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ABSTRACT

AGENCY, IDENTITY, AND AUTHORITY IN RWANDA:
1950s POLITICAL RHETORIC AS A BRIDGE TO POST-COLONIAL GENOCIDE

By
Amanda E. Rollinson

May 2020

Thesis supervised by Robin P. Chapdelaine, Ph.D.

During the Rwandan genocide, Hutu targeted Tutsi and allies. Interpreting this complex event requires examining the late 1950s. Analyzing Tutsi and Hutu in central Rwanda in 1957 improves understanding of political and social context preceding the genocide. This study rejects that the genocide occurred as an inevitable event. Instead, it layers domestic actors with international groups: the White Fathers missionaries; the United Nations; Belgium; and the United States. Analyzing each group and synthesizing their interactions elevates Rwanda’s history from the falsehood of ancient adversaries to a complex, modern narrative. Studying Rwandan rhetoric and responses to it provides an opportunity to display and study Rwandan agency and identity. This research analyzes sources from Tutsi and the Hutu perspectives, the White Fathers, the UN Visiting Mission, and Belgian reports. It provides a complex understanding of each group’s actions. The study concludes by integrating the 1994 genocide,
therefore presenting a nuanced view of identity and group dynamics in this transformative time of Rwandan history.
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GLOSSARY

**Corvée:** French – a term found in French and Belgian imperial documents used to refer to forced labor, especially labor for a colonial superior by colonized peoples in a specific territory. Also used to refer to forced labor in Rwanda, including prior to colonialism.

**Évolués:** French – a pejorative colonial term used within Belgian colonies literally meaning ‘the evolved,’ meaning that the referenced group had ‘evolved’ out of their native state ‘into civilization’, and usually implied European education. In Ruanda-Urundi, the term could apply to either Hutu or Tutsi. Used in this thesis to maintain consistency with existing scholarship.

**Hutu:** Kinyarwandan – ethnic group in Rwanda and Burundi, distinct from a clan, with several centuries of dynamic lineage. In 1950s Rwanda, Hutu were the majority, approximately 85%, of the population; usually referenced in combination with Tutsi and Twa. (singular: mahutu, plural: bahutu)

**Mwami:** Kinyarwandan – term for ‘king’ in Ruanda-Urundi (plural: Bami)

**Ruanda-Urundi:** from 1922-1962, the name of the colonial territory approximately equating the twentieth century nation-states of Rwanda and Burundi. Previous to then, part of the German colonial region of German East Africa.

**Rwanda:** the nation-state recognized in 1962 by the United Nations as independent. Throughout this thesis, occasionally used as short-hand to maintain focus on central-southern area in the contemporary area of Rwanda and not imply the entire colonial mandate.

**Trusteeship Council of the United Nations:** a council established in chapters XII and XIII in the founding Charter of the United Nations. Assigned oversight over Trust Territories (former colonies) and the territories’ Administering Authorities (the metropole). Conducted visits to the Trust Territories every three years to inspect status and identify progress towards either self-governance or independence, as the Council deemed feasible.

**Tutsi:** Kinyarwandan – ethnic group in Rwanda and Burundi, distinct from a clan, with several centuries of dynamic lineage. In 1950s Rwanda, Tutsi were the minority, approximately 15%, of the population, usually referenced in combination with Hutu and Twa.

**Uburetwa:** Kinyarwandan – a type of taxation via agricultural labor created circa 1870s Rwanda that disproportionately was required of Hutu and, according to Jan Vansina, solidified the terms of ‘Hutu’ and ‘Tutsi’ as a class consciousness.

**Ubuhake:** Kinyarwandan – a relationship of clientship between a patron and client where the patron lends property (cows) to the client to care for, and in return the client receives protection. In this way, the clientship acted as a social adhesive. The term and practice traces back to the Nyiginya Kingdom in the 1600s and thus was significant to traditional culture.
Introduction

1955: “These wretched and stupid Hutu dare to challenge [the] total superiority [of the Tutsi]? It is unthinkable.”

Jean-Paul Harroy\(^2\)
Governor from 1955-1961 in Ruanda-Urundi

2001: “We may agree that genocidal violence cannot be understood as rational; yet, we need to understand it as thinkable...To show how the unthinkable becomes thinkable is my central objective.”

Mahmood Mamdani\(^3\)

There are two main events wherein Rwanda received mainstream international attention in the last three decades. The most recent is their adjacent position to North Kivu, the region in the Democratic Republic of the Congo experiencing the worst outbreaks of the Ebola virus in 2019-2020.\(^4\) The older, but more well-known, is the genocide of 1994. When news of the event broke in April 1994, articles and magazine covers swirled with photos of children, machetes, and soldiers. The media included maps to identify the small country in the heart of the Great Lakes of Africa, nestled between Lake Kivu and mountains scattered with volcanoes. For some, the region was only broadly familiar, especially those who followed the careers of Diane Fossey, Jane Goodall, Louis Leakey, and Mary Leakey.\(^5\) What pictures, maps, and news stories could not achieve in the initial period following the genocide was the shattering of the façade that seemed to cover the news. During the genocide, from April to July 1994, over half a million people were

---


\(^5\) Fossey worked in Rwanda and Goodall, Leakey, and Leakey worked in Tanzania during various stages of their scientific careers.
killed. Participants mostly targeted Tutsi, killing upwards of 75% of them, but they targeted thousands of Hutu as well.\footnote{Alison Liebhafsky Des Forges, “Leave None to Tell the Story”: Genocide in Rwanda (New York: Paris: Human Rights Watch; International Federation of Human Rights, 1999), 1.} Perpetrators executed ‘intimate killings,’ face-to-face assaults requiring the attacker be within arm’s reach of their victim, and did so with machetes as weapons. According to news sources, only hyperbolic phrases were sufficient to explain the events of the genocide. It was unbelievable. It was the logical result of colonialism, what else could one expect? It was “a vision of hell.”\footnote{Referring to the genocide as hell has been a common comparison and headlines (or articles or photos) rely on the term throughout publications, whether during to the genocide or recently, to encapsulate the violence. The Time magazine cover from 16 May stated, “There are no devils left in Hell. They are all in Rwanda,” similar to the cover from August that referred to the genocide as the “apocalypse.” David Orr, “Inside Rwanda’s Death Camp Hell,” The Independent, May 15, 1994, https://www.independent.co.uk/news/inside-rwandas-death-camp-hell-1436059.html; Jacques Langevin, “TIME Magazine Cover, 1 August 1994,” August 1, 1994, http://content.time.com/time/covers/0,16641,19940801,00.html; Frank Fournier, “TIME Magazine Cover, 16 May 1994,” May 16, 1994, http://content.time.com/time/covers/0,16641,19940516,00.html; “The Road Out of Hell,” The Economist, March 25, 2004, https://www.economist.com/special-report/2004/03/25/the-road-out-of-hell; Jessica Phelan, “100 Days of Hell: Rwanda’s 1994 Genocide in Photos,” PRI, April 7, 2014, https://www.pri.org/stories/2014-04-07/100-days-hell-rwandas-1994-genocide-photos; Jack Picone, “Rwanda: Capturing a Vision of Hell,” Al Jazeera, April 7, 2016, https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2016/04/rwanda-capturing-vision-hell-160407111638338.html; Pauline Holdsworth and Cate Cochran, “‘My Soul Is Still in Rwanda’: 25 Years after the Genocide, Roméo Dallaire Still Grapples with Guilt,” CBC, April 7, 2019, https://www.cbc.ca/radio/thesundayedition/the-sunday-edition-for-april-7-2019-1.5086008/my-soul-is-still-in-rwanda-25-years-after-the-genocide-romeo-dallaire-still-grapples-with-guilt-1.5086075.} It was Hell. That being said, in the last 25 years, key scholars and activists have successfully worked to change this narrative in order to gain a deeper understanding of both the event and process of the genocide. This thesis aims to do the same.

Much research exists on debating the events from April to July 1994, on the real and constructed memory of the events, on the genocide’s existence as a catalyst for the Congo Wars (1996 – 2008).\footnote{Des Forges, Leave None to Tell the Story; Timothy Paul Longman, Memory and Justice in Post-Genocide Rwanda (Cambridge, United Kingdom; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2017); Mamdani, When Victims Become Killers; Gérard Prunier, The Rwanda Crisis: History of a Genocide (New York City: Columbia University Press, 1997); Gérard Prunier, Africa’s World War: Congo, the Rwandan Genocide, and the Making of a... - Gerard Prunier - Google Books (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).} Out of these works, scholarship has clearly and definitively established that the
Rwandan genocide did not occur because of ancient tribal hatreds. Just as Christopher Browning argued in *Ordinary Men*, perpetrators and participants in the Holocaust were not uniquely evil, but average members of society. So too, Rwandans were not ‘more evil’ or ‘less civilized’ than others in Africa or around the world. These stereotypes are flawed, baseless attempts at categorizing this event. Instead, it is helpful to start with the understanding that the Rwandan genocide, as do all genocides, occurred as an outcome of historical actions and rational actors responding to, against, and between each other. This thesis argues that the process of the Rwandan genocide began in 1957 with political debates among Hutu and Tutsi elite that festered with the United Nations Trusteeship Visiting Mission later that year. In 1958, these debates ignited a divisive debate about power and roles of social groups in Rwanda’s future. The next year, a Social Revolution occurred when the debate turned violent. This thesis asserts that by studying the major political events of 1957 in south-central Rwanda (then, Ruanda-Urundi) and several significant groups of actors who interacted in those events, the roots of the genocide become more grounded, more thinkable. Emphasis on this time and place will illuminate Rwandan identity formation, therefore contextualizing power dynamics in Rwanda. Just prior to Independence and the genocide. These stories and analysis focus on the ethnic groups Hutu and Tutsi to understand identity formation and expression during this formative time. The cities of focus in this research are the central cities of Nyanza (the traditional royal capital of Rwanda), and Kabgayi (a significant mission of the European Roman Catholic order the Society of the Missionaries of Africa [the White Fathers]). With these cities as reference, this thesis discusses the perspectives of the national-level actors of United Nations, Belgium, the United States of America and the White Fathers to further understand the dynamic of Rwandan identity. The

---

specific study of the rhetoric of Rwanda’s nascent democratic political associations – The Conseil Supérieur du Pays (the CSP, the Rwandan king’s Tutsi-controlled advisory council) and évolutés (the Hutu counter-elites), as well as these external national-level actor’s responses, will further enable understanding identity by means of a comparative analysis of significant political exchanges. This comparative analysis in the larger context of 1957 and the broader trends of twentieth century actors in central Rwanda shows that Rwanda had begun the process of genocide decades prior to the event itself.10 Discussion of 1950s Rwanda, however, first requires a review of the Rwandan ethnic groups and of scholarly literature.

Hutu and Tutsi: Elaborate Origins

The terms ‘Hutu’ and ‘Tutsi’ – in combination with ‘genocide’ – are two prominent keywords used in a description of contemporary Rwanda.11 Frequently, these words are some of the only ones used to identify Rwanda, especially in a newspaper headline. With the prevalence of these words, it is easy to jump to the conclusion that these groups must have always existed in the same manner that they did in the late twentieth century. Divided. At war. Raging brutal violence. Unchanging. However, the perception of a binary construction of Hutu versus Tutsi

---

10 Enumerated as a process by Gregory Stanton in 1996 during his work in the US Department of State, these ten stages provide a helpful tool to understand such a destabilizing event as genocide. Other procedural understandings do exist, such as Adam Jones discusses. Gregory Stanton, “The Ten Stages of Genocide,” Genocide Watch (blog), 1996, https://www.genocidewatch.com/ten-stages-of-genocide; Jones, Genocide, 752–57.

during the genocide was a product not only of twentieth century colonialism, but also of at least three centuries of social transformation.

There is a kernel of truth to the idea that the Hutu, Tutsi, and Twa ethnic groups have an ‘ancient existence.’ As Jan Vansina has proven, the words ‘Hutu’ and ‘Tutsi’ themselves mean more than a category, and they have existed since at least the mid-seventeenth century. Since then, it appears that the terms went through several waves of social and linguistic use and these iterations, in combination with colonialism, resulted in the power dynamics discussed here. Initially, ‘Tutsi’ was a term self-selected by only some herders, whereas Hutu was “a demeaning term that alluded to rural boorishness or loutish behavior used by the elite.” Some also used the term ‘Hutu’ to refer to a servant or an otherwise subordinate, even if that person was Tutsi. Additionally, some used it to categorize foreigners. As early as the 1600s, ‘Tutsi’ and ‘Hutu’ had very specific linguistic meanings and social use.

By the mid-eighteenth century, partially due to an adjustment of the organization of the military, the terms took on another meaning. This revision formally institutionalized the Hutu-Tutsi binary, thus showing the beginnings of contemporary understanding of the terms. In the mid-1700s, ‘Tusti’ referred to combatants in the military. As the combatants tended to come from the ruling elite, who were also Tutsi, these two groups reinforced the naming convention. Likewise, the opposite of combatants are non-combatants, whom people referred to as ‘Hutu.’ The non-combatants tended to come from farming communities. Thus, the communities who supplied the people placed into each of these respective military roles came to take on the names

---

13 Vansina, 135; Jean-Pierre Chrétien, *The Great Lakes of Africa: Two Thousand Years of History* (New York: Zone Books, 2006), 190. Several grammatical examples exist of this usage, among them “he is not my Hutu.”
themselves of the roles. Hutus, as non-combatants, were the opposite of Tutsis, the fighters, just as farmers were opposite of herders.

In the mid-to-late nineteenth century, the terms saw the next wave of definition, again further institutionalizing the dichotomy. The king, mwami Rwabugiri, imposed forced labor onto those with farmland as a type of taxation for using that land. However, some Hutu were the farmers and Tutsi were the herders, this policy of uburetwa only influenced Hutu. This policy was a source of significant unrest and rebellion. These rebellions became the background of the tumultuous transition of royalty in the mid 1890s, including a coup. During all of this, the new king, Musinga, would seek stability, and aim to acquire it, through a partnership with Germany.

Tracing back the linguistic and social origins of Hutu and Tutsi begins to show the layered complexity of Rwandan society’s evolution with respect to these ethnic groups and provides vital background to understanding the relationships the Rwandan government leveraged during the genocide. However, this lineage does not answer what served as the main structure of social organization, at least up until German colonial incursion in 1897. What served that function, as Vansina and David Newbury’s research shows, were clans. Prior to the twentieth century, Rwanda had eighteen clans that formed the overall identification and social structure of society. Clans were inclusive of Hutu, Tutsi, and Twa. Each clan varied from the next based on the social, geographic, or military needs, but within the clans the social expectations of Hutu,

---

14 Vansina, Antecedents to Modern Rwanda: The Nyiginya Kingdom, 135.
18 Mamdani, When Victims Become Killers, 54.
Tutsi, Twa still held. Thus, the combination stitched together an intricate socio-political system that Rwanda’s future colonial rulers would misunderstand and ultimately manipulate.

Reviewing recent historiography proves that clans were the dominant social structure but also that the notions of Hutu, Tutsi, and Twa existed and had meaning, and it is clear that people utilized those categories. Reviewing culture again at Independence, ethnic groups (having replaced clans) were the dominant organization. Just as the meaning of Hutu and Tutsi evolved as social classifications, so did the social organization. It seems that most of the social classifications in preceding centuries emerged due to internal influences. The shift from clans to ethnic groups, however, resulted from external influences. Therefore, broadly considering external influences on Rwanda throughout the twentieth century can begin to illuminate this shift in social organization that later would include identity formation as Rwanda proceeded into Independence and out of colonial rule.

