioning this problem in the transitional period between November 1959 and July 1962. This period was marked by extreme ideology based on ethnicity in the dealings of politicians and in relationships of Rwandans among themselves. Those who followed this situation closely uphold that it is in this period where Unity among Rwandans vanished, because of the coming to power by PARMEHUTU Party which proved to be in favour of one ethnic group while discriminating another group.

Those who say so are right, but it can also be added that the fundamental principles of the colonisers which were based on racial discrimination reached a large scale when they were applied in the administrative institutions of the new government.

In this section we will put emphasis on how PARMEHUTU came to power and how it addressed the situation as regards unity after coming to power.

HOW PARMEHUTU CAME TO POWER

1.1. Vacuum following the death of MUTARA III RUDAHIGWA

King Mutara III Rudahingwa died in circumstances that remain unclear, on July 25, in Bujumbura. His death put an end to administrative collaboration between white people and Tutsi Chiefs. As seen in the first section, the Belgians' choice of their collaborators resulted into serious consequences in Rwandans' social relationships, their choice for new other collaborators and their integration into the new administration, due to the end of colonialism, increased misunderstanding and dissension among Rwandans.

Rwabugiri's succession to the throne was done in conformity with the legislation established by the Colonizers. Article 15 of law-Decree of 1952. which was also the Fundamental Law, stipulated, *"The King is he who is enthroned according to Common Law. However, he cannot exercise his powers before approval by the Governor"*:

In this section, the method applied differs from the one applied before, because participants to Rugwiro meetings did not ask any questions from which the Committee could start finding solutions as was indeed the case in the first section.

The most important things as regards royal succession were respected. The heir was chosen by a few Kings secret advisors " abiru" who were still alive, because this institution met serious opposition from the colonizers. The new king was sworn in before the Governor at Kigali on October 9, 1959, was approved and undertook to reign as a Constitutional monarch. No coup d'Etat as some writers claim, took place because the laws were applied as provided for. Rather, it is the option for regency, as the Governor and the Resident wished (instead of immediately enthroning another king), which was not in conformity with laws.

To reassert the value of the culture in this way at that time whereas there was no consultation with the colonial administration, had bad consequences because the royal court's relations and the colonial administration kept on worsening. This became more obvious since the establishment of political parties in September 1959 (see part 1).

1.2. Killings of November 1959

The killings which took place within the first half of November 1959 broke out when there was social as well as political turmoil. Such a turmoil was mainly caused by the lack of confidence as mentioned above between the monarchy and its supporters and the colonial administration and its supporters. There was also activities of political parties which sew dissension among people.

The killings were sparked off, reportedly, by the fact that chief-assistant Mbonyumutwa was assaulted by UNAR militants; another version has it that this was staged. The result of this assault is the rumour that spread out saying that he was killed by UNAR.

The killings were in two stages: the first stage is the hunting down and killing of Tutsi Chiefs in central and northern regions of the country. The other stage is that the monarchy supporters got their revenge by hunting down and killing some of PARMEHUTU and APROSOMA leaders in the south of the country.

There was much damage: many houses were burned down, people were killed, others fled (some went to Bugesera, others abroad), other people lost their property, ...

Despite the fact that there have been killings directed against ethnic groups, the monarchy, at that time, was still regarded as the pillar for unity among the masses, because there are some wrong doings whose perpetration was said to have been ordered by the King. Ethnic consciousness had not yet gained ground.

Tutsis were not yet persecuted, Tutsi Chiefs were the ones who were hunted down. There are regions, such as Kibungo and Cyangugu, which never experienced these killings at that time, the killings reached those regions later brought by PARMEHUTU and the Belgian administration.

During the killings of November 1959, the Belgian administration did nothing to stop them whereas it had the capacity to do so. There is much evidence to the effect that those administrators knew that these killings could break out. The situation changed

later on after Colonel Logiest arrived in Rwanda, on November 9, as the Commander-in-Chief of the Belgian and Congolese armed forces to restore security. After a few days, Logiest became Resident with special power (Special Resident) because he seemed to have no supervisor. He played a major role in PARMEHUTU's accession to power.

After consultation with Bishop Perraudin and Kayibanda, Logiest soon chose a political agenda to be followed. He presented it to territorial administrators in their meeting of November 17 in clear words, saying : *"We must help order elements and fight against disorder elements, i.e. we must collaborate with Hutus and combat Tutsis, because some will be obeyed by people while others cannot"*.