**Colonial Transition**

Rwanda first experienced European influence in the late nineteenth century after the Congress of Berlin divided central Africa into colonial territories for Britain, Germany, and Belgium. Germany imposed political power while French missionaries imposed Catholic doctrine. During the First World War, military victories switched parts of German East Africa to Belgian rule and saw them renamed Ruanda-Urundi. Belgians significantly manipulated Rwandan traditional social structures for their own political and economic benefit. The crux of this involved viewing members of Tutsi social group as superior to Hutu and Twa, and then transforming this belief into rhetoric, legal status, and educational opportunity for Tutsi.

19 J.J. Carney, *Rwanda Before the Genocide: Catholic Politics and Ethnic Discourse in the Late Colonial Era* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), Appendix 1, “Timeline”. Initially, most of the White Fathers were French but later they came from other European countries, significantly Switzerland.

With the creation of the United Nations after the Second World War, the new organization began overseeing Belgian control of Rwanda as a Trust Territory. The UN instated the goal of future independence. Belgium realized that continued manipulation of Tutsi (14% of population) over Hutu (84%) and Twa (1%) would not lead to a predictable or stable decolonization. Thus, Belgium began shifting their favor from Tutsi to Hutu.

Power dynamics began to shift within Rwanda just as colonial rulers did, too. Tutsi, not only in power during colonialism but also as kings in pre-colonial Rwanda, feared losing their long-held political control and their recently provided privileges. Meanwhile Hutu, exasperated with subjugation since even before European colonial contact, seized the opportunity for control. Groups formed, publishing arguments and goals, some forming into political parties. To provide structure to the move towards independence, Belgium introduced structural changes to Rwanda’s political system, and created the Conseil Supérieur du Pays. Similarly, the White Fathers (who themselves were also shifting their favor from Tutsi to Hutu) created an agricultural cooperative to provide training and resources for farmers. While not the first Rwandan political discussions to occur, it was from these groups that political dialogue featured more prominently. These political debates specifically included “Mise au Point” and “the Manifesto of the Bahutu,” and they entered the international stage.

Hypothesis. The discussion of this transformation and manipulation is a significant portion of Mamdani’s argument in this book.

21 Carney, Rwanda Before the Genocide, 273 and Appendix 1.
22 David Newbury, “Precolonial Burundi and Rwanda: Local Loyalties, Regional Royalties,” The International Journal of African Historical Studies 34, no. 2 (2001): 255–314. This is a complicated statement for two reasons. First, scholars have recorded the Nyiginya Clan as the ruling clan of royalty in Rwanda since the seventeenth century. While clan does not equal ethnic group, due to the rise of the Nyiginya Clan’s power that paralleled the use of ‘Tutsi’ to denote power and elitism, the clan’s identity become one of a Tutsi clan. (Vansina, Antecedents to Modern Rwanda: The Nyiginya Kingdom, 37.) Second, the king was in society but not of society, being an “intermediary” between several social categories but not within any of them as being the king was a sacred position above these categories. (David Newbury, “What Role Has Kingship?,” in The Land Beyond the Mists: Essays on Identity and Authority in Precolonial Congo and Rwanda (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2009), 250.)
23 This is the full name of the manifesto, in English. “Ba” is the Bantu linguistic prefix that denotes plural, thus future references to this document will be to “the Hutu Manifesto” to simplify the reading.
In 1959, when the Tutsi king died suddenly and mysteriously in Usumbura, Burundi under Belgian purview, Tutsi and Hutu political ambitions exploded.\textsuperscript{24} Both Hutu and Tutsi created political parties, some moderate and others extreme, all vying for power. Power grabs initiated a process of revolution under the guise of democracy. A Hutu party – the political and popular majority – achieved victory. But freedom from colonial rule in July 1962 did not end agitations. Tensions, competition, and retaliation escalated into diasporas through the 1960s and 1970s, the 1990 Civil War, the 1994 genocide, and the twenty-first century Congo Wars.

In September 1957, the UN Trusteeship Council had scheduled an advisory visit and, aiming to influence that visit, the CSP wrote “Mise au Point” describing their views on the status of Rwanda. Dissatisfied with their perspectives, the \textit{évolués} wrote a response, “the Hutu Manifesto,” and sent it to the Belgian Governor-General Harroy. These written discussions illuminate in Rwandans’ own words their preferences and objectives regarding their present and future. Since these two documents are self-reflective and so analysis of them, as well as Governor-General Harroy’s memoirs, United Nations trusteeship reports, United States Department of State records, Rwandan scholarly collections, and other primary sources, can lead to a deeper comprehension of Rwandan’s understanding of themselves and how this converges with the genocide. The 1950s was a watershed time in Rwanda where people discussed and tested what \textit{was} against what \textit{could be}. Primary sources, especially from 1957, highlight this tension and transition, and provide an opportunity to view alterations in Rwandan identity, both by their own writings and how other actors responded to them. These writings also show how the

\textsuperscript{24} There is not consensus on how mwami Mutara died. Prunier cites research that suggests either assassination covered by a vaccination, or anaphylactic shock from a vaccination of penicillin. Catharine Newbury records the official report as a brain hemorrhage, and Des Forges describes it as he “died unexpectedly” and points out that some Rwandans see nefarious conspiracy in this event. Prunier, \textit{The Rwanda Crisis: History of a Genocide}, 54; Catharine Newbury, \textit{The Cohesion of Oppression: Clientship and Ethnicity in Rwanda, 1860 - 1960} (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 193; Des Forges, \textit{Leave None to Tell the Story}, 38.
process of genocide began at this time, connecting the last pre-Independence years to the genocide.

**Exceptionalism of Sources**

Before concluding this introduction with a brief historiography and roadmap of the thesis, the exceptionalism of the sources needs to be acknowledged. The sources used in this thesis are valuable because they are a snapshot in time of sects of Rwandan society in their own words. However, they reflect pockets of the Rwandan population. The CSP were a mere thirty individuals, mostly Tutsi, in a newly formed advisory council who worked for the king. Even acknowledging that Tutsi comprised a small portion of the population, only a small number of them would ultimately work for the king, whether in the CSP or in other senior roles. Likewise, there is a similar issue with the document the *évolués* wrote. Only some Hutu received higher education that would enable them to write an academic argument fluently in a foreign language. Thus, neither of these sources can fairly or reasonably claim to speak for all Tutsi or all Hutu in Rwanda.

The fact that the Rwandan sources used here are in French also requires some explanation. First, there are other sources available in Kinyarwandan (Rwanda’s native language), but the author determined this language barrier too significant for the parameters of this project and instead focused on translations of French sources. Second, the fact that a significant number of sources exist in French (and not Kinyarwandan or even Flemish, Belgium’s other primary language) speaks to the original authors’ audiences, generally showing an audience that projects externally and international – towards colonial leaders and the UN – instead of internally – towards Rwandans. Arguably a document only in Kinyarwandan might only have an intended audience of Rwandans, regardless of ethnic group, possibly even intending to isolate European audiences. These writing in French instead of Kinyarwandan
further shows the exceptionalism of the CSP and évolutés writings. By the means of the chosen language, these authors intended their audiences to be either highly educated Rwandans or Western Europeans. Thus, not only are the groups self-selecting, but the chosen language of communication highlights further their exceptionalism.

Despite the clear exceptionalism of the sources, they are still valuable to this research. Historical studies should aim to use all reasonable, available resources to analyze past events, even if there may be known flaws or biases. Indeed, in the field of African History where scholars utilize both oral and written sources, this is a helpful reminder that no source is ideal and that all sources require interrogation. Nevertheless, even though these authors belonged to select populations and wrote in a European language does not disregard them as viable sources to analyze Rwandan history. These documents have, by means of their capture in writing, recorded arguments that enable contemporary researchers to hear from Rwandan voices. This value outweighs their exceptionalism.

**Historiography**

Comparing Rwanda at Independence to Rwanda during the genocide shows the vast changes experienced during the adjoining four decades. Rwanda’s social structures (the primary means of social organization) completed the shift from clans to ethnic groups and the leader of socio-political power inverted between these two events. Rwanda violently created a Republic independent from Belgian colonial rule, and experienced multiple diasporas that resulted in a local civil war and genocide. But how did these events happen? How did Rwanda shift from its culture in 1950s to that of 1990s?

---

25 With the Belgian introduction of identification cards by Hutu, Tutsi, or Twa in early 1930s, this began the social shift from identifying by clan to according to the still-forming ethnic groups. Prior to this shift, Hutu, Tutsi, and Twa were elements of Rwandan social but not singularly ethnic groups. It seems that no later than Independence, the shift from clans to ethnic groups was complete.
There have not been significant works in English dedicated solely to Independence or connections of early post-colonial Rwanda to the genocide. (Scholars having had similar discussions primarily seem to have had them only in French.) However, significant scholarly discourse exists on pre-colonial, colonial, and post-colonial Rwanda. Key pre-colonial scholars and works are: Jan Vansina, on the use of oral tradition and the legitimacy of the African studies as a historical field (Antecedents to Modern Rwanda); and David Newbury, on the role of kings and their chronology (Land Beyond the Mists and “Bringing the Peasants Back In”).

There are many works on colonial and post-colonial Rwanda, especially the genocide. These scholarly works include Mahmood Mamdani’s When Victims Become Killers, which assesses the Hutu transition from social peasant to perpetrators of the genocide and Gérard Prunier’s The Rwanda Crisis, which reviews Rwandan history in brief in order to provide context to his detailed description of the genocide. This cohort’s discourse also includes René Lemarchand’s Rwanda and Burundi, the first historical and political review of the two nations, and the requisite updates in Jean-Pierre Chrétien’s The Great Lakes of Africa, the comprehensive survey of the region from pre-history to contemporary events.

While there are some scholars who bridge events across pre-colonial and post-colonial Rwanda, some focus on a governmental, monarchical level (such as Alison Des Forges’ Defeat is the Only Bad News). Other works, due to their publication date, do not extend far enough into

27 Mamdani, When Victims Become Killers; Prunier, The Rwanda Crisis.
contemporary history to draw connections past the colonial era or connect it to the Rwandan genocide (such as Catharine Newbury’s *Cohesion of Oppression*). However, works such as these still provide vital context for study across Rwanda and highlight regional-specific studies that combat the notion that Rwanda is homogenous. Finally, there are two religious histories – Ian Linden’s *Church and Revolution in Rwanda* (1977) and J.J. Carney’s *Rwanda before the Genocide* (2016) – that both discuss the history of the missionary work of the Society of the Missionaries of Africa (White Fathers) in Rwanda over the twentieth century.

This thesis seeks to connect Mamdani’s work discussing the transformation of Hutu from the suppressed to the suppressor to Prunier’s approach of the genocide as a result of colonialism. It also seeks to advance approaches of Vansina, Lemarchand, and Chrétien also drawing from Linden and Carney, continuing to bridge the time of Rwanda’s self-rule with European religious and political intervention with that of its establishment as a modern nation. It also expands upon scholarly discussions of “Mise au Point” and “Hutu Manifesto,” which up until this point have discussed these documents but not thoroughly analyzed them. References to these two political texts in the current scholarship are limited to only a paragraph over the course of an entire book. This thesis challenges these limited discussions by other scholars by initiating analysis on “Mise au Point” and “Hutu Manifesto” and arguing that this analysis provides valuable insights to furthering discussion of Rwandan political identity. However, relevant literature is not limited to regional scholarship. A review of literature on the United Nations and how these
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Rollinson

works are in conversation with Africanist works further contextualizes this thesis’ discussion of 1950’s Rwanda in the era following the end of the Second World War.

Recent scholarship on the UN’s structure, purpose, and action does not agree on its institutional origins or to what meant to be engaged with the colonial world. However, scholars do agree that the UN was an imagined community and significant global actor in the twentieth century, and the desires of member nation-states ultimately limited the power of the UN.32

M. Todd Bennett focuses on public’s perception of the UN during the Second World War and argues that the UN’s existence as a cultural construct was an “imagined community.”33 This construct enabled its malleability, therefore allowing the American government to shape its construct to the popular psyche for the Allies strategic advantage during the war.34 This psychological manipulation, Bennett argues, literally shifted how people perceived the UN. Through this effort, their imagined construct of the UN transformed from isolationist and xenophobic to part of the “family of nations.”35 Mark Mazower argues that the origins of the UN, were a “way of imagining a new world organization.”36 He describes the UN as a “product of evolution not revolution,” essentially an extension of empire first with British then with


34 Bennett, One World, Big Screen, 5. Bennett specifically argues that the US government worked with Hollywood to make films as the public relations strategy to accomplish this task.

35 Bennett, 256–58.

increasingly American influence.\textsuperscript{37} He challenges what he identifies as anachronistic descriptions of the UN. He expresses that simply because contemporary scholars, and even citizens, view the UN as a bastion of idealism and internationalism, that does not mean this understanding is truly congruent with the UN’s origins or how the nation-state actors within the UN understood its creation.\textsuperscript{38} He further draws attention to just how imagined this community is when he identifies several perspectives of the UN’s Charter, stating that some members perceived it full of hope as an idealistic contract, while others saw it as “promissory notes…never intended to be cashed.”\textsuperscript{39}

William Bain also connects UN history to Anglo-Saxon historical roots. He asserts that the British first utilized the trusteeship system, and once created then worked its way into the League of Nations and United Nation’s foundational structure.\textsuperscript{40} Bain elaborates on the British trusteeship system (later incorporated in League mandates and then UN trusteeships), asserting that trusteeship is the structural manifestation of the White Man’s Burden.\textsuperscript{41} It is emplacing into an institutional system that the ‘civilized’ group were under a moral obligation to teach the ‘uncivilized’ until they transformed into or otherwise ‘proved’ their ‘civility’ (if such a thing was even possible in this relationship).\textsuperscript{42} Mazower, in his follow-up text to his 2009 work, seems to agree.\textsuperscript{43} He moves past origins of the UN and explores “the organized cooperation among nations” that led to not only the UN but other international organizations and what remains of

\textsuperscript{37} Mazower, 17–18.
\textsuperscript{38} Mazower, 17–18.
\textsuperscript{39} Mazower, 8.
\textsuperscript{40} Bain, \textit{Between Anarchy and Society}, 11. Trusteeship conveys the relationship between one nation – perceived to be uncivilized and immature – requiring the tutelage of a nation-state - perceived to be civilized and mature. With the creation of these international organizations and the consolidation of colonial territories under their control, the mandate / trusteeship relationship became the way of maintaining control over the colonies.
\textsuperscript{41} Rudyard Kipling, “The White Man’s Burden,” 1899, https://rpo.library.utoronto.ca/poems/white-mans-burden. This poem, while specifically referring to the US and Philippines, writ large serves as a commentary on colonialism. In short, Kipling says it is “the white man’s burden” to take the “half devil and half child” and ‘civilize’ them by any means necessary, including torture or death.
\textsuperscript{42} Bain, \textit{Between Anarchy and Society}, 1–2.
\textsuperscript{43} Mazower, \textit{Governing the World}. 
them today.\textsuperscript{44} Specifically, Mazower asserts that the UN Charter does not in actuality support colonial independence. Instead, it is a verbose veneer covering the system of colonial rule to give the impression of change in place of institutional reform.\textsuperscript{45}

Bennett told a tale of manipulation, Mazower one of pessimism, and Bain one of British influence, but these are not the only scholarly views on the history of the UN. Sunil Amrith and Glenda Sluga, like their peers, challenge the popular narrative of the UN while also articulating several new historical discussions of the organization. In their scholarship, they assert a fresh interpretation of the UN’s role in history.\textsuperscript{46} First, they challenge Bain’s argument and assert that the UN’s intellectual history is not only British or Western in scope, but instead universalist. Second, they emphasize the “complexity and contradiction” of the UN’s history, stating that calling out this tension between international and nation-states is a more accurate narrative for this organization.\textsuperscript{47} By recognizing that “the interests of sovereign states” had limited previous conversations, this then enables future discussions to fill in blind spots.\textsuperscript{48} Third, they argue that the UN has always placed an emphasis on – and thus successfully has reshaped - social elements of international society, as illustrated through the creation of WHO and UNICEF, for example.\textsuperscript{49} Lastly, they argue that the UN “is a historiographical actor in its own right,” not just for its own study but also as it worked to legitimize other areas of the world and convince others of their perceived worthiness of historical study.\textsuperscript{50} Rightfully so, they remind fellow scholars that “the tension between nationalism and internationalism … is at the very heart of the UN’s intellectual

\textsuperscript{44} Mazower, xiii.
\textsuperscript{45} Mazower, 253.
\textsuperscript{47} Amrith and Sluga, 257.
\textsuperscript{48} Amrith and Sluga, 253.
\textsuperscript{49} Amrith and Sluga, 261.
\textsuperscript{50} Amrith and Sluga, 253.
history, even if the former almost always prevailed.” \textsuperscript{51} The identification of this tension is what makes Amrith and Sluga’s article stand out among their peers. By modeling a non-binary historical discussion of the UN, they further reveal its complex nature.

Considering the recognition of human rights in this complex relationship of the UN and its function in international history furthers this historical conversation. Peter Stearns examines this relationship, considering how each internal action and human rights have both informed the other within the context of recent global history. He focuses on the modern era since this is when “human rights arguments become important enough, but also pervasive enough, for societies to quarrel over them.” \textsuperscript{52} Despite this importance, the products of human rights discussed were not as fruitful as hoped. Stearns points out, like each of his peers, that the priorities of the nation-state overpowered that of the UN’s Charter, as displayed when “[the United States, France, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union] balked at coming on too strong in the human rights domain, and this resulted in statements that were deliberately weak and vague.” \textsuperscript{53} Even though the nation-states frequently overshadowed the UN, Stearns still asserts the very mentioning of human rights in the Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights still indicated progress. Codifying ideas in writing resulted in legitimization of human rights was a point of discussion for member nation-states, and any nation-state who was a member of the UN implicitly understood that their agreement to join the UN meant they agreed to abide by these proclamations. \textsuperscript{54}

Samuel Moyn adds to this conversation of the history of human rights. As part of his broader thesis that the contemporary understanding of human rights did not enter society until

\textsuperscript{51} Amrith and Sluga, 273.
\textsuperscript{52} Stearns, \textit{Human Rights in World History}, xii.
\textsuperscript{53} Stearns, 126.
\textsuperscript{54} Stearns, 127.
the mid-1970s, he argues that the UN’s focus was not on human rights, much less not on
decolonization. He even asserts that decolonization occurred in spite of, not because of, the UN’s
work.55 While he states that it was at the UN where “the intersection of anticolonialism and
human rights occurred,” he also caveats to say the discussion of human rights was contingent on
the structure of the nation-state, not an international organization.56

This notion of the power of the nation-state that Moyn emphasizes is a common theme
for each of these scholars. Although communicated in various ways, each argues that the nation-
state had greater influence than and over the UN’s supranational idealist structure. Given this
consensus, it is helpful to consider this scholarly cohort in light of how scholars on colonial
Rwanda integrate and discuss the UN. Broadly speaking, the trend with works on Rwanda is that
scholars tend to not focus on the UN as a historical actor, but when they do, they credit the UN
as more influence than Belgium, Rwanda’s administering power.

The two scholarly works that tell the history of the White Fathers Catholic order in
Ruanda-Urundi both only discuss the UN as a necessary but ancillary actor. Ian Linden and Jane
Linden in their 1977 work speak only briefly about the UN. For example, one reference includes
the UN as a means to describe Belgium’s relationship with Ruanda-Urundi, but despite this
declared relationship that implied that Belgium had a goal for the trusteeship to independence, it
“was slow to set the wheels turning.”57 J.J. Carney’s work, the other scholarship on the Catholic
order of priests, similarly expresses tensions between Belgium and the UN, only really
incorporating the UN out of necessity.58 While identifying this power struggle between the

56 Moyn, 95.
57 Ian. Linden and Jane Linden, Church and Revolution in Rwanda (Manchester: Manchester University
Press, 1977), 222.
58 Carney, Rwanda Before the Genocide, 46–47.
international organization and the nation-state is both valid and important, their incorporation of this relationship does not extend into analysis, although this seems likely due to the indirect topical relevance for them.

While Gérard Prunier expresses similarly brief comments on the UN, Mahmood Mamdani and René Lemarchand significantly incorporate and emphasize the UN into their colonial portions of their historical discussions. Prunier only references the UN a few times and briefly each time. One of the few detailed references he incorporates emphasizes that a new Rwandan political party that aligned with the goals of “Mise au Point” was receiving financial support from Communist countries on the UN Trusteeship Council.\(^{59}\) While important to identify to enable an understanding the international political networks at play in this complex relationship, Prunier mentions this also akin to trivia before moving onto his next point. Thus, Prunier’s incorporation of the UN into his historical narrative is akin to the scholarship on the White Fathers – it is superficial and referential. However, Mamdani and Lemarchand’s incorporation of the UN into their works is more substantial. While Mamdani only briefly mentions the UN during Rwanda’s colonial era, he does so by giving it credit for Rwanda’s decolonization through democratic processes. In fact, he specifically circumvents Belgium saying, “Although administered by Belgium…Rwanda was a UN trust territory,” implying that the UN held the influence, not Belgium.\(^{60}\) This qualitative statement is more than just a description of the UN or its actions, it stakes a claim on the UN’s actions. Lemarchand advances this treatment of the UN when he, over several iterations in his text, discusses the UN in a similar

\(^{59}\) Prunier, *The Rwanda Crisis: History of a Genocide*, 47 & 52; Carney, *Rwanda Before the Genocide*, 107. The communist alliances on the Trusteeship Council specifically supported the main Tutsi party (UNAR), which was the same group that the Special Resident of Ruanda-Urundi, Guy Logiest, aimed to eliminate from 1959-1961 as he supported the Hutu political part’s so-called ‘legal coup’ gaining control over Rwanda.

\(^{60}\) Mamdani, *When Victims Become Killers*, 114.
way. Lemarchand attributes and somewhat praises the UN as being an “accelerator of change” in Ruanda-Urundi and then berates Belgium for its behavior.\(^{61}\) He articulates why the UN was a force of change (due to its act of setting a date of independence and forcing Belgium to incorporate democratic processes) and why he berated Belgium (due to its poor and unstable relationship with the UN). Then Lemarchand does something his peers do not do at all – he defends Belgium’s actions. After explaining how Belgium failed in its duties, he then explains Belgium’s perspective and why it acted as it did during the days of the social revolution in 1959.\(^{62}\) Therefore, the difference between Lemarchand’s work and his Africanist peers is that he is the most successful at teasing out the complexity of the relationship between the UN and Belgium. He does not shy away from assertions, but he also works to exam his assertions. This examination takes his work to an analytic level that uniquely explores the role of the UN in Rwanda and its relationship with Belgium.

Reviewing this selection of Rwandan scholarship shows that the methods used by the broader scholarship as it addresses the inherent tension in the UN proves to be true, but the inverse plays out in the colonial relationships of Ruanda-Urundi. This scholarship highlights the relationship between membership of the nation-states and the international goal of the UN. The additional aid of this scholarly overview is that it contextualizes the discussion of power regarding the 1957 Visiting Mission to Ruanda-Urundi. Although theory expresses that the nation-state overrode the UN, analyzing Ruanda-Urundi as a case study shows the opposite. As this thesis shows, the UN remained stronger than Belgium at least going into the 1950s.


\(^{62}\) Lemarchand, 110.
Overview

This introduction has provided an overview of the argument of the thesis, which is to discuss identity formation of Hutu évolués and the Tutsi-majority CSP in Kabgayi and Nyanza in 1957, and to relate this identity formation to assist in better understanding the Rwandan genocide in 1994 by displaying it as the beginning of the process of genocide. Additionally, this introduction has also included an overview of the nuanced origins of the terms and social application of ‘Hutu’ and ‘Tutsi’ from 1600s through the early 1900s. Additionally, this introduction specified the key primary sources this thesis will discuss, as well as the inherent exceptionalism and value of those sources. Lastly, this introduction reviewed relevant historiography to position this thesis within the work of the scholarly community. This background is necessary to understand the following historical narrative, which traces from approximately 1900 until 1962.

The thesis progresses by discussing the following actors and their interactions. After providing twentieth century background by discussing the White Fathers in Kabgayi (chapter one), this paper will then discuss the Rwandan CSP in Nyanza (chapter two) and the simultaneous growth of the Rwandan évolués in Kabgayi (chapter three) and, in turn, describe each group’s priorities and actions, thus enabling a discussion of identity formation of these groups. Following discussion of these actions, the focus will broaden, incorporating the responses and impressions of the United Nations and Belgium during the same time (chapter four). The Conclusion will synthesize the analysis to provide a starting point for future studies focusing on the 1994 genocide.

To understand the crucial late 1950s means to understand the various actors interacting simultaneously. The main historical actors interacting in 1957 are the Missionaries of Africa (White Fathers), the Tutsi ethnic group, the Hutu ethnic group, and international state-level
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63 Stanton, “The Ten Stages of Genocide.”
actors (the United Nations, Belgium, and the United States). Due to the complexity of these interactions, this thesis identifies and analyzes the history and behavior of each group in turn. Isolating each group while also progressively layering and synthesizing preceding explanations allowed for appropriate analysis for each actor that with each additional actor complicated but informed the events of Rwanda’s pre-Independence history. Discussion of the 1950s also requires recognition that Rwandan society did not begin with colonialization and acknowledgement that elements of Rwandan society that existed at the turn of the twentieth century became elements of colonial rule. Recognizing the history of the terms Hutu and Tutsi displays that while these are dynamic terms, they decidedly exist in the Modern Era. This is the beginning of the rejection of the mistaken explanation of the Rwanda genocide as an “ancient tribal hatred”. 64
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64 Jones, *Genocide*, 474.
Chapter 1: The White Fathers in Kabgayi, 1900 – 1956

Fourth Commandment: Honor your mother and your father, that you may have a long life in the land which the Lord, your God, is giving you.  
Exodus 20:12  

The White Fathers, or the Missionaries of Africa, to use their formal name, are a Roman-Catholic order. The White Fathers are a male religious order (referred to Fathers) and are a community within the hierarchical structure of the Catholic church. While they are subordinate to the larger Church, they have autonomy to the extent that actions fall within their directed mission. The White Fathers focus on the spiritual value of charity, determined by the founder, Charles Lavigerie. Charity, in conjunction with the principles of the Catholic Church, serve as the doctrine to dictate and limit their actions in the conduct of duties within their larger religious and secular geographical communities. Lavigerie founded the group in 1868 with the goal for the order to evangelize Africa, beginning with his diocese in Algeria. The White Fathers received their nickname due to their uniform comprising of white robes. Lavigerie gained the approval of the Holy Father (commonly referred to outside the Catholic Church simply as the Pope) to move into the African continent.

The history of the White Fathers in Ruanda-Urundi begins in the early twentieth century. It starts when the White Fathers entered the area known as the nation-state of Rwanda, but at that time was combined with Burundi under German colonial rule as Ruanda-Urundi. This chapter discusses the significant social actions of the White Fathers in the mid-1950s – the celebration of
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66 The white robes would have especially been prominent against the black robes (or cassocks) that were the socially excepted uniform of priests at that time. It is also noteworthy to point out that the year after founding the White Fathers, Lavigerie founded the Missionary Sisters of Our Lady of Africa, the White Sisters, in 1869. “Beginnings of Our Society,” Missionaries of Africa White Fathers (blog), accessed January 15, 2020, https://mafrome.org/about-us/beginnings/; “The Origins and Presentation of Our Society,” Missionaries of Africa White Fathers (blog), accessed January 15, 2020, http://www.peresblancs.org/histoi1a.htm.
the twentieth-fifth anniversary of the mwami of Rwanda and the establishment of an agricultural cooperative that would become a tool for Hutu to wield political power in the early 1960s. But reaching into the 1960s and talking of the Hutu as having power to wield is getting ahead. It is first important to talk about the White Fathers – who they were, what they did, and how they interacted with Rwandans – before talking about anything that Rwandans did (as later chapters will show, the Hutu and Tutsi both staked claims in this process). Reviewing and analyzing the history of the White Fathers in Rwanda is important because it helps to explain some of the ways that European colonial incursion occurred through religious communities. Examination of the work, agency, and power of the White Fathers is a necessary foundation to make sense of the discussion of the rise of Hutu agency via education against the Rwandan-created but European-manipulated Tutsi. The clashing of the Hutu and Tutsi in the late 1950s led to the conditions that began the process of the genocide, made manifest in 1994. The presence and involvement of the White Fathers, while neither a sole factor nor deterministic, aided the Belgian colonial manipulation of Rwandan politics, religion, and culture. As this manipulation became social stratification and evolved into violent bifurcation, these became the conditions where the process of genocide could cultivate. Acknowledging the works of Ian Linden and Jane Linden (1977) and J.J. Carney (2016), this chapter builds on their histories of the White Fathers in Ruanda-Urundi but further contextualizes the religious order within the colonial rule during the twentieth century by weaving their story into the story of the other peoples who were also in Rwanda.

In 1900, the White Fathers first entered Rwanda to begin their missionary work. It is with a deep sense of irony that, upon their entry, they brought with them their Catholic doctrine, including the Ten Commandments, as foundational moral imperatives. This was ironic because it was this same logic of exclusive worship enumerated in the Commandments that the Fathers
intended to use to convert Rwandans, but instead mwami Musinga used it to limit their audiences for preaching. Musinga prohibited the Fathers to preach to Tutsi. Instead, he restricted their evangelization to Hutu and Twa. Once the Fathers agreed to these conditions, Musinga allowed them access to the country. The Tutsi were followers of the mwami alone and he allowed no other loyalty besides him, the same logic of the Fourth Commandment. Apart from the religious preaching, Musinga did agree to and expressed interest in learning to read and write. He could see that literacy was a required political and military skill he needed to have in order to deal with the European presence.

Musinga’s move to limit the White Father’s access to the population was the first indication that he did not welcome them into his kingdom. To further emphasize this hierarchy of power, he tried to put the White Fathers into Bugoyi, northwest Rwanda, or Gisaka, east Rwanda, but the White Fathers insisted on their mission having a closer proximity to the center of the court’s power in Nyanza. Eventually, the two parties made a compromise and the priests settled into Save hill and Mara, in the south of Rwanda. Once they received and settled their habitation, the White Fathers began their missionary work, acquisition of power, and adjustment of Rwandan society. The process of gaining power did not happen overnight nor was it easy. Instead, the White Fathers used several methods. Their efforts of evangelization, political manipulation, and social justice work provided their increased power, and thus capability to
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68 Des Forges, 29. It seems that Musinga did become literate in Kinyarwandan. Jean-Paul Harroy includes one of Musinga’s letters in his memoir. Harroy, *Rwanda*, 60.
70 This scope of this thesis does not address presence or role of slavery in Rwandan society at the time of European colonial incursion. For a discussion on slavery in Rwanda and Burundi, and the White Fathers altercation with German colonial leaders, see Chrétien, “The Slave Trade in Burundi and Rwanda at the Beginning of German Colonisation, 1890-1906.”
influence, as they successfully worked to reshape culture and provided a narrative of identity to Rwandans.

**Evangelization**

During the first few decades of their missionary work, the White Fathers experienced highs and lows, adversity and successes that show the various degrees that Rwandans accepted them into society. They received threats from the Rwandan Royal Court in Nyanza. They witnessed huge spiritual celebrations after a fruitful harvest. Most importantly, they experienced Hutu’s perception of them as protectors take hold. This latter experience shows the integration of the White Fathers into the fabric of Rwandan society. Prior to European incursion, wealthy Rwandans occupied the position of protector in a patron-client relationship, but with the missions the Fathers came to replace this role, in part. Hutu were the largest population in the missions and, within some social scenarios, were used to using Tutsi to gain protection from or during vulnerable social scenarios. With their presence in the missions, Hutu began to look to the priests for social protection from Tutsi. Thus, these change in actions began to weave the White Fathers into the fabric of society.