To achieve this, he adopted many strategies, mainly aimed at destroying UNAR and doing his best to exclude Tutsis from new institutions which were to be set up in the period of political autonomy leading to the first Republic.

One strategy which brought PARMEHUTU to power among the many it adopted was dismissing Tutsi Chiefs and Chief-assistants and replacing them by provisional Chiefs and Chief-assistants from PARMEHUTU, APROSOMA and RADER. He had no difficulty doing this because after the killings of November 1959, 23 chiefs (out of 45) and 158 chief-assistants out of 489) had been imprisoned, killed or had exiled. A few who had remained in power were dismissed.

The Governor and King condemned that act which was against the laws because Article 17 of Law-Decree of 1952 provides that it is the King who appoints chiefs and chief-assistants. But this had no effect. Resident Logiest explained such an act saying that it was the State's Necessity.

Provisional leaders, appointed by Logiest in the early 1960's, conducted a campaign for PARMEHUTU ideologies centred on

- solidarity of Hutus,
- hatred against Tutsis saying they are foreigners who oppressed Hutus,
- rejecting monarchy and its pillars such as Kalinga and Ubwiru (esoteric code).

These authorities are also the ones who contributed to uprooting the monarchy from the minds of people by eliminating UNAR roots thus contributing to PARMEHUTU's victory in elections which were planned.

Such an act was followed by the dissolution of the National High Council and its permanent bureau, in 1960, to be replaced by an extraordinary provisional council. That extraordinary council was made up of representatives of four main political parties. Such a council was also set up within the framework of political autonomy put in place by the Belgians; as the Belgian Government had planned in a new programme on November 10, 1959, for Rwanda - Urundi. Logiest progressively entrusted PARMEHUTU with that political autonomy.

1.3. Elections of June-July 1960

Communal elections were held first and were followed by parliamentary elections. Before communal elections, there are major activities which led political parties to be in conflict with each other

- The forum RADER, APROSOMA and PARMEHUTU rebelled against monarchy. This was explained in a telegram sent to the King of Belgium. PARMEHUTU proclaimed it in its congress held at Gitarama on May 8, 1960, when it changed its name and named itself the Republican Movement for Democracy.
- PARMEHUTU, with the intention of showing that it did not support monarchy.

After this, UNAR left the extraordinary provisional Council and said that it would not participate in Communal elections, because, as they said, they were not based on true democracy. This UNAR's idea was supported by many countries in the UN.

To ensure UN does not rule out the elections, the Belgian regime approved them saying they were central administrative elections to appoint burgomasters and councillors, but not political elections. Afterwards, it was proved that this was wrong.

UNAR condemned these elections, but placed much confidence in the UN hoping that the latter would prevent or dissolve them in case they were held. Such was not the case because the UN could not prevent the Belgian regime from acting as it pleased given the fact that it supervised the country. Even later, after the elections the UN did not dissolve them because elections monitors said they were well conducted, in transparency, and that the fact that UNAR had not participated in these elections had not had any bad effect.

Communal elections were held between June 26 and July 30, 1960. These elections were held in a very bad atmosphere, and were characterized by criminal acts, terrorism and fraud carried out mainly by Logiest and the parties he supported all this was directed against UNAR and its supporters. These are examples

- a communiqué by Logiest inviting people to avoid UNAR,
- campaigning against the monarchy, the King and Tutsis,
- criminality orchestrated by new leaders against Tutsis,
- an order forbidding UNAR to hold political meetings and to publish writings. Logiest reserved the right to publish articles (campaigning for PARMEHUTU),
- many criminal acts whose perpetrators were not punished by the regime.

These are the reasons why RADER left the forum of parties before elections as a way of denouncing PARMEHUTU's terrorism in politics. These communal elections appointed 229 burgomasters and 2896 councillors. PARMEHUTU obtained 74% of votes, while 21 % abstained. From that period PARMEHUTU controlled almost all the communes. It monopolized power at local level whereas it is local authority which is essential because it is closer to people. Those who analysed the situation closely found that if UNAR had participated in elections, the overwhelming representation of PARMEHUTU in local

administration could not reach such a scale. Admittedly, UNAR's abstention allowed PARMEHUTU to spread countrywide even in territories where UNAR had the most supporters.