The struggles at the start of the twentieth century when the White Fathers entered the court in 1900 gave way to a situation more congruent with what the Fathers had hoped for during their initial arrival. They gained the confidence of Hutu and earned a reputation for being dependable. Twenty years after their arrival, in The Annual Report from 1923, notes that “the supernatural purpose of our work is known by everyone, and the prejudices of the beginning have given way to trust. […] It is the people who now declare themselves as catechumens or Christians, without incurring the king’s disgrace […] [and they are no longer] exposing
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themselves to the risk of being stripped of their belongings.”

While this correspondence to Rome was likely working to justify the priests’ presence in the region, if not defend perceived successes, the details expressed also describe a marked improvement in evangelization practices from their initial arrival in Nyanza. Ulterior motives aside, their persistence was paying off, and so the priests continued to focus on conversions.

As the 1920s flowed into the 1930s, the White Fathers were not only gaining power through their actions in their missions, but also through their relationship with Belgian colonial leaders. Through the combined power of this partnership, the priests oversaw several significant shifts in Rwandan society. The first significant shift occurred when the White Fathers convinced Belgians to allow them to run schools in lieu of Belgian operation of classrooms. The second shift occurred when the White Fathers worked with Belgian colonial representatives to depose mwami Musinga. With his long-standing resistance to Christianity, both specifically to conversion himself and generally to the White Father’s presence, Musinga blocked the White Fathers from increasing their political standing. As this discussion proves, after the deposition, the White Fathers both displayed their power in doing so and gained more power.

Education

White Fathers delivered the first social shift during the 1930s in the form of education. The modification in education that they implemented capitalized on a Hutu-Tutsi dichotomy that also manipulated the identity of each for political purposes. Their reliance on education as a catalyst for change harkens back to their origins. At their formation, they received inspiration
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73 A.G.M.Afr., “Les ‘Bahutu,’” 2.1 1923, Chroniques et Rapports Annuels, General Archives of the Society of Missionaries of Africa. Original text: Le but surnaturel de notre œuvre est connu de tous, et les préjugés des débuts ont fait place à la confiance; […] C’est que les gens peuvent maintenant se declarer catéchumènes ou chrétiens, sans en courir la disgrace du Roi … et ainsi s’exposer au risqué d’être dépouillés de leurs biens…”
74 Linden and Linden, Church and Revolution in Rwanda.
75 Des Forges, Defeat Is the Only Bad News, 237; Linden and Linden, Church and Revolution in Rwanda, 170–73.
from the history of the Society of Jesus (Jesuits), who had conducted extensive missionary work on several continents in previous centuries. The White Fathers did seem to gain inspiration from and to emulate the Jesuit style, to include creating a written language for Kinyarwandan, just as Jesuits and other priests had done with indigenous peoples throughout North and South America. A system of writing, however, was only the start of the educational reforms. The written word cemented the perceived social dichotomy that Musinga had used to divide the White Father’s evangelization in an attempt to reduce the priests as a threat of power. Instead, the roles of Hutu and Tutsi, more malleable in the early twentieth century, supplied Rwandans with a narrative of identity and the educational system shaped and cemented them.

While Musinga’s approval of exclusionary access indicated his adherence to social roles within Rwanda, the Europeans brought perceptions of their own to the process of colonization that then set the tone for processes of education. There seem to be two key origins for European’s views. The first heralds from the geological discovery by Europeans of the source of the Nile River to the Great Lakes. This record from John Hanning Speke describes his perceptions of Africans throughout his travels of tracing the Nile River from Tanzania to Egypt:

“I profess accurately to describe native Africa—Africa in those places where it has not received the slightest impulse, whether for good or evil, from European civilization. If the picture be a dark one, we should, when contemplating these sons of Noah, try and carry our mind back to that time when our poor elder brother Ham was cursed by his father, and condemned to be the slave of both Shem and Japheth; for as they were then, so they appear to be now—a strikingly existing proof of the Holy Scriptures. But one thing must be remembered: Whilst the people of Europe and Asia were blessed by communion with God […] the Africans were excluded from this dispensation, and consequently have no idea of an overruling Providence […]. Whatever, then, may be said against them for being too avaricious or too destitute of fellow-feeling, should rather reflect on ourselves, who have been so

76 Linden and Linden, *Church and Revolution in Rwanda*, 29–30.
much better favoured, yet have neglected to teach them, than on those who, whilst they are sinning, know not what they are doing.”

Speke’s observations recall the Biblical story that tells of Ham’s sin when he failed to care for his father, Noah, when intoxicated. Upon Noah’s awakening, he quite literally curses Ham for his failures then blesses his other two sons for their correction of their errant brother. “Cursed be [Ham’s lineage]! The lowest of the slaves shall he be to his brothers.”

Understanding Speke’s description, its reference, and the fact that this was initial European exposure to central Africa helps to explain its reverberation within western European society. This was a well-known biblical passage used as an explanatory tool for a very unknown people, one to explain away with divine approval the physical and cultural differences between Europeans and Africans. This perception combined with a need to explain away the accomplishments of societies within Africa without acknowledging them as equivalent to European societies. Instead, Europeans perceived descendants of Ham (Hamites) as responsible for the ‘civilized’ accomplishments within Africa, but also that they were at risk of succumbing to the ‘uncivilized’ indigenous peoples. Thus, to Europeans, the Hamites were not only superior but needed support in further civilizing indigenous Africans. It was this cultural framework and stereotype of the Hamitic Hypothesis that Belgians and the White Fathers brought with them into Rwanda.
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78 Speke, 11–12; Adam Hochschild, *King Leopold’s Ghost* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 1999). Speke is referencing Genesis, Chapter 9 where it details Noah’s interactions with his sons. See Hochchild’s work for a detailed description of the race to find ‘the heart of Africa,’ as well as the political maneuvering of this period.


The second explanation of European views of Rwanda ethnic groups was via the Hamitic Hypothesis combined with existing elements of Rwandan society in the early 1900s. The history of Hutu and Tutsi as ethnic categories is long and complex, and one in part that resulted in the term ‘Tutsi’ denoting persons deemed socially superior. Europeans then perceived that Tutsi were social elites, thus, the Europeans deduced, they must be Hamites and deserving of preferential treatment to assist them in civilizing other Rwandans. This was the basis of social understanding that served as the foundation upon which Belgians and the White Fathers built their educational systems.

In order to enforce the inflated social dichotomy between Hutu and Tutsi, Belgians instituted a requirement in the early 1930s that mandated members of each group carry identification cards. This policy soon led to the segregation of Hutu and Tutsi education.82 Even though the education system and the leaders of it changed in the early twentieth century, the common factor of preferential treatment of Tutsi over Hutu remained. Whether administrators favored Tutsi over Hutu to attend the schools or whether both ethnic groups attended but Tutsi received superior education, the hierarchy remained until after the Second World War.

The White Father’s method of governance over the school exposes the hierarchical nature of society. The most telling manifestation of this preferential treatment, besides allowance for enrollment, lies in the choice of language instruction according to ethnic classification. The conditions in schools, including the school in Kagbayi, for example, appear very consistent with indigenous boarding (residential) schools in North America in the nineteenth and twentieth
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82 Mamdani, 88. These reforms took place from 1927-1936. While the cards listed identity, Belgians primarily utilized these within the state administration for taxation purposes, per Elisabeth King, “The Rwandan Genocide: A Case Study” (Genocide and Human Rights University Program, Zoryan Institute, Toronto, ON, Canada, August 9, 2019). King also noted that for bureaucratic reasons the creation of the card system took several years to implement, hence no singular date is available and many scholars broadly reference early 1930s.
centuries. School rules forbade any communication in a student’s native language (either Swahili or Kinyarwanda) and instead only allowed students to speak in French or Latin. Students had very limited contact with families over the course of studies that lasted around ten years. This process not only divided the population, but Belgians also took Tutsi graduates of higher levels of this education and replaced chiefs who were against the European presence with these recent graduates to decrease political friction. This process displays that Belgians, with the assistance of the White Fathers, manipulated the population to ease the political transition of colonial rule for Europeans’ own benefit.

For schools that accepted both Hutu and Tutsi there existed two curricula. The one for Tutsi included instruction in French, therefore empowering those students to take on roles as adults within Belgian colonial society. The curriculum for Hutu explicitly did not include teaching in or of French, only in Swahili. In these and other ways, the educational system perpetuated the subjugation of Rwandan culture to European culture and Hutu to Tutsi. Rwandan children and young adults received this reinforced narrative from the White Fathers.

As these examples show, the White Fathers power had significantly increased since their entry into Rwanda in 1900. Their presence – in missions, churches, and schools – not only extended across Rwanda’s geography and increased in number of buildings, but further increased

84 Linden and Linden, *Church and Revolution in Rwanda*, 197–98.
85 Linden and Linden, 156.
86 For additional discussions of Belgian use of education as a tool of empire and propaganda, see Matthew G Stanard, *Selling the Congo: A History of European Pro-Empire Propaganda and the Making of Belgian Imperialism*. (Lincoln: University Of Nebraska Press, 2015), 43.
87 Linden and Linden, *Church and Revolution in Rwanda*, 184 n.222.
to alter cultural practices. The power to build schools or create curriculum is one thing, but the power to depose a monarch is quite another.

**Political Manipulation**

The second significant way that the White Fathers exerted and gained power in Rwanda was through political manipulation. This occurred significantly during the 1930s. The event that most represents this use of political manipulation to gain and show power is the overthrow of Rwanda’s mwami.\(^89\) With the ousting of Musinga, the Europeans removed a significant barrier to Catholic evangelization and thus, unfettered colonization of Rwanda. Before Musinga’s removal, Tutsi had been skeptical of conversion to Christianity. But following his removal, his son Mutara became king and political pressure lifted, enabling more conversions. A wave of Tutsi conversions culminated in an event that the White Fathers referred to as *la tornade*, the tornado of conversions from 1932-1936.\(^90\) Mutara himself converted to Christianity in 1943, twelve years after his assumption and his father’s deposition.\(^91\) This sequence of events, beginning with the White Father’s overthrow of Musinga, is significant because it displays the Catholic order’s rise in power and establishment as a political actor.

The change in leadership occurred neither without resistance nor without aid. Instead, the increasing acceptance of Catholicism and its shaping of Rwandan culture resulted from the significant political manipulations of leaders in the White Fathers with the support of Belgian colonial leaders. Key to this was one of the most senior priests in Rwanda, the Vicar Apostolic of

\(^89\) Linden and Linden, *Church and Revolution in Rwanda*, 195. Another more subtle form of political manipulation was the creation of the magazine *Kinyamateka*, effectively pro-Church propaganda.

\(^90\) Linden and Linden, 190; Prunier, *The Rwanda Crisis: History of a Genocide*, 41. An interesting cross-cultural connection is that the White Fathers used a term of extreme weather to refer to the mass conversions and, in 1959, the Rwandans used the Kinyarwandan word *muyaga*, meaning “a strong but variable wind” to refer to the social revolution or *jacquerie* in that year.

\(^91\) Carney, *Rwanda Before the Genocide*, 39–40. In an act that further symbolized the integration of the Europeans and Rwandans, Mutara had two Europeans at his side for his baptism: Classe, as his spiritual advisor, and Pierre Ryckmans, the Belgian governor of Ruanda-Urundi.
Rwanda, Léon-Paul Classe. Classe worked with the colonial governor of Ruanda-Urundi to convince the Belgian Colonial Ministry to enable the deposition of Musinga. Specifically, Classe worked to convince one of Musinga’s sons, Mutara, that he should claim the position as king before and superior to his siblings. Mutara had received a European-taught education and Classe correctly assessed that this education and Mutara’s installation as king would make him a more sympathetic to European presence than his father had been. While the consideration to depose Musinga began in the mid-1920s, it began in earnest in late 1930 and gained final approval from Belgian authorities in late 1931 (it occurred in November 1931). Initial responses revealed that the Belgian and Fathers’ preference for Mutara was a success. Kabgayi was the location of Mutara’s first official royal visit and, while there, leaders delivered speeches about the “divine dependence of kings,” a hardly subtle nod to the entanglement of the White Fathers with Belgian colonial rule and the Rwandan monarch.

There were two other actions within this larger event of the deposition that display the White Fathers’ manipulation of power dynamics for their own advantage. This usurpation was not the only act on Rwandan society that influenced the cultural narrative. First, when the Belgian governor carried out the deposition, he forced Musinga to surrender the physical manifestation of his power, the Kalinga drums. The importance of the drums in Rwanda is analogous to the importance of a bejeweled crown of precious metal in western European kingdoms. A stolen crown equates to a coup d’état and likewise the loss of the drums symbolized

92 Linden and Linden, Church and Revolution in Rwanda, 170–72; Des Forges, Defeat Is the Only Bad News, 237–38.
93 Des Forges, Defeat Is the Only Bad News, 239. The name ‘Mutara’ is the name of the king upon his ascension as mwami; his birth name was Rudahigwa. For ease of reading due to the brevity of the reference, this paper only uses his royal name.
95 Linden and Linden, Church and Revolution in Rwanda, 172.
96 Des Forges, Defeat Is the Only Bad News, 3. The royal drums were “the central focus to the royal rituals legitimizing kingships” and served as “the claim to power.”
Musinga’s loss of power. Second, the White Fathers restricted information and did not respect the inclusion of traditional royal court advisors to select the successor. Not only did they not inform the advisors, but they also chose Mutara’s name for him and only after this process then did they recall the advisors for the coronation ceremony.

The political influence did not cease with the completion of Musinga’s deposition. Although debates between Rwandans and the Fathers in the 1940s revealed the beginnings of discontent that would more fully manifest in the 1950s, the Catholic church’s foothold in the region remained strong, even throughout the war. Following la tornade and the Second War World, the White Fathers held a Jubilee anniversary celebration for Mutara. The celebration of the Jubilee over three days in late June 1957 shows that the White Fathers and Belgian influence of installing Mutara, a monarch sympathetic to the colonial cause, had a long-term staying power. A review of the dates of his Jubilee – 1931 to 1957 – reveal an influence and resonance over an entire generation of Rwandans. A closer look at the Jubilee reveals political influences that shaped the Rwandan narrative.

_highlighted two examples – religious leaders who
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97 Des Forges, 16. The seizure of the drums was not a uniquely colonial phenomenon. A similar struggle for power occurred upon Musinga’s rise as mwami when his opposition saw they could not win the throne and committed suicide, destroying the Kalinga in the process. Thus, while this was not the first historical event of its type, it still holds significant cultural relevance.

98 Linden and Linden, Church and Revolution in Rwanda, 172.
99 Carney, Rwanda Before the Genocide, 39–42.
100 29 June – 1 July 1957, see Carney, 84–85.
101 The UN Visiting Mission (discussed in chapter 4) were present at this Jubilee, as they directly state in their report from 1957 (T/1402). However, how they were present there is unclear. The Mission visited Ruanda-Urundi from mid-September to mid-October, after leaving New York in 14 July and visiting Somaliland and Tanganyika through 6 August (T/1404; T/1401). The Mission comprised of the same four men for this tour returned to New York on 23 October 1957, which reports available confirm. This raises the question of whether the Mission attended the Jubilee celebration in June and altered information in the reports to conceal that or if there was a secondary celebration created to impress the Mission during their scheduled visit. The latter seems most likely with the currently available information. United Nations Trusteeship Council, “United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, 1957: Report on Ruanda-Urundi (T/1402)” (New York: United Nations, 1958), paras. 4 & 236; United Nations Trusteeship Council, “United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, 1957: Report on Somaliland under Italian Administration” (New York: United Nations, 1958); United Nations Trusteeship Council, “United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, 1957: Report on Tanganyika” (New York: United Nations, 1958).
attended and Mutara’s choice to wear Western clothing – shows the presence of this consistent influence and the preferred narrative.

The attendance of a representative of the Pope to the Jubilee is one example of continued political influence. The Jubilee took place in Nyanza (not the Kabgayi mission) and the events therein were predominately Rwandan cultural practices, including “all the country’s folklore.” Despite that cultural focus, however, the White Fathers noted that “the showpiece of the feast was no doubt the religious ceremony” (Catholic mass).\(^\text{102}\) Occurring simultaneously with the mwami’s Jubilee was the Jubilee of 50 years of Kabgayi mission and as part of this celebration a “delegate of the Sovereign Pontiff [the Pope]” had a “triumphant visit” in the Vicariate (religious province) for ten days.\(^\text{103}\) For a representative of the Pope to visit central Africa at a time when the mwami’s Jubilee was also occurring was almost certainly not a coincidence.\(^\text{104}\) Instead, his presence shows the political influence the White Fathers and the Catholic Church had even within an event categorized as traditionally Rwandan.

The second example that further shows the influence and narrative that colonial powers reinforced to Rwandans is in regard to clothing. While the wearing of European-style clothing by the mwami was not new in 1950s (Mutara’s father, Musinga, wore a colonial uniform, e.g), the context of the wearing of a business suit during a Rwandan ceremony makes it a significant


\(^{104}\) Newbury, “What Role Has Kingship?,” 234. It is not clear as to why the celebration occurs in July. Authorities deposed Musinga in November 1931 and quickly installed Mutara, so the selected month does not seem to correlate. Also, the traditional means of counting king’s anniversaries – via the First Fruits ceremony, which the Belgians outlawed in mid-1920s – does not occur from April through July, as well as the seemingly lack of evidence of the occurrence of sexual relations and food dispersal, an integral aspect of these ceremonies, so again the month does not correspond. While by no means exhaustive, these points suggest that there is no clear precedent in Rwandan culture for the selection of this date.
political statement and reveals the cultural dance that Rwandan leaders participated in during colonial rule.

In a photo from the colonial governor’s memoir, Mwami Mutara pours milk into a container that a group of children hold\textsuperscript{105}. This likely held great significance for the children as well as adults. Cows held a privileged status in Rwandan society and its history, as some scholars tie the importance of cows in their use as capital as responsible for the founding the Nyiginya Dynasty, of which mwami Mutara was a descendent.\textsuperscript{106} While the children in the photo appear to be wearing a uniform, the adults throughout the photo wear various culturally normative and weather appropriate outfits: several Europeans wear short pants and short sleeves and several Africans wear wrapped and draped robes consistent with other photographs of traditional clothing. The king, however, wears a Western-style suit including loafer shoes and socks, possibly a necktie, and even including a watch (with a possibly leather band). The celebratory milking of the cows and sharing of the milk with Rwandan youth seems that it held great cultural significance in Rwanda…and yet, the king of Rwanda is not wearing culturally aligned clothing for the event. This, especially when considered in combination with Mutara’s baptism, could represent the acceptance of the endorsed European narrative as the acceptable Rwandan identity. The White Fathers and Belgian, in their combined efforts, succeeded in their political manipulation of Rwandan society, which worked in conjunction with the forces of education. Yet there was still a third arena where the White Fathers reached into Rwandan communities.

**Social Justice Work**

The previous two examples of evangelization, including education, and political manipulation show the narratives that the White Fathers, in conjunction with the Belgians,

\textsuperscript{105} Harroy, *Rwanda*, 206.
\textsuperscript{106} Vansina, *Antecedents to Modern Rwanda: The Nyiginya Kingdom*, 47.
Rollinson

supplied to Rwandans in the early and mid-twentieth century. However, their focus on altering Rwandan society does not mean that the White Fathers were static actors. Indeed, White Fathers in Rwanda after the Second World War were considerably different from their predecessors, and this reveals that the religious order was a dynamic actor. Even though they underwent a generational change as a group, they still continued to provide a narrative of identity for Rwandans.

The postwar environment was powerful and provided a catalyst for some of this change. Collectively, more individuals within the White Fathers held more liberal beliefs than their predecessors that were also more focused on social justice and, thus, more focused on aiding the Hutu, not only converting them to Christianity. With the end of the war came the fear of communism, and that fear also reached the White Fathers in Rwanda by way of the Catholic Church. Communism, in part feared for its connection to atheism, required a bulwark to stop its advance. To accomplish the guard against this and to provide social justice services to Hutu around Kabgayi, the White Fathers established an agricultural cooperative in late 1956 (sanctioned by the governor of Ruanda-Urundi in February 1957). They hoped that by providing improved and stable conditions for workers would make the allure of Communism less attractive while also tempering the perceived excesses of capitalism.

The White Fathers built the cooperative adjacent to the mission at Kabgayi and named it “Travail – Fidélité – Progrès” (“Work, Loyalty, Progress”), TRAFIPRO, for short. Consistent
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109 Carney, Rwanda Before the Genocide, 50; This conversation was not unique to missionary work, colonialism, or Africa. For discussion on this in Western Europe, no doubt an influence on the White Fathers as both Catholic leaders and Europeans, see James Chappel, Catholic Modern: The Challenge of Totalitarianism and the Remaking of the Church (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2018), 182–226.
with cooperative models in western Europe at the time and even in contemporary America, workers contributed a fee to join TRAFIPRO and then benefitted from the superstructure surrounding the group to assist with the process of agricultural business.\textsuperscript{111} In this case, the structure of TRAFIPRO aimed to provide a place for workers to receive loans, have a place to produce the crops as well as sell them, vehicles to transport goods, creation of roads to transport the vehicles, and the logistical and bureaucratic systems to support this business (among several other specific goals).\textsuperscript{112} As of late 1956, TRAFIPRO was just a plan for a shop in Kabya that would sell local products – sorghum, rice, soap, sugar, coffee – with the eventual goal that “once the cooperative TRAFIPRO is well launched and consolidated in the territory of Nyanza, it will extend over all of Rwanda.”\textsuperscript{113} By the records of the 1959 Annual Reports, the White Fathers appear to have done so. They reported having thirteen stores (magasins) with 5,487 members (coopérateurs), compared to the starting members of 457, a twelve-fold increase.\textsuperscript{114}

TRAFIPRO, however, served as more than a store or a vehicle or a committee for the community. It also served as a means for self-organization and empowerment, especially for the Hutu counter-elite whom the White Fathers had educated and whom the priests were keen to keep within their control.\textsuperscript{115} The Hutu counter-elites, the évolues, were ready to be a part of the decolonization process for Rwanda and proceed into the future.\textsuperscript{116} These radical ideas were part

\textsuperscript{111} Carney, \textit{Rwanda Before the Genocide}, 78.
\textsuperscript{112} A.G.M.Afr., “Coopérative.”
\textsuperscript{113} A.G.M.Afr.; Carney, \textit{Rwanda Before the Genocide}, 78. Original text: “Une fois la cooperative “TRAFIPRO” bien lancée et consolidée dans le territoire de Nyanza, elle s’entendra sur tout le Ruanda.”
\textsuperscript{115} Prunier, \textit{The Rwanda Crisis: History of a Genocide}, 45; Carney, \textit{Rwanda Before the Genocide}, 45; Linden and Linden, \textit{Church and Revolution in Rwanda}, 231 & 240.
\textsuperscript{116} Stanard, \textit{Selling the Congo}, 275n84. Stanard defines évolues as “a condescending and erroneously applied term used by Belgians and other Europeans to specify Africans who were ‘civilized’ and European educated – literally ‘evolved’.” Acknowledging the condescension of the term, this author has deemed the term historically necessary to specify the group of Hutu involved in this historical discussion and to be consistent in terminology with other scholarship. This paper, as do other sources, uses ‘counter-elite’ as a synonym.
of why White Fathers desired to keep them within their realm of control. As such, several of these men were in leadership positions, such as within TRAFIPRO or one of the several vernacular magazines that the White Fathers published. This leadership position, while under the watchful eyes of the priests’ supervision, also provided the évolutés experience and taught them the skills they could, in the future, apply on their own.

This chapter has argued that, since education provides some of the first narratives for individuals to view themselves and thus construct identities, the White Fathers held a vital role in process of identity formation for Rwandans in early to mid-twentieth century Rwanda, specifically in Kabgayi.117 Through evangelization, education, political manipulation, and social justice work, the White Fathers were political actors who successfully provided the context and cause for how Rwandans viewed themselves. The next two chapters will further discuss the évolutés by first discussing their cultural competition and then how they fought against this competition. The group the évolutés pushed back against was the mwami’s High Council of advisors – the Conseil Supérieur du Pays. By first discussing the CSP and then their prominent political actions then enable analysis of the évolutés response that launched their political dialogue on the international stage and began the initial stages of the process of genocide.

117 King, “The Rwandan Genocide: A Case Study.”

It would be difficult at the present stage to specify when it will be possible to grant us self-government, but we are anxious that we should be trained for self-government now.  

Conseil Supérieur du Pays, February 1957

This chapter discusses the Conseil Supérieur du Pays (the CSP). The CSP was a Tutsi-majority council of chiefs who acted as advisors to the mwami, were vocal about local politics, and whose meetings were reasonably popular topics of debate among Rwandans. The CSP were the mwami’s council, his advisors, and accordingly he presided over the council. The Belgian colonial government created the council in 1954 to be both a council of advisors to the Rwandan mwami. The CSP were active politically and used their available power and agency to assert their role in Rwandan society. They viewed themselves as leaders in Rwanda, as evident by how they exercised their power, including in response to Belgian and United Nations political actions. Therefore, as this chapter argues, their prominent political document from February 1957, “Mise au Point,” reveals not just their political stances but illuminates who they were as Rwandans. This document is noteworthy not only because it shows the voices of Rwandans at a time where European voices saturated Rwandan society (as the previous chapter argued), but also because this political argument echoed far beyond 1957. It is because the CSP sent in writing an argument to the United Nations that the Hutu évolués responded in writing back to the
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120 United Nations, 35.
121 Carney, Rwanda Before the Genocide, 212.
Belgian colonial governor. With this debate as prologue, the triennial visit from the UN trusteeship council – effectively an inspection of Belgian colonial rule – took place in September 1957. The debate the CSP and évolutés initiated did not end with this visit, however, but instead Rwandan leaders from the CSP and évolutés only just began grappling with the arguments one year after they started, in March 1948. The discussions in this chapter, therefore, are the first shots fired, the taking of sides for the acceptance and hardening of the ethnic binary that Rwandans ultimately accepted, as Mamdani argues in When Victims Become Killers.123 With the battle lines drawn, the classification of ‘the other’ complete and the beginning of symbolization and discrimination, the roots of the process of genocide in Rwanda are in this political dialogue.124

While the White Fathers were preaching Catholicism across Rwanda and increasing their political power, the Rwandan indigenous government continued to hold its presence in Nyanza. The anniversary celebration for mwami Mutara took place there in late June through early July 1957. While this event was fraught with power dynamics and political tensions, Rwandans were also capable of staking a dominant role in the conversations of power and politics. That is precisely what happened a few months prior to the Jubilee, in February. The United Nations Trusteeship Council had previously announced a planned visit for its Visiting Mission in late September with the intent to inspect the status of Ruanda-Urundi and Belgium’s governance. This was a routine occurrence, the previous one having occurred the year of the CSP’s creation, 1954. The CSP, in a bid to influence the agenda and conversation for the visit in six-month’s time, published “Mise au Point,” their Statement of Views. This document, and the response (discussed in chapter 3) successfully engaged the attention of the UN. While chapter 4 will
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123 Mamdani, When Victims Become Killers, 104.
124 Stanton, “The Ten Stages of Genocide.”
analyze the UN’s own reactions to these publications, it is first necessary to contextualize their dialogue to consider the CSP to define who they were and understand what they said. Analyzing the CSP includes considering their origins, power capacity, and identity as expressed in “Mise au Point.”

While only Rwandans served on the CSP, it was not a Rwandan-established organization. Instead, it was a product of Belgian colonial governance. In July 1952, Belgians announced a plan for Independence in Ruanda-Urundi within a decade. In the following years, other elements of this plan became clear – there was a general call for democratic institutions within Rwanda (1953) and elections for the geo-political regions called sub-chiefdoms (sous-chefferies) (1956). While these processes did reinforce nepotism (since progression through an election required a candidate to have begun at the bottom of the process until they eventually became part of a senior council), the new processes and institutions were nevertheless a transition from an oligarchy to democracy.

The CSP was not exempt from this nepotistic process of election. Only men who had first been chiefs of smaller areas could have eventually worked their way up to the CSP. The literal translation of French name Conseil Supérieur du Pays translates to ‘Superior Council of the Country’ (although most scholarship uses the acronym CSP, as this paper also does). Regardless of the language of the title, the superlative corresponded to the council’s job and its relationship to the mwami: they were his advisors for the country. Sources available do not seem to indicate the exact limits of their duties and responsibilities, but what does seem clear is that they were not a puppet council. It seems that the mwami valued them for their trust and abilities, and it also

125 Carney, Rwanda Before the Genocide, 46–47.
126 Carney, 78.
127 The Belgian organizational chart of the Administration of Ruanda-Urundi from 1954 does not display CSP, instead only listing the Administration, Mwami, chiefs, and sub-chief. United Nations, “T/1201,” 29.
seems that the United Nations also trusted them to a limited degree. While the Europeans certainly did not seem to view them as equals, they did incorporate their observations in the Report of the Visiting Mission of 1957 and valued the CSP as superior to the évolutés. Doing so required the UN, at the very least, to validate, thus empower, the CSP on the international stage.

**People on the Council**

While the process for an individual becoming part of the CSP was simultaneously nepotistic and democratic, another factor that influenced a man’s presence at all at this time was if they had managed to stay in power without suffering a Belgian-influenced replacement who would be more sympathetic to the colonial cause, which as the White Fathers did with the *mwami*.

While it is not clear whether or whom the Belgians might have rotated out, there is a clear connection of the CSP to the White Fathers, and thus European influence, if not approval, via their educational authority. The White Fathers took over the educational system in Ruanda-Urundi in 1930 and the Belgians founded the CSP in the early 1950s. That, in combination with the fact that the education (especially for those in seminary, even if they did not become priests) lasted for close to a decade, shows that the members of the CSP had received a heavy dose of religious colonialism. There were at least three members of the CSP in the late 1950s who were graduates of the White Fathers’ school in Astrida – Michael Kayibura, Pierre Mungalurire, and Michel Rwagasana. Beyond the educational importance there is also an added layer of class to this commonality. Attendance and graduation from Astrida became a
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128 United Nations Trusteeship Council, “Report on Ruanda-Urundi (T/1402),” 43. Carney, *Rwanda Before the Genocide*, 212. In “Mise au Point,” the CSP refer to a time presumably immediately before writing the document as “its eighth session.” As J.J. Carney notes, the CSP had its inaugural meeting in 1954, thus sessions seem to be approximately two or more a year, averaging these over three plus years of existence.

status symbol (something contemporary readers might draw akin to being an alumni of an Ivy League school in the United States, for example). It was not only the presumed education—which included Western linguistic abilities—that students received, but the networking and power as well that made this a formative experience and provided them prestigious status.

While powerful people with influential background and deeply rooted connections throughout Rwandan society were on the council, it is not as clear how much power the CSP itself possessed within the full range of the government, whether Rwandan indigenous, Belgian colonial, or both. It is clear from the United Nations’ response to “Mise au Point” that this response assisted in legitimizing the CSP. This is especially apparent when compared to how the United Nations referenced the évolutés that the UN valued the CSP more than their political opponent. Briefly considering the United Nations’ response to the CSP raises the question of what the CSP said, what they meant, and what it says about themselves. To accomplish this requires a close look at “Mise au Point.”