After these elections, a provisional council was set up, made up of 48 members and a provisional government comprising Rwandan and Belgian ministers and secretaries of state. The majority of ministers and secretaries of state were from PARMEHUTU. This is not surprising following the elections that had taken place.

Putting in place these institutions in this way plunged the country in a deadlock, because, given the laws in force at that time, that government was said to be the King's government whereas he himself had condemned the procedure of setting up those elections, he also condemned the elections that were organised while he was outside the country (he left in June 1960).

Parliamentary elections were also another big step which allowed PARMEHUTU to further control higher Government institutions. Politicians from all parties agreed upon organising parliamentary elections. What they did not agree upon was the method of organising them. PARMEHUTU and APROSOMA parties counted on the benefits that they could get from elections which they wanted to be held as soon as possible. UNAR had expressed its views before and even at the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. This session requested the UN to monitor these elections, amnesty, to be declared and internal refugee camps to be dismantled to allow displaced people to return to their property and the provisional Government and Council to be dissolved.

In its Resolution n° 1579, the UN General Assembly criticized the Belgian administration and requested that negotiations of all parties on monarchy be organised. Belgium complied with the UN resolution and organised a meeting that brought together representatives of major parties at Ostende from January 7 to 12, 1961. This meeting was a hope of reconciliation but the meeting did not yield any results. Its organisers had a plan in mind which they wanted to carry out, and that plan consisted in organising elections rapidly so as to abolish monarchy. The elections were postponed at the UN's request.

This resolution was regarded by the Resident and PARMEHUTU as a defeat. Such is the reason why they did their best so that by the time of holding elections the situation would be in their favour. To achieve this, the Resident concocted a plan to catch unawares the UN because he considered the UN to be an obstacle to Hutu's administration.

Resident began by granting Rwanda independent administration with all the powers, on January 15, 1961. This decision was against UN instructions. It soon changed Rwanda into a Republic, with a Government made up of Rwandan Ministers except for the ministry of Foreign Affairs and of Defence. Then followed the conception and implementation of what they called "The Coup d'Etat of Gitarama".

On January 28, 1961, all the burgomasters and Councillors who were invited went to meet the Minister of Internal Affairs. The Resident and territory officers sent cars to pick them up. Logiest and a group of Belgian paratroopers were in charge of their security. On the agenda those who attended the meeting had a pretext of discussing security issues and restoring peace in the country.

However, because of the important leaders of PARMEHUTU and APROSOMA, the meeting put a completely different complexion on things. Those present at the meeting decided to establish a republic, together with related institutions.

- President: Dominique Mbonyumutwa
- National Assembly made up of 44 deputies (40 seats for PARMEHUTU and 4 for APROSOMA) with Gitera as Speaker
- Cabinet was appointed by Gr. KAYIBANDA,
- Constitution : was only a symble, because it was never published in the Official Gazette and was not approved by the country which colonized Rwanda whereas the country continued to apply colonial legislation till independence.
- The supreme court was chaired by 1. Nzeyimana (but became operational after independence).

The decisions made at Gitarama were accepted by the Resident. UN envoys, who were at Bujumbura on that day, and Belgians who did not recognize Logiest's administration were surprised. In their reports, these envoys stressed the important role played by Belgians in the Coup d'Etat of Gitarama. This report was approved by the UN General Assembly in its Resolution n° 1605 of March 27, 1961, because it condemned the Belgian administration and fixed the period for holding elections(August 1961) and requested that a broad-based transitional government be put in place, and requested that provisional leaders be suspended.

The Government's and National Assembly's activities were then said to be suspended pending parliamentary elections, but, to tell the truth, this was a pretext. Ministers and communal leaders were not suspended.

The same thing took place as experienced in the first elections, election campaign was characterized by criminal and terrorist acts in most parts of the country. Behind these acts were mainly PARMEHUTU supporters (especially at communal level), they we're directed against UNAR followers and Tutsis. Many people were again killed, houses were burned down, people fled and others were displaced, ... To determine political party membership, different colours were used both in campaigns and in elections, this increased terrorism. Because of all these acts, a question arises to know whether these elections were valid.

The Belgian regime completely objected the King's having a role in elections allegedly for the purpose of political stability. In March 1961, a UN envoy said that there was, in Rwanda, a sectarian and dictatorial regime that was being established, that a regime of oppression was taking over.

Another fact is that the Resident's officers were punishing only UNAR followers or Tutsis who had gone against the laws, but PARMEHUTU supporters were not punished for their offincers. This proves that the Resident aimed at supporting only

one party. Parliamentary and monarchist elections were held on September 25, 1961. Parmehutu got 35 seats (77.7% of votes) in Parliament, UNAR got 7 seats (16.6 % of votes, but UNAR's deputies had fled the country in May 1962), APROSOMA got 2 seats (3.5% of votes). Regarding elections on Monarchy and King, the result was similar to the result from Gitarama meeting : 80% of voters rejected monarchy, therefore Rwanda moved from "Tutsi Monarchy" into "Hutu Republic". Political players were not the same but their motto of divisionism and discrimination policy which characterized the colonial regime intensified.

In February 1962, UN tried to reconcile Rwandans by appointing mediators who were representatives of Guinea, Liberia and Senegal. Mediators started negotiations bringing together Rwanda Government's representatives and UNAR, and reached an agreement known under the name of "The New York Agreement". Among the Government's concessions were to repatriate refugees

. and to concede two ministries while leaving administration of some prefectures and sub-prefectures and the management of the Bureau in charge of refugees to UNAR. Apart from two ministries which were entrusted to UNAR members, E. Africa (Ministry for Livestock) and F.X. Ncogozabahizi (Health Ministry) in a reshuffle of May 1962, all its other concessions were not carried out.

The search for unity of people was not the major concern of the authorities because they wanted to monopolize power and its advantages. In its session of March 23, 1962, the National Assembly, all deputies, except for those from UNAR, adopted that reconciliation of Rwandans was not an urgent issue. It is also known that Gr. Kayibanda could not reach a common understanding with Tutsis, because he felt extreme hatred towards this understanding, even though some PARMEHUTU leaders were no like him.

The Management of PARMEHUTU Policy

The Parmehutu Regime was not based only on racial discrimination but also on religious discrimination. This is clear in the Constitution approved on November 24, 1962 (later amended in 1963 and 1973).

Even though this Constitution stressed equality with no discrimination of origin, gender or religious denomination, favouritism (as in Articles 3,16,17,33) which was characterized by favouring the Catholic Church and ignoring other churches. In most part of this text (especially in the preface and in Articles 28,29,38,39: Church wedding equals civil wedding, polygamy is prohibited, official oath is based on God, Catholic Church-owned Schools have a respectful place, communism was condemned. It was the only constitution in Africa to mention communism, which was against the right to expression and political association. Divorce was approved after many difficulties. PARMEHUTU leaders never conceal their adhesion to the Catholic Church and their gratitude towards leaders of that church.

Massacring political opponents and Tutsis

When PARMEHUTU came to power it did not abandon terrorism and the acts of eliminating its opponents and Tutsis. The Constitution of 1962 recognized

multipartism in its Article 10. But since 1964, PARMEHUTU soon became one single party because other parties absent. Different reasons explain the absence of these parties.

APROSOMA was victimized by its founder because he was someone who had no stable decisions, with no specific political programme, the party was also undermined by the Parmehutu policy of egocentrism and terrorism like in Butare Prefecture from 1961 till 1963 where some of its leaders were persecuted, imprisoned, etc.

RADER wanted to stay in between UNAR and PARMEHUTU but was unable to because politics was progressively showing sectarianism and sowing dissension among the two parties. It abandoned politics in 1963. The Government beheaded it because when the Inyenzi attacks in Bugesera, it killed its leaders : P. Bwanakweri, L. Ndazaro and C. Karima.

UNAR was persecuted by the colonial rule and white fathers because it was characterized by giving priority to patriotism, the King, independence and was also victim of its relations with socialist countries members of the UN. It played a role in parliamentary elections in 1961, entered the broad-based government from February 1962 until February 1963. It did not send representatives in the election of 1965 and afterwards.

Because of persecution, UNAR was undermined by the split into two parts, one inside the country which was recognized by laws, and another outside the country. The abroad UNAR also broke into many factions: supporters of monarchy, centrists, socialists, supporters of the use of military forces, The youth of UNAR who were supporters of the Military option are the ones who carried out activities that destabilized security after independence, they conducted their activities within the Inyenzi Rebellion, with the aim of overthrowing by force the regime in place.