**Exceptionalism**

Prior to analyzing this work, it is important to acknowledge the exceptionalism of this source. “Mise au Point” is not representative of the whole of every other Tutsi’s perspectives. The CSP are elite men, highly educated, and self-selecting. They took public political stances to engage in this debate. They did not write this work in Kinyarwandan, but French, the language of Belgium and the UN. Tutsi mostly comprised the CSP, but most Tutsi in Ruanda-Urundi did not work for the mwami or were even a tribal chief. The members of the CSP thus are exceptional in that they are elites even compared to the privileged legal status of their fellow Tutsi in Rwanda.

Despite these drawbacks, this source is still valuable for scholarly discussion. Even though the group and its writing are exceptional and do not fully represent who they claim to,
they are available written sources by Rwandans. Therefore, “Mise au Point” provides a suitable aid as a dialogue-based snapshot in time to understand Rwandan government in 1957.

“Mise au Point”

The CSP published “Mise au Point” in February, four months prior to the United Nations Visiting Mission’s official visit to Ruanda-Urundi. They had the intent to influence or manipulate political conversation. This was consistent with previous actions for other Mission visits. For example, in the last decade, the mwami had abolished the practices of uburetwa (in 1949) and ubuhake (in 1954) just prior to previous Mission visits.\(^{130}\) While these two previous actions related to Hutu and Tutsi relations, the social and political climate since then became more volatile. ‘The Hutu-Tutsi question,’ as people called the tension of the relations between Hutu and Tutsi, rose to the forefront of many communications throughout the 1950s. Additionally, it was five years into Belgium’s ten-year plan for Independence. These combined conditions provided a different environment than before while still existing within the same context of political power plays by Rwandans.

Some Rwandans had already seen an increase of power due to the implementation of universal male suffrage in 1956 and council elections.\(^{131}\) TRAFIPRO, the farming cooperative, was in its first year of operation and was slowly growing in both size and influence. Belgian colonial leaders were content with these advances, but the CSP sought a more active role in these moves. Thus, they initiated the conversation for the 1957 UN visit.

\(^{130}\) These were systems of clientship, or an economic and power negotiation between a client (akin to a buyer) and the patron (akin to the seller). Both parties might benefit from these deals, the client having access to resources and protection, and the patron having access to labor. Over time, these systems came to mirror the Hutu-Tutsi divide and increasingly unpopular as a way to control labor. These systems were not existent from time immemorial, but, as Vansina argues, within certifiable history. Vansina traces uburetwa to the early 1870s under Rwabugiri’s rule and ubuhake to Ndori’s rule. Ndori founded the kingdom c.1650. Therefore, while uburetwa was fairly new, ubuhake was intrinsically part of Rwandan culture. Vansina, Antecedents to Modern Rwanda: The Nyiginya Kingdom, 47, 134, 216.

\(^{131}\) Newbury, The Cohesion of Oppression, 185–88.
“Mise au Point” demands that Rwanda strive for independence, but concedes that this must occur with deliberate training and steady action, implying that this balance is what would be necessary for a smooth transfer of power. In support of that continued development and progression toward self-governance, the CSP focused on four main ideas. These were problems they deemed needed training to correct on the road to Independence. These four themes were: education, “participation in government,” “economic and social policy,” and the “reduction of colour prejudices.” These themes have an additional layer of interconnectedness beyond their content. The CSP also crafted their writing in such a way that reveals how they self-identified, identified others, and responded to them. “Mise au Point” displays specific choices of vocabulary, highlights specific frame of reference, and includes key allusions. By discussing the content and analyzing these later elements in the content all while assigning the CSP agency in their writing, then the elements of their identity come into focus.

The first and vividly apparent element that the CSP use in “Mise au Point” is vocabulary. When the CSP discuss education, policy, and involvement in government, their word choice stands out. In the discussion on education, what they describe as “the key [to solve] all other problems,” the CSP’s vocabulary signals their sense of identity as members of the collective group of Rwandans. In this section, the CSP calls for Rwandan students to receive the same education as Belgian students, including legal certifications and technical training, and for the languages prioritized in education to be Kinyarwandan (“greater stress should be placed on the teaching of our national language”), followed by a secondary option of English and tertiary of
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133 United Nations Trusteeship Council, 42.
134 United Nations Trusteeship Council, 42.
In this section, there is a notable use of both we/us and identification of Rwanda as a whole entity. In addition to the previous quote, the CSP states that “the Banyaruanda have no access to university education in Ruanda,” and they urge that “we share a common concern.”

A third example of this is when they express assurance that with sufficient assistance from other groups and “the Banyaruanda [it] will soon enable us to achieve the desired goal.” This tension between inclusion of the group (through use of the Banyaruanda) and implied exclusion through self-definition (use of our and we) seems to reflect the CSP’s advisory role, balancing existence in the group with corporate identification in a senior role.

In the discussion on policy, the CSP’s vocabulary also shows aspects of their identity. In this section, the discussion of policy is broad and diverse, ranging from economic and political, to cultural and social. While the CSP had previously focused most of its ideas regarding race and education externally, their discussion of policies consists of both external and internal reflections. In this conversation of policy, the CSP calls for external assistance in the form of foreign aid to assist them with their internal improvements. They suggest various sources of aid, from “Belgium and, if need be, international organizations of Europe and America.” They continue, saying that “[t]he people under colonial rule should not be held responsible for that situation; for while in some cases they were wrong not to respect the rights of the settlers, in others, both sides were to blame. The economic domination of the settlers, giving them a monopoly on action, is often the cause of the conflict.”

---

135 United Nations Trusteeship Council, 42–43. When referencing the educational equivalence, the CSP is directly referencing the Astrida secondary school. Also, the addition of Flemish is a nod to the split within Belgium of the French and Flemish languages. Although French was not listed here, it was already being taught in schools, as indicated by the original language of this text being itself in French. Emphasis added.
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use of “the settlers” in this sentence. Applying Mamdani’s research to this vocabulary informs one reading of this excerpt. It seems, applying this research, that is not that the CSP is referring to the colonial government of Belgium as settlers in Rwanda, but instead that they are invoking the Hamitic Hypothesis. Another reading of this excerpt could be referencing the Belgian settler-colonists in the Congo who were asserting their rights to African land for at least the last few years. Thus, despite their previous inclusive rhetoric of we and our, the CSP retreats into more divisive language in use of “indigenous” and “settler” to describe, possibly to describe their fellow Rwandans. This further shows that the CSP simultaneously views itself as citizens of Rwanda (through their use of first-person plural pronouns) but they also view themselves as an omnipotent entity that can impose categories on other Rwandans.

The CSP’s discussion of their external policy views, aimed to appeal to Belgian power, also engages with internal actions, aimed to improve Rwanda’s geo-political and economic status. In this discussion, the CSP openly call for steps to independence, although they deem it necessary through a slow and steady process of internal improvements to support the external political transition. In the section entitled, “the Government of our country” the CSP discusses the theme of governance. They discuss the increased democratic structure but warn of the need for cooperation both within present context and in future transitions. They argue that an

140 Mamdani, When Victims Become Killers, 32. Mamdani discusses how, as an extension of the Hamitic Hypothesis, the Hutu were seen as the long-term indigenous people and the Tutsi seen as the “settlers”, as discussed in this work’s Introduction. In this way and using binary logic, the Tutsi were seen as less African and therefore ’more white’ than the Hutu. Thus, according to the hierarchy imposed by Belgians under colonial rule, Belgians were superior to all Rwandans, but Tutsi were superior to Hutu and Twa as the “settlers” of the region. Hence, as the Belgians saw Tutsi as superior, they were educated and treated superior to Hutu, providing tangible advantages that the CSP alludes to here.


“indirect administration requires two parties, two parties which will co-operate. [...] There can be co-operation only if the indigenous Government of the state is effective, well-organized and entrusted with real responsibilities.”

This external plea for transition by stages is both inclusive to all Rwandans and displays that the CSP sees itself as being part of a group, just as they discussed with education. Their identity of self is very apparent through their language, especially their use of we/us/our, as well as its references to their fellow Kinyarwandans as the “indigenous” population.

The CSP expend effort to balance perspectives and convince the UN of their needs, but they are not always so measured. After detailing the need for international aid, they continue, not calmly or meekly, but instead aggressively. Having asked for aid, they continue explaining that Rwanda needs industrialization, “But in order to industrialize, we must invest and to invest we must have capital. [...] It is practically impossible for us to obtain locally the capital needed for investment except out of income which is already insufficient; we would have to accept fresh sacrifices in order to achieve that objective, and they would be so painful that they could be imposed successfully only by a dictatorial and totalitarian government.”

Here the CSP is not subtle. They are informing the UN that if they do not give them what they request, they will take it by other means that the UN and Western powers will find distasteful. Their use of “fresh sacrifices” and evoking extreme forms of government is sharp vocabulary that is intentionally a power play to get the UN’s attention.

Whether it is through use of pronouns that indicate inclusivity, their inclusion of Banyarwandan cultural identity, use of the binary settlers and indigenous, or aggressive word choice, the CSP’s vocabulary in “Mise au Point” displays their sense of self as in but not of the
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Rwandan people and as being a powerful entity with persuasive agency. Further analysis of narrative tools will add more elements of the CSP’s perception of identity.

The second tool within “Mise au Point” that explains the CSP’s identity is frame of reference. The CSP uses both an externally and internally oriented frame of reference to suit their argumentative needs, but ultimately emphasizes the external (i.e. international) relative to Rwanda as reflective of their self-perception as a senior government agency. While the CSP exerted their own agency in the act of writing this document, it is not known the intentionality behind the frames of reference used. However, whether intentionally included for political purposes or to genuinely express themselves, analyzing the selections can still provide an understanding of how the CSP viewed their world and, thus, themselves. Regardless of their intention behind the inclusion, the choice itself reflects identity.

Exposure of the tension between internal and external frames of reference exist throughout most of “Mise au Point.” The first themes that the CSP discuss are education and policies, likely for argumentative purposes, as these sections aim to politically manipulate the UN in preparation for their visit. These larger influential forces were likely of more immediate interest to the UN, or at the least, reveal the CSP’s perspective that they held this importance. Still included, but with less emphasis, the CSP includes racial and ethnic relations.

In the section on education, the CSP use an external frame of reference to justify their perspective. They apply an emotional appeal as they aim to achieve these educational improvements. By leveraging the fact that they are under Belgian colonial rule, they “justify” their requirements by asserting the need to put Rwandan education in sync with “Western culture” that “is much more than science and knowledge. It is an education, way of life, a pattern
of behavior, a sense of the common good and of respect for the human person.”\textsuperscript{145} This clearly aims to appeal to the Western patriarchal system that seeks to guide Rwanda into civilization. There is an implied question here from the CSP. They seem to be challenging Western powers using their own logic against them. If they have deemed Rwanda uncivilized, then how can Rwanda become civilized without education to be the catalyst of this process? With this rhetoric, both literal and implied, the CSP reveals that they both exist and perceive themselves to be on the border between advisors and decisionmakers. On one hand, their language reveals that they see themselves as part of the national community. They are part of the people who use the Kinyarwandan language and need not adopt a northern European tongue. (That being said, they have already adopted a western European tongue since they wrote this statement in French.) Nevertheless, they are a colony and hence still fall under Western imperialism. Therefore, they argue that if this is the goal of the governmental rule, then Rwanda should be able to educationally benefit from this process. On the other hand, it seems that, while they see themselves as Rwandan, they are also aware of their status of power and do not see themselves as of the people, but instead maintain distance from the revolting \textit{évolués} as they write with and emanate a professional and neutral tone.

In the section on policy, the CSP again uses first an internal frame of reference followed by an external to persuade the UN of their argument. They discuss the required improvements internal to Rwanda saying, “the only way for the country to advance towards emancipation is by transitional stages; only thus can we avoid the difficulties which would be inevitable if we were to pass suddenly from trusteeship to freedom.”\textsuperscript{146} They fear that Rwanda is on “the brink of
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disaster” due to limited natural resources and lack of industrialization.\textsuperscript{147} Thus, to improve these issues and support independence, the CSP calls for “the development of land through irrigation and other techniques [to make it] possible to increase crop yields. Better food for the labour force improves its physical capacity and its work output. Moreover, schools have to be opened to enable workers to acquire the training called for by modern production methods.”\textsuperscript{148} By better preparing Rwandan peoples, working conditions, and education, then the country will be more stable, thus be able to handle a transition of power, and finally be able to become autonomous from European political power, the overall goal of the UN Visiting Mission’s inspections and Belgium’s ten-year development plan. Here, as in the educational section, the CSP views itself as an advisory authority, at once being leaders of Rwanda but simultaneously also of its people.

The CSP continue to use these internal and external frames of reference as “Mise au Point” continues. The inclusion and discussion of the goal of “reducing colour prejudice” is no exception.\textsuperscript{149} In this excerpt, the CSP highlights the “fundamental problem in [Rwanda that] is undoubtedly that of human relations between whites and non-whites.”\textsuperscript{150} Echoing their previous discussions of economics and society, here the CSP comments on discrimination. Their language is direct as they describe African capability as equal to European work: “[...] it is only right that justice should be done and that they should be paid according to their output and not according to the colour of their skin.”\textsuperscript{151} It is not only Europeans as compared to Africans in this section, though. It also is clear the CSP is commenting on internal Rwandan relations, both between Hutu and Tutsi and between men and women.
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In the CSP’s continued discussion on race and ethnic relations, the section reveals that they worried deeply about these social relations and the role that they might play in the future of Rwanda. The fact that the CSP speaks in a more limited capacity about internal race relations but focuses more on external relations – the “human relations between whites and non-whites” – is not surprising.\textsuperscript{152} Not only was the CSP nearly completely Tutsi, the Nyingya Dynasty was also Tutsi and had ruled Rwanda for over 300 years.\textsuperscript{153} In the power dynamics of the CSP versus évolués, the CSP are clearly in the dominant position of the social power dynamic. Even if individuals recognized inequality, there would not be group motivation to impact change in the balance of power. Additionally, Ruanda-Urundi had an incredibly diverse population of over 4 million included Europeans from 30 different countries and peoples from across East Africa, the Middle East, and India, as well as followers of several sects of Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and native African regional spirituality.\textsuperscript{154} Thus, it seems the CSP are not interested in equalizing the balance of power within Rwanda (potentially decreasing their own position of power), but instead to increase their position relative to Europeans. Likewise, this applies to and illuminates their concern with education and production, even to the point of asking for international aid. Throughout each of the themes, it is clear that the CSP ultimately chooses to focus on issues with an externally focused frame of reference. This bolsters the perception understood from their choice of vocabulary, further proving that they see themselves as a powerful entity and on with international influence.

\textsuperscript{152} United Nations Trusteeship Council, 44. While there were, as discussed, Europeans within
\textsuperscript{153} Vansina, Antecedents to Modern Rwanda: The Nyiginya Kingdom. Vansina cites that the kingdom existed at least since 1650, but dates prior cannot be confirmed due to lack of interdisciplinary and corroborating evidence. Also, saying that the dynasty had ruled for three centuries necessarily broadly sweeps over events of this time, of which there were numerous coup d’états, as well as complex usage of Hutu and Tutsi, which this work’s Introduction briefly discussed.
The last tool that the CSP utilize in “Mise au Point” are allusions as an explanatory tool to further convince the UN of their argument. Several references woven into the discussions on government and policy particularly stand out for analysis. In their discussion of governmental participation, the CSP allude to parental relationship when arguing for greater participation and ultimate leadership of an independent Rwanda. They state that while the “present élite,” presumably themselves, “is not yet able to guide its political affairs alone” as they do not yet have “sufficient […] skill[s],” the CSP also pleads that “little children must learn to walk on their own feet.” Unlike an earlier reference to adolescence, here the CSP do not provide a Kinyarwandan equivalent or a translation. They do not qualify the expression with a cultural meaning or reference. The words stand on their own without quotation marks as the CSP’s own voice. Therefore, it is possible that this reference to “little children,” while it still could be a cultural reference, might instead be an appeal to Western powers and the overriding paternalistic tone of colonial rule. In addition to paralleling earlier references to Western paternalism in the discussion of education as a way of life, this could also mirror the preferred language of Roman Catholic teachings. In these teachings, of which the members of the CSP would be well steeped in understanding and using, Christian leaders emphasize and followers self-identify as “children of [God]” to align with Biblical traditions. With this dual appeal of the paternalism of religion and government, this reference to “little children” seems to be a deliberate move by the CSP. It
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158 The New American Bible, 1155. As one reference, see Luke 6:35, “But rather love your enemies and do good to them, and lend expecting nothing back; then your reward will be great and you will be Children of the Most High, for he himself is kind to the ungrateful and the wicked,” emphasis added.
seems that could not only to appeal to Western powers but also could to convince them to allow or facilitate the CSP’s desired outcomes.