Around 1965 UNAR's political branch abroad had just vanished because of long internal conflicts, based mainly on the management of assistance given by countries which supported it. As for the attacks by Inyenzi, they had decreased after 1963-64 until 1967. In the meantime, those in charge of security were strong enough to deal with those attacks.

Criminal acts directed against UNAR were many, constant terrorism, unjust imprisonment, murder, ban on meeting, abductions, stealing votes, forced exile, etc. Political life had become challenging for members and leaders of UNAR. This terrorism and criminal acts were conducted by PARMEHUTU and Logiest. They were aimed at destroying UNAR.

The climax for these acts occurred in 1963. The attack by Inyenzi in Bugesera was an opportunity for Government on which it based to eliminate some leaders of UNAR and RADER and perpetrated genocide against Tutsis in some regions. Those leaders of opposition parties were arrested on the day when the Inyenzi attacked. They were shot dead at Ruhengeri by policemen under the command of the Belgian soldier named Pilate, with no judgement.

At that time, Tutsis were also hunted down as a way of revenge. This lasted for around one week after the Bugesera attack. Cabinet members were sent in their prefectures of origin with instructions to "create civil self defence committees". It is in this time that in Gikongoro killings claimed lives of many people following the prefet's instructions.

Reliable estimates showed that the number of victims was between 10 000 and 14 000 throughout the Country, half of them being of Gikongoro.

This persecution caused other people to flee to neighbouring countries. The killings of 1959 did not cause many people to flee. Many Tutsi refugees (as well as a few Hutus and Twas) fled since 1960, especially during campaigns and elections of communal leaders.

Most people fled after elections of administrative institutions and the Referendum in September 1961.

Though there are people who don't want to say that these killings of 1963-64 were "genocide", many people agree to say that the Country experienced "horrendous killings", directed against Tutsis in many regions of the country from December 1963 until January 1964.

However UNAR, the branch which was inside the country had condemned the terrorism of Inyenzi after their attack of July 4,1962. And there was no conclusive evidence to the effect that it had participated in preparing those attacks, except an unclear document, on which were written names of those who were to enter Government in case of Inyenzi's victory, which had been found on the body of one of the attackers.

PARMEHUTU did not need to do all this. It feared nothing at all because it monopolized power. It had no reason to fear its opponents because the latter did not share a common understanding within their parties.

The fact that PARMEHUTU opted to act in this manner finds explanation in the fact that there is a group of its leaders who had the intention to isolate their party from others. Such a monopoly is a legacy from the colonial rule which did not prepare the Rwandan elite to a competitive political administration without killing each other. Rather this power inculcated in them that the key-positions in political institutions were very few and that they had to be monopolized. This is also expressed in their strong envy to serve personal interests which characterized those who were in the administration of the first republic.

REGIONALISM AND POWER MONOPOL Y

The priority of the regime which was Hutu's accession to power soon proved to have no political agenda, after attaining its goal.

As said above MDR-Parmehutu had become a unique party even before it was called "the National Party" in its congress of October 23, 1966. Before this date, it was clear that Parmehutu was the equivalent of many institutions in the government. The President of the Republic was also the chairman of the party,

ministers played a major role in higher organs of the party, important deputies were in the party secretariat in territories, etc....

The fact that Parmehutu had no objectives for the country and all its people became obvious especially since the time when the common enemy, the Inyenzi Rebellion, no longer represented a threat to the country.

A Report commissioned by the President of the Republic which was drafted by deputies in 1964 but was not published, showed that, at that time, Parmehutu had not well administered the Country. Many people were imprisoned without file, the judiciary was weak for unclear reasons (through conflicts within the Supreme Court), there was regionalism, tribalism especially in the north, various territorial administration levels did not function well, conflicts based on interests or quarrels were many, the party on power was not operating well because it did not recognize freedom of speech.

This report was submitted to the President of the Republic, and not to deputies to be discussed by them, but many people exchanged views on its conclusions.

Problems like these were also considered in Parmehutu's national Congress held on October 23, 1966. It was said that party leaders were characterized by the lack of zeal and effort, applying racial discrimination, subversion, corruption, opportunism, etc...