Similar to their first reference in their discussion of domestic development, the CSP reference international aid. While already discussed earlier in this chapter, the incorporation of this potential resource is an important inclusion. In requesting foreign aid, the CSP is balancing their projected expertise on Rwanda with supplication to Western powers (or at the least perceived humility to them). This balance is most apparent when they suggest that they will “leave to more competent people the task of finding an adequate solution.” These are the words of people who view themselves as advisors, asserting ideas confidently, but also add the caveat of advice, not policy, to their statement. Reference to international aid is also a reference to the fact that they see themselves as in a position of power sufficient to activate this resource. Request for aid implies weakness relative to another’s position of power, but also indicates that the request, the CSP, perceives that they possess the ability to meaningfully execute the request. This, therefore, conveys a relative position of power coexisting with the relative fragility.

This tone of advice echoes through the continued argument for foreign aid that includes a third allusion. In this excerpt, the CSP seems to want to head off any debates about domestic events by admitting to the “unfortunate results of recent political instability.” However, they are not specific as to the recent events in question. Perhaps it was the founding of the early political parties in 1955, or TRAFIPRO’s expansion or increased debate on ‘The Hutu-Tutsi question’ in 1956 that left them feeling unsettled? Either way, this and the following rhetoric is quite revealing. They continue, saying that “[t]he people under colonial rule should not be held responsible for that situation […] The economic domination of the settlers […] is often the cause

---
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of the conflict.” While one reading of this excerpt is along the aforementioned analysis of Mamdani’s settler analysis, the context of the paragraph also opens up the comparison to European-Rwandan relations. Regardless though, the event that the CSP hints at (but does not name) is meaningful here. They both refuse to give the unnamed event power and show it has power over them. When they refuse to acknowledge it and give the event a name, they refuse to provide it more visibility. However, in that very same act, they also reveal that it has some power over them. If the event was harmless or meaningless, then naming it would not further a cause or provide acknowledgement impactful to the CSP. In the discussion of this last tool allusion, they reference “little children,” politically unmentionable events, and foreign aid. These references provide moments within “Mise au Point” for the CSP to establish a buoyancy for their power. These show some vulnerabilities, but more strongly they show the CSP’s ability and willingness to exert their power.

The CSP’s agency and identity display through analysis of “Mise au Point” and the lens of the tools of vocabulary, frame of reference, and allusion. The CSP recognize that they do not possess the same kind of power as Western actors, but with the power they have they wield it fiercely. They diplomatically demand independence from colonial rule with a specific plan to do it, while simultaneously threatening the West with a rouge dictatorship if Western leaders do not meet their requests. They portray themselves as both Rwandans through their use of first-person plural pronouns (we/us/our) that declare group ownership of elements of Rwandan culture and identity (such as their shared language), but also express their distance from the Rwandan populace at times by declaring, either implicitly or explicitly, their seniority. Their use of multiple frames of reference that ultimately maintain an external focus are a mark of their
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education and their desire and achievement of an increased presence on the international political stage. The CSP are, after all, the king’s superior council. Finally, through several allusions, their hints at power manipulation reveal that the CSP is not a weak entity. Their colonial guardian and argumentative opponent for this upcoming UN visit were their educators in their youth. The CSP may not be as strong as an international organization, but they understand their position of power relative to their opponent and they understand their opponent. From this understanding of themselves, they derive their power.

Discussion of “Mise au Point” included considering its content and analyzing the narrative tools in the content. Doing so clearly demonstrates that the Conseil Supérieur du Pays were not passive actors, but instead had agency in what they wrote and what they expressed in that writing. Therefore, the content and analysis of “Mise au Point” expresses elements of their perception of themselves. Their writing shows they viewed themselves as Rwandans, but as superior to common folk. They were not naïve or idealists, but realists even to the point of threatening Western powers with tyranny in Rwanda to achieve their declared goals. To that effect, they also clearly viewed themselves as actors on the international stage, actors who could invoke foreign aid or push back against external powers claiming Flemish had a place in their educational systems before their own native tongue. However, some of these qualities and assertions, especially their main focus on external power dynamics, were precisely what would meet resistance with the Hutu évolués one month after the publication of “Mise au Point.”

While we agree that the current [T]utsi administration should participate more [...] we feel that a warning should be issued against a method, which tending to eliminate white-black colonialism, would leave a worse [Tutsi] colonialism over the [H]utu.

Manifesto of the Bahutu, March 1957

This chapter discusses the Hutu évolués who acted in response to the CSP’s political dialogue. The actions of the CSP and then the évolués in response are the beginning of the hardening into ethnic delineations of Hutu, Tutsi, and Twa. These transitioned from cultural distinctions, what Alison Des Forges refers to as “significant units of identification,” to ethnic groups. Analysis of the CSP’s “Mise au Point” and the évolués’ “Manifesto of the Bahutu” expands upon Mahmood Mamdani’s argument that “the Revolution [of 1959] not only left standing, but reinforced, the political identities created by colonialism.” This chapter contends that this hardening of identities was not just in 1959, but also occurred in 1957, as this analysis of “the Manifesto of the Hutu” proves.

Despite their introduction this late in the story, the Hutu have been part of Rwandan history for centuries, especially coming to the fore with the White Fathers establishment in Ruanda-Urundi. In the varied ways available to them, they had been acting as agents of change within communities since the early twentieth century. Popular narratives tend to treat Hutu in the extreme, including the ‘ancient tribal hatred.’ They did not suddenly appear after the Second

---
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World War ready to interact within a system that they knew nothing about. The Hutu, for instance, were the group who enabled the White Fathers to establish their missions. While mwami Musinga gave permission for their evangelizing, it was access to the Hutu – and only to the Hutu- that he permitted. Thus, the Hutu have been key actors despite their concurrent social subjugation. The Hutu have been a constant actor in tandem with the White Fathers as recipients of their education, patronage, protection, and cultural influence. However, as the history from post-Second World War through the late 1950s demonstrates, the Hutu elite shifted from existing as tandem with the White Fathers to being peers to them. The Hutu elite gained political training and agency with their action in TRAFIPRO, and thus honed their skills for their entrance onto the international stage. They became significant political actors with their publication in March 1957 in response to the CSP’s “Mise au Point” in February as both groups pushed Rwanda down the road to independence.¹⁶⁶ Before seeing how the évolutés responded to the CSP, it is first necessary to retell the White Fathers history to explain how Hutu transitioned, in the eyes of Europeans, to évolutés. This review also accounts for the transitions within the White Fathers that shifted social preferential treatment to the Hutu and thus provided the springboard for the évolutés’ political launch in 1957.

Following the end of the Second World War, the White Fathers experienced a generational shift, and these new priests who went to Rwanda were more democratic than hierarchical, were anticommunist, and aimed to assist the decolonization process.¹⁶⁷ These men were from Belgium and Switzerland, less so from France, which contributed to the compositional shift. Being from these countries, they likely had formative experiences during or following the First and Second World Wars that resulted in a shift in attitude regarding treatment

¹⁶⁶ Lemarchand, Rwanda and Burundi, 149–50.
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of Hutu. Belgian priests who had directly experienced German Occupation in the early 1940s might have especially carried memories of violent, forced subordination. The Belgian post-war environment, as Martin Conway articulates, was consistently shifting along a spectrum of various political, linguistic, and regional identities and these shifts occurred due to a popular outcry to update political coalitions.\footnote{168} While this defined Belgium, other parts of Western Europe, many having already experienced the transformative wave of nationalism before the wars, focused on internal rebuilding of infrastructures, economies, and peoples while also working to establish a new regional power dynamic, as Tony Judt describes.\footnote{169} Living and working in the post-war era, the priests brought these experiences with them to Rwanda.\footnote{170} But it was not only their lived experiences, it was also their observation of what was occurring around the global in the post-war environment – the start of the Cold War, the establishment of the People’s Republic of China, combat in Korea, and France’s involvement in French Indochina.\footnote{171} These experiences, while heterogenous and depending on the origins of each priest, influenced how they operated within Rwanda in the post-war environment where ideas of decolonization slowly seeped into the country, at least as early as 1953.\footnote{172}

Additionally, outside of these internal or external social experiences, the perspectives of the Catholic church were also changing as it, was trying to figure out how to be modern.\footnote{173} According to James Chappel, since the 1930s, for most or all of the lives of this new generation of White Fathers, the Catholic church had aimed to stake their place in the world by defining
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what modernism meant for Catholics. Primarily, from the 1930s into the 1950s, this new modernism meant anti-communism and “forg[ing] new alliances [to] survive.” With this hard line drawn, Catholics saw themselves as responsible for providing the antidote to the illness of communism.

This all contextualizes how, when this new generation of White Fathers came to Rwanda post-war, they began to upturn the previous preferential treatment solely given to the Tutsi. The priests began, instead, to sympathize with the Hutu and aim for ways to increase conditions for work in order to avoid the allegedly desirous elements of communism that sought to address worker’s needs. Additionally, the White Fathers aided Hutu when they created TRAFIPRO in late 1956. But how did the Hutu get to the point where they could receive this amount of attention from the White Fathers?

When this new generation of White Fathers began to work in Rwanda, they saw the paternalistic ways that their predecessors had treated the évolutés and they realized this (in combination with other poor decisions of the Catholic church), had delegitimized them, according to J.J. Carney. Instead of the évolutés seeing the priests as patrons, as the Hutu originally had seen them as a buffer from the Tutsi, the White Fathers realized the évolutés saw them as patronizing. According to Donat Murego, however, even though only Tutsi received the benefit of education (at least until more opportunities opened for Hutu in 1955), the Hutu experienced inclusion from the White Fathers, albeit for ulterior motives, but inclusion
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nonetheless.\textsuperscript{179} Between the time of the White Fathers’ takeover of the educational system in 1930 and Hutu educational inclusion in 1955, the only place Hutu could be educated were in the seminaries. The Hutu were again under the watchful eye of the White Fathers.\textsuperscript{180} Even with the constant oversight, when Hutu completed seminary education, they increased their social standing. Not only did the classroom provide knowledge and skills, but new opportunities also enabled Hutu to shed their second-class citizenry and gain power in Rwanda. It seems here that indeed the master’s tools – education as a ‘civilizing’ force – did succeed in dismantling the master’s house – the Church-supported Tutsi grip on power in Rwanda.\textsuperscript{181}

Disassembly of this metaphorical master’s house occurred slowly at first, but definitively. A revolt at the Great Seminary of Nyakibanda in 1950 wherein Hutu refused to follow the strict rules proved this correct.\textsuperscript{182} This revolt displayed to the priests that they would have to ramp up their focus on social justice, as well as focus on anti-communist measures, to maintain social decorum.\textsuperscript{183} The most prominent way they aimed to do this was through the creation of TRAFIPRO, which, along with several Catholic sponsored magazine and newspaper publications in the region, acted as a springboard for the Hutu évolués to enter the international stage.

Gregoire Kayibanda was one of the products of this educational system and he used it as the social springboard it was. He was a Hutu man born in eastern Rwanda on May 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1924. Thus, his entire educational life, he lived under the tutelage of the White Fathers. This
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integration into education almost certainly resulted in his fluency in English, French, and German, as well as his native Kinyarwanda.\textsuperscript{184} Part of his education took place at the Nyakibanda seminary, the very same one that revolted in 1950, which he entered in 1943. After his time at the seminary, he worked at another Catholic institution in Kigali starting in 1949. By the early 1950s, Kayibanda was in contact with Belgian colonial leaders, working as a secretary to senior White Fathers, and editor for several of the Catholic-sponsored magazines.\textsuperscript{185} Kayibanda had social mobility, linguistic skills, practical experience teaching in classrooms and to the public, and he had the trustworthiness of the White Fathers. He stood on the springboard of the White Fathers, poised and ready to enter a position of power.

The creation of TRAFIPRO, while funded mostly by the Church and which Father Louis Pien advocated for, was not a solely original idea of the White Fathers. Originally built out of the coffee cooperative that Gregoire Kayibanda had created with influence from the priest’s exposure to cooperatives in Europe, TRAFIPRO not only served economic and agricultural purposes, but also political.\textsuperscript{186} For the White Fathers, it provided a space to model options for agricultural workers that were alternates to communism. For the Hutu évolués, it provided a space for political meetings, teaching of skills, and establishment or increase of networks. The évolués therefore had social, economic, and political infrastructures to support their growing political discourse, and Kayibanda had a significant leadership role within these structures to

\begin{quote}
184 Nkundabagenzi, \textit{Rwanda Politique}, 408. A note of interest: this short biography of Kayibanda lists that he spoke English, French, and German, but not Kinyarwanda. This likely reflects the Euro-centric focus or the implied inclusion of Kinyarwanda.

185 Nkundabagenzi, 408; Linden and Linden, \textit{Church and Revolution in Rwanda}, 228–29; Prunier, \textit{The Rwanda Crisis: History of a Genocide}, 44 n.8; Lemarchand, \textit{Rwanda and Burundi}, 148.

186 Linden and Linden, \textit{Church and Revolution in Rwanda}, 239; Lemarchand, \textit{Rwanda and Burundi}, 148 & 251–53.
\end{quote}
“awaken the political consciousness of the Hutu masses.” This displays that while “The Manifesto of the Bahutu” may have been the first public and international response to these contemporary conversations, it was not the first social response nor the first written response to events. For example, TRAFIPRO itself was a community response to self-organize, and various forms of the press existed that provided written debates. Despite this evidence of political action, “Mise au Point” was different stimulus for the évolutés. This publication from the CSP hit a nerve of the évolutés, and they “hurried to react” and responded with their own direct address.

When Kayibanda and his eight peers wrote their manifesto, they addressed it to the Belgian colonial governor general, Jean-Paul Harroy. Harroy only revealed this fact in this memoir as he tries to establish his limited interactions with the leaders of the “Hutu peasantry” who only rarely organized publicly, he claims, otherwise they were usually “in the shadows” or “in hiding.” The organization may have been in private, but the spreading of news occurred publicly, as Harroy also describes, and this resulted in a pitting of mwami Mutara against Kayibanda, “a merciless dual between Nyanza’s Goliath and Kabgayi’s David.” There is no doubt Harroy knew how the story of David and Goliath ended in the Bible, just he knew how the history of the Independence movement in Rwanda ended from his experiences. In short, the underestimated and presumed unskilled David (Hutu) attacked the proud giant (Tutsi ruling elite)


189 Harroy, Rwanda, 227 & 230. Original text of latter: “Comme je l’ai dit plus haut, ce texte me fut publiquement adressé.”

190 Harroy, 230. Original text: “Si j’ai quelque peu développé ce qui précède dans un passage que pourtant j’ai annulé devoir être relativement abrégé, c’est en raison de l’importance extrême que je crois qu’il faille attacher à cette influence de la presse dans le duel sans merci qui oppose le Goliath de Nyanza au David de Kabgayi.”
with his unsophisticated weaponry and then slayed the giant with their weapon to ensure total victory.\textsuperscript{191} Again, Hutu actions demonstrated how the tools of ‘civilization’ empowered the ‘uncivilized.’ The Belgians saw the act of ‘civilizing’ as giving the Hutu social tools for improvement, but then the Hutu used these very tools to destroy existing social structures. Therefore, analyzing the Hutu \textit{évolués} retort to the CSP’s “Mise au Point” shows at face value the system that they deemed needed remediying, but deeper also illustrates the Hutu \textit{évolués} sense of identity that support this demand for change.