Another commission of deputies, set up on July 4, 1968 by the National Assembly whose speaker was Bicamumpaka, came to similar conclusions. Its report discredited several politicians, starting by Kayibanda himself who used the communal forest to fire bricks in his own brickworks. That commission condemned favouritism, terrorism, politization, impunity and the fact that Parmehutu had lost credit.... . Somewhere it said: *"the commission finds that it can assert that what the Hutu administration has undertaken to fulfil is progressively showing less zeal in its effort"* (p.97).

Again no discussion on this report took place in the National Assembly , but the conclusions were read. Another point is that politicians broke into two parts those who supported the report and those who were against it especially in the President's office and in the party secretariat at national level. These found that the authors of that report and its supporters had become opponents to the regime, they had deviated from the "political line". This is the reason why 18 deputies, including the Speaker of the National Assembly, were excluded from the party and from those eligible in the 1969 elections. This was made possible because even though the Constitutions provided that the President was accountable to the National Assembly as the Head of Government, he too controlled the Assembly as the party Chairman !

The National Congress of July 1967 restructured the party and put in place organs similar to those functioning democratically because all was planned from local levels, from people who were the voters. In reality, all was based on those chosen during the selection of candidates.

A group of a small number of people from the party general secretariat carried out this selection . All the decisions were taken by the party chairman and the executive secretary, who had necessarily to be Kayibanda's confident. Those "democratic" institutions therefore canceled their sticking to power by appointing informers for party leaders from the top down to the bottom level.

Within PARMEHUTU there were many conflicts of several kinds, based on

- Social relationships : this happened in all prefectures ; an example is the conflict between "the former party leaders" and "the new party leaders", some conflicts became a story such as those referred to as " poisoning" (in the end of 1965) between Calliope Mulindahabi who was Kayibanda's favourite and J.B Rwasibo;
- Churches : Catholics and Adventists in Kibuye;
- Clans : especially in the north,
- Misunderstanding between leaders of all categories;
- Regions : between Butare and Gitarama, until Butare was excluded from Politics after APROSONIA was no longer existing, between the north and the south (the problem of land estate which was in the process of abolition but the bill disappeared and was not submitted to the National Assembly since 1964 because of people from the north). In one region there was sectarianism between PARMEHUTU followers between Gisenyi and Ruhengeri, etc...

Between 1959 and 1962, Parmehutu followers shared the unity based on fighting Tutsis. The party's functioning was based on cells, groups and regions. Since 1964 to 1965, Parmehutu became an Institution to put in place and to reinforce political clientelism. The ideology limited itself to reviving the past, attributing all the mistakes to Tutsis calling them foreigners who brought all the bad things. That ideology based on words without sound lessons and an expression which tended to change things but by promoting racial discrimination and persecution acts.

The more power tended to go in the hands of a clique until this was achieved in 1972, the more ground Parmehutu was losing. In the beginning Parmehutu was predominant in Butare, Gitarama and Ruhengeri areas; other prefectures had no important role in politics. In the last days of the first republic, Parmehutu survived in the group of "people from Gitarama" and others who followed Kayibanda. In the last cabinet that was put in place on February 21,1972: out of 18 ministers, 6 were from Gitarama (1/3) . This power monopoly by a group of people from Gitarama created jealousy among others who nurtured opinions based on regions.

3. THE END OF THE FIRST REPUBLIC

We have dealt with conflicts that characterized MDR-Parmehutu's regime. We have also seen how this party which was on power was unable to defend the interests of all Rwandans and those of all its followers. Before this party was ousted, this regime once again planned the hunting down of Tutsis so as to cancel its difficulties.

Troubles of February to March 1973

The Killings that started in February 1973 were aimed at dismissing Tutsis within three sectors: education, administration and trade.

There is a connection between these troubles and the genocide of Burundi Hutus, which took place from April to May 1972. The fact that some Burundian refugees were on the Rwandan territory increased the will of some politicians to avenge their "fellow Hutus". But there are other solid roots, specific, based on the regime in Rwanda which were behind these troubles.

Hunting down Tutsis began in school establishments (Shyogwe, Byimana and Kabgayi). Before the situation became critical, a meeting was held at Kavumu (at the President's Residential House) between the President and students' delegations from Byimana and Shyogwe, the party executive secretary and the minister of education.

This hunting down of Tutsis reached other school establishments and University. Lists drawn up and established by the "Students' Movement" called "the Public Salvation Committee" were distributed every where in school establishments, and mentioned names of Tutsi students who were requested to "escape" or flee the country. After school establishments it was the turn for civil servants and private operators, the same method was used to publish the lists drawn up by those "Public Salvation Committees".

Dismissing many people included killings, as was the case in Josephite Brothers' Centre at Kabgayi. In some prefectures, such as Gitarama Kibuye, Kibungo, Gisenyi and Cyangugu, houses of Tutsis were burned down and people killed.

One part of Parmehutu leaders was not happy seeing Tutsis occupying over 10% of positions reserved for them in economy, education, secondary and higher institutes. They gave an example of the Butare School Establishment where Tutsis in 1972 represented around 46% (120 out of 260) and at University with 40% (200 students out of 500).

Kayibanda, from long ago, had wanted to bring things to "ordinary figures". This is one of the reasons behind the conflicts between the Catholic Church and the Government concerning the law of 1966 on education. The regime and the management of schools (especially in official examinations found it difficult to apply the balance based on ethnic group in schools. As for the regime, supported by one part of religious people, wanted to change the situation so as to apply the balance.

In the second stage, conflicts took another shape to become revenge and confrontation between the northern part, central part and the southern part.

In that period, the regime kept silent, which proved its collaboration in the confrontation and victimization. The message called "the message of peace" by the President was delivered only on March 22, 1973, almost at the same time as the message by Catholic bishops was delivered after their meeting held from March 19 to 24, 1973.

Two explanations are given on the role which might have been played in these conflicts. For some observers, politicians from Gitarama began these troubles. For others, it is army commanders who wanted to show that to seize power by force was justified, because the regime in place had lost its value and it was overwhelmed by the situation. Whatever the explanation (discussions will be settled by the explanations which will be provided by those present) hunting down Tutsis was a farce that was commonly used and which was necessary to both parties, so as to achieve their goal. It enabled them to change the problems that were in their administration (conflicts, centralization, regionalism, etc)or to hide the thirst for power for some leaders.

This way of changing the problem is often used by a regime which has many problems which it cannot or does not want to solve adequately. Under the first republic, the regime often adopted this way of changing the problem such as in 1959 to 1961 and between 1963 and 1965.

NATIONAL ARMY'S IN VOL VEMENT IN POLITICS

Because of the increasing misunderstanding in his regime Gregoire Kayibanda was progressively isolated and remained with a few favourites.

This can be expressed by his act of sending far from Kigali military officers from the north, replacing prefects (9 out of a total of ten and foreign highranking officials (except two) ...etc... A bad atmosphere of misunderstanding and suspicion intensified gradually among politicians and the people.

The 1969 to 1973 term in office was to be his last in conformity with Article 53 of the Constitution which provided for three limited consecutive mandates. This article was modified when the Constitution was amended on May 18,1973; this limited number of mandates was suppressed. The MDR -Parmehutu's Congress of February 24, had somehow provided for this because it accepted Kayibanda's run for the presidency.

The ceremonies that marked the 11th independence anniversary took place while preparations to seize power were under way. The President himself felt it , because, in his speech for the occasion, said, *"if anyone feels he has more power than me to lead the Country (...) , I challenge him to replace me "*.

In the night of July 4 to 5, the national security guards, under the command of Major General Juvenal Habyarimana, seized power. Either the coup had been prepared, or was prompted by the fact that the defence minister defended himself as put forth by some people. This problem has not yet been explained clearly.

From the late (1960s) sixties the national army had avoided involvement in the conflicts which had disbanded Parmehutu . It is when the regime of the first republic started to be undermined by internal problems that the army also began to enter politics.

Its delayed open entry into politics is explained by the fact that it was new. Belgium avoided creating "volunteers" to make up Ruanda - Urundi Army. The "mandate" agreement did not allow Belgium to do so, but "trusteeship" agreement in Article 3 allowed Belgians to do so in 1960.

It is in May 1960 that Logiest took the decision to create a Territorial Guard made up of 650 men : He wished to apply the ethnic balance (85% to be Hutus, while 15% were Tutsis).A higher Military Academy was established in Kigali. Recruits were from the north : the reason is that it was widely believed that Hutus from the North were the ones who were "pure" and that they were stronger than those of central part of the country and in the south, thus they would perform well their military service. This was requested and implemented by a politician from GITARAMA, Calliope Mulindahabi, who was minister of national security from 1961 to 1965.

His successor, Juvenal Habyarimana never changed this procedure.

A report by a commission of deputies in 1964 appreciated the national army saying it was a force made up of intelligent soldiers, with good reputation which had shown its skills and capacities in maintaining the national security and being apolitical. But this army could not keep distant from the bad atmosphere which was in the administration and among the people since 1965.

In his speech of March 1967 Kayibanda warned those within the army who had opinions to overthrow the regime. In 1968, a group of soldiers tried to overthrow the regime, but its plans were not very clear : It was either misunderstanding between soldiers or political interests. A high-ranking official in the Office of the President, Commander NYATANYI , reportedly, was involved. Though this did not yield any result, nonetheless, it proved that the armed forces could play a role in politics. This is what the army later proved in overthrowing the regime of the first republic meeting no resistance in 1973.

CONCLUSION .

How Parmehutu came to power and how it ran the country had bad consequences on Rwandans' relationships. This party which put forward unity based on ethnic group consolidated that unity among people, in the regime and administration, in justice, education and in the army. What Parmehutu claimed that it came to power to reconcile Rwandans and to defend the victims of injustice did not come true, because, those it said it was going to promote, it was proven later that it had forgotten them for ever, they were even isolated, then it introduced regionalism silenced their political ideas and killing its opponents.

IMPORTANT DATES (1959-1973)

1959

25th July

Death of King Mutara III Rudahigwa

28th August

Enthronement of Kigeli V Ndahindurwa

9th October	Kigeli V Ndahindurwa took the oath before the governor
September - October	Three main political parties were established
10 th October	Three chiefs were punished because of their bad behaviour, they had criticized Trusteeship / Tutelle in the UNAR's meeting
2 nd November	Statement by the Belgian Government. This statement used the wishes expressed by the committee set up by the ministerial law-decree of 16 th May 1959. The programme of the Government policy which was asking for establishing two phases : to establish a Government that will progressively become independent with Belgians, and (direct) elections of the National Council.
11 th November	Special periods. Within a few days later, G.Logiest was given the full power and capacity (Special Resident).
25 th December	The law-decree establishing provisional government in Ruanda -Urundi.
1960	
January	The National High Council was dismissed, and replaced by the
7 th -17 th January	Provisional Special Council. An investigation committee made up of three people was sent by the Minister of Belgian Congo and Ruanda - Urundi.
March	The UNO's envoys on special assignment dropped by Rwanda.
30 th April	The establishment of a general fund for the three political parties: RADER, APROSOMA and PARMEHUTU. 8 th May PARMEHUTU's Congress, at Gitarma. The party changed its name, and became Movement for Democracy and Republic which was abbreviated as MDR-PARMEHUTU.

May	The Special Resident established a unit to preserve national sovereignty (which later became the National Army). 20 th May UNAR withdrew from the Provisional Council and decided not to participate in the elections at the commune's level. which it said they were an obstacle to democracy.
June	The King left the country
26 th June - 30 th July	Elections at the commune's level.
18 th October	The establishment of a Provisional Council and Government.
7 th - 14 th December	A meeting bringing parties together was held at Gisenyi.
20 th December	The UNO's decision 1579 (XV) about the policy in Ruanda - Urundi in the next few days, and asking for a meeting in which would participate all parties before elections.
1961	
7 th 12 th January	A meeting bringing all parties together was held in Ostende.
15 th January	Autonomy (autonomie)
28 th January	Gitarama coup. The proclamation of the Republic and abolition of dictatorship held by PARMEHUTU's and. APROSOMA's leaders who were supported in that by the Resident.
25 th September	Government and Kamarampaka elections (dictatorial powers held by the King).
21 st December	Power exchange 1962
February	The establishment of a group of mediators within the UNO, between the representatives of the Government of Rwanda and UNAR. The New York agreement.
May	Cabinet reshuffle. Two authorized Ministers from UNAR : the Minister of Animal Resources and the Minister of Health.

1st July	Rwanda got Independence 1963
4 th July	The inyenzi's attack
21 st December	The inyenzi's attack in Bugesera, followed by killing RADER's and leaders, and even by pursuing Tutsis.
1964	
March	Report of M. Dorsnville, special envoy from the UNO Secretary