Gregoire Kayibanda and his fellow believers in the injustice of Tutsi reign over Hutu had certainly not been silent prior to the publication of the “Hutu Manifesto.”\textsuperscript{192} They routinely shared the published news from hill to hill throughout Rwanda, traveling and reading the newspaper or magazines to share it rapidly across communities.\textsuperscript{193} There was especially a connection with the shared media and Kayibanda’s role as editor of these forms of print media, whether it was \textit{Kinyamateka} or \textit{L’Ami}. Besides the verbal sharing of written communication, there was also the work of TRAFIPRO which served as a modeling community from which Kayibanda drew support and supporters for this political action.\textsuperscript{194} However, these were all local and internal actions to building a movement and gaining support. The fact that “Hutu Manifesto” both aimed regionally and nationally, and external to Rwanda shows that this document worked to do something different than the cohort’s work previously did. The reason that it did was different was because the previous month’s publication of “Mise au Point” was the catalyst, not only railing against the systematic social injustice.\textsuperscript{195} Therefore, with this motivation, the writers

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Coogan, \textit{The New Oxford Annotated Bible}, 427. Biblical text is 1 Samuel 17, specifically verses 48-50.
\item Harroy, \textit{Rwanda}, 229.
\item Lemarchand, \textit{Rwanda and Burundi}, 251.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
needed to be precise with their language, to enumerate injustices, and to suggest improvements. They needed simultaneously to rally their supporters and convince their nay-sayers in order to exert power and enact change. They needed a manifesto.

“The Hutu Manifesto”

The “Hutu Manifesto” successfully shows the Hutu évolués focused on identifying and remedying the “indigenous racial problem in Ruanda.”\(^{196}\) They existed as the subordinated group, but their identity exists as more than that. They see this systematic subordination as the root of all economic, social, political, and cultural problems. Without undoing the oppressive system supporting this “monopoly,” they write, Rwanda could not travel “the road to genuine democratization.”\(^{197}\) Proof of the Hutu évolués’s identification and goals exists in their use of vocabulary, their frame of reference, and allusions in their text. Enumeration, analysis, and synthesis of these features within the text illustrate the group’s expressed identity. Individually these express identity tendencies but together these narrative tools provide an entire image, a snapshot in time to illustrate how the Hutu évolués saw themselves and understood their relationship within society.

The vocabulary and the language of these words is the most pronounced and diverse narrative feature of the “Hutu Manifesto” and reveals the agency of the évolués in this complex political situation. Being a manifesto, their purpose is, yes, to respond to the CSP, but also to gather support and convince others of their perspective. Therefore, this manifesto casts a wide net to engage a broad audience and aimed to engage this audience through its impassioned explanations of problems and suggested remedies in Rwandan society. The writers accomplish this through writing in the first person and writing in multiple languages.


\(^{197}\) United Nations Trusteeship Council, 39 & 42.
Similar to “Mise au Point,” “Hutu Manifesto” utilizes the first-person plural pronouns to evoke a sense of community among the writers and the readers of the manifesto. In this way, they assert goals, beliefs, and aspirations that implicitly reference the group dynamic to the writing as well as invite other readers (or listeners) of the manifesto to join the cause. Further, this consistent incorporation throughout the manifesto emphasizes the identity of the writers behind the ideas. It is not that something should be done by someone about social inequality in Rwanda, instead it is that “we will endeavor to shed some light on this matter.”\textsuperscript{198} It is not colonialism and paternalism wherein an unrelated party steps in to defend another for personal gain, it is that “we desire […] the advancement of the Muhutu” and “[we aim to convince] the authorities of the thinking and specific desires of the people to which we belong.”\textsuperscript{199} They identify as Hutu and with the skills and experiences they possess, they speak for the group.

The second way that the Kayibanda and his peers aim to garner the attention of a large group is through their emphasis on linguistic diversity and compromise. They accomplish this with the use of three languages: French, Latin, and Kinyarwandan. Again, the same as “Mise au Point,” the writers of the manifesto wrote the document in French. This makes sense since they were writing this to governor Harroy, but it also has the advantage that it could then be in direct dialogue with “Mise au Point.” Both works were in French, and could reach the same international audience, specifically Belgium and the UN Trusteeship Council. The price of using the language of the colonial government effectively acted as a compromise of the ésolus’ culture of origin, but the price bought them access to a large, international audience.

The second language used in the manifesto is Latin. The periodic incorporation of Latin phrases furthers the writers’ ability to gain access to European audiences, but its incorporation

\textsuperscript{198} United Nations Trusteeship Council, 39.
\textsuperscript{199} United Nations Trusteeship Council, 41, paragraph 4(e) & p. 42.
does more than that. In a sense showing off their advanced education from the White Fathers, the additional phrases act as a nudge to a Western reader to assert the évolutés as peers to international political leaders. In one reference, the writers divulge that a group of Hutu and some Tutsi youth use the phrase “in itineribus semper” (always on the road or on a journey) as a motto, perhaps aimed to give legitimacy to this group through its use of an ancient European language.\textsuperscript{200} Similarly, they invoke the phrase “ceteris paribus” (all else being equal) while arguing for educational reforms, relying on this phrase as an standard logical caveat.\textsuperscript{201} While these inclusions are interesting, it is especially interesting to consider these to Kayibanda’s available biography. It already does not mention his fluency in Kinyarwandan, his native language, and these Latin references raise the question if perhaps he was also fluent in Latin. Of course, one of the other eight writers could have also been proficient and insisted on inserting these phrases. Or perhaps it was too obvious to mention, an unextraordinary skill of a graduate of the White Fathers’ education, just as expected as fluency of the native tongue of one’s native land. Regardless of the reason though, the usage of Latin bolsters the usage of French to emphasize the évolutés’ audience.

The third language that the évolutés use in the “Hutu Manifesto” is Kinyarwandan. Staying consistent with keeping their intended audience as the focal point, their use of Kinyarwandan phrases are contextualized, expected, and only periodic. Unlike the Latin phrases, which they use fluently and without translation or explanation (thus anticipating that their audience perfectly understands their usage), the native Rwandan phrases have context associated

\textsuperscript{200} United Nations Trusteeship Council, 40, parapgraph (1). The manifesto writers state that this group is “fleeing the corvée” (forced work), and they imply that they are “always on the road” because they fleeing and perhaps also looking for other means of economic support.

\textsuperscript{201} United Nations Trusteeship Council, 41, paragraph 4(a). While this is a stock Latin phrase that has survived into the modern era, it is also a specific use of grammar. One wonders if the writers knew just the phrase or also knew the grammar as well.
each time. Whether it is a definition of the phrase “respect for the culture and customs of the country” or classification as “[royal] court drummers,” each time the writers provide a description.\textsuperscript{202} This shows that they are walking a fine line, they have a focus on their European audience while also striving to maintain legitimacy within their own culture. They may be defining the Kinyarwandan words in French, but they still use the Kinyarwandan words. They may speak a language that enables communication with colonial powers, but they still are members of their own cultural community.

The second narrative tool that the writers used to express their argument and their identity is their selected frame of reference. Contrary to “Mise au Point,” the writers repeatedly express a profoundly rigid internal frame of reference that centers on Rwandan race relations. Just as CSP’s “Mise au Point” discussed education and politics, so does “Hutu Manifesto.” As “Manifesto” discusses each element of society and government that needs a remedy, each time the writers describe that the core of a problem is preferential treatment of Tutsi at the expense of Hutu. By successfully linking power to ethnicity as well as precolonial Rwandan culture to colonial manipulation, the évolués display that this was a complex social system that did exist and needed deliberate attention to enact change within it.\textsuperscript{203} Their message through the “Hutu Manifesto” is clear: we cannot address any other problems without addressing the problem of social inequality first. Therefore, in order to address these problems, the évolués seek European alliance which becomes most apparent in the third tool – allusions.

The last category of analysis of the “Hutu Manifesto” reviews and analyzes the allusions, either as examples or explanations, that the évolués utilized. During the évolués’ discussion of

\textsuperscript{202} United Nations Trusteeship Council, 40, paragraph 1 & pp. 41, paragraph 4(d). The Kinyarwandan used is “Umuco w’Igihugu” (which they note used sarcastically) and “biru”, respectively. Interestingly, Carney describes the biru instead as “keepers of tradition” instead of in this specific role (pp. 106).

\textsuperscript{203} Murego, La Révolution Rwandaise, 1959-1962: essai d’interprétation, 766 & 773.
what they perceive as the various Tutsi monopolies within Rwandan culture, they incorporate several Western European elements to display cultural openness and Rwandan cultural references to display their core cultural belonging. The Western references successfully articulate their openness to European culture, and the original writing of the document in French also acts in parallel to these references, which in combination show not just a willingness to engage with Europeans but to do some so on European cultural terms. Simultaneously, however, the writers of the manifesto do not neglect to incorporate some Rwandan cultural references. This combination of allusions expresses a cultural heritage from both groups – Rwandan genealogy and European education.

The European-based references that the évolués include are more prominent than Rwandan references in the manifesto and cover mostly political and legal ground. For example, they argue for political inclusion of the European colonists.204 This is a fascinating inclusion given that several years prior in the Belgian Congo a group of white colonists gathered together to assert their perceived right for political agency within the colonies.205 The évolués also argue for a piecemeal transition to a Western legal tradition, specifically by codifying laws and requiring a “legal recognition of individual land ownership in the Western sense of the word.”206 These two references combined aim to pull in European colonists and push Rwanda towards a European tradition, thus displaying to colonial powers that Rwanda is on the path to become independent. They further articulate this by stating what could happen if Rwanda stays on its current route without changes: communism.207 The threat, or even mere mention, that parts of

---

204 United Nations Trusteeship Council, “Report on Ruanda-Urundi (T/1402),” 41, paragraph 3(e).
205 Claussen et al., “The Consul General at Leopoldville (Mallon) to the Department of State.”
206 United Nations Trusteeship Council, “Report on Ruanda-Urundi (T/1402),” 40, paragraph 1(b) & pp.41, paragraph 3(a).
Africa would fall to the evils of communism was a great fear of the Western powers, most especially true for the United States of America.\(^{208}\) There is a final reference the \textit{évolués} include with Europeans as the focal audience. In this reference, the \textit{évolués} aimed to invalidate the inherent presumption that “the Mututsi are […] born to rule,” a heavenly mandate for Rwanda.\(^{209}\) To contest this with Europeans, they counterargue that “the same virtue may take a different form in an Italian than in a German, in an Englishman than in a Japanese, in a Fleming than in a Walloon.”\(^{210}\) This comparison of senior-subordinate powers of not only sovereign states but the intrinsic division within Belgium is striking. What these references show overall, more than ambitions for political alliance or that the authors are highly educated – all of which is true – is that they know their political opponents. How do they know the Europeans so well? The same way they can speak European languages and know cultural references – Europeans were the source of the \textit{évolués}’ Western education. Used as a civilizing force by Europeans, the \textit{évolués} successfully employ these same tools as they aimed to win political favor.

Despite the fact that most of the references in the “Hutu Manifesto” are Euro-centric, there are some that focus on Rwandan culture. Just as the inclusion of Kinyarwandan noted, the


\(^{210}\) United Nations Trusteeship Council, 39, paragraph b.
évolués discuss several cultural phrases and groups in society, to include the biru. As the overall “keepers of tradition,” they acted as court drummers, advisors on tradition, and final authority on a king’s successor.211 Although brief, this reference is significant as it reflects cultural knowledge about Rwanda regarding the existence and the role of the biru.

The “Hutu Manifesto,” written in March 1957, is in direct dialogue with “Mise au Point,” written in February. Kayibanda and his peers directly confront “the Tutsi High Council.”212 This confrontation is obvious when they contend that “No solution of the Mututsi-Belgian relations [i.e. discussions within “Mise au Point”] can be durable until the fundamental difficulties between the Mututsi and the Muhutu are settled.”213 Their vocabulary displays their sense of collective group inclusion, but also betrays their advanced education with their writing in French, emphatic Latin incorporation, and inclusion of Kinyarwandan phrases. Their frame of reference is internal to Rwanda, focusing on the social, cultural, political, and economic inequality of the preferential treatment to Tutsi. Lastly, their references primarily aim to convince their European audience of the integrity of their argument and the potential consequences of failure to act in solidarity with the évolués. The few Rwandan cultural references included strive to show solidarity to their compatriots. Combined, these features communicate how the évolués identify within Rwandan society.

While the évolués presented a compelling discussion and fought to bring attention to a deep social inequality in Rwanda, it is nevertheless important to recognize that this group had the

211 Carney, Rwanda Before the Genocide, 106. The biru were supposed to be the advisor of the king’s successor and this is precisely what did not occur with the White Father’s involvement in this process earlier in the century.
212 United Nations Trusteeship Council, “Report on Ruanda-Urundi (T/1402),” 41, paragraph 4(e); Nations Unies Conseil de Tutell, “Rapport sue le Ruanda-Urundi (T/1346),” 9, paragraph 3(e) & 11, paragraph 4(e), Annexe I. Here they reference the CSP as “The Tutsi High Council” as compared to paragraph 3(e) where they use the official name “The High Council of the Country.” The French difference is “le Conseil supérieur MUTUTSI” versus “Conseil Supérieur du pays,” respectively.
skills, time, and ability to engage in these significant conversations on an international level. This fact, and the cumulative life experiences that they received that resulted in those skills, shows the exceptionalism of this group as compared to other Hutu in Rwanda at the time and as compared to other historical sources. However, their existence as a non-representative population does not invalidate them as a historical source. They may not have been the Hutu farmer struggling through *uburtwa, ubuhake, corvée*, and working for their own livelihood, as some Hutu were. However, despite this exceptional status, these Hutu were still members of their communities, shaped by them and originating from them. This manifesto, although written by elites, still shares the perspective of Hutu and provides a valuable perspective to counterbalance against other sources that focus on solely European perspectives.

**Rwandan Political Leadership Responds**

It might be easy to assume that political leaders largely ignored a sassy manifesto of a subjugated group fighting to upturn a country’s political system. That assumption is incorrect. Instead, the publishing of this manifesto resulted in the writers of the document receiving a personal and in-person death threat from *mwami* Mutara himself.\(^{214}\) This threat shows the Rwanda internal response and proves that the *mwami* took the text and political pressuring from it seriously, even if he initially tried to ignore it.

Following release of the “Hutu Manifesto,” the Hutu clamored for discussion of the ideas presented on a more public scale. Instead, *mwami* Mutara denied the conversation. The king continued to delay and ignore, and so the time passed…the Jubilee celebration occurred in June and July…the UN Trusteeship Council visited in September. It was not until a full year later that

\(^{214}\) Harroy, *Rwanda*, 240.
the king relented and allowed meetings to commence. In March 1958, ten Hutu and ten Tutsi met together to form “the Hutu-Tutsi Study Commission.” There were approximately ten or twenty Hutu and Tutsi at the commission, but no matter the count, the event went poorly for the Hutu. They found that they had been disillusioned, falling from the excitement and pride of being called to the royal capital to speak with the king, to being accused as traitors and “haters of Rwanda” and “enemies of the king [and] enemies of the country,” and this usually was punishable by death. The threat almost came to fruition for one Hutu, Joseph Gitera. There are varying accounts on what happened and specifically on what date, but sometime between April to June 1958 during the commission meetings, mwami Mutara either forcefully grabbed Gitera’s throat or walked up to Gitera and whispered to him, “…be careful, Joseph…” as he made a clear mime with his hands of strangling Gitera.

Despite this animosity, the Commission eventually finished and determined that there was at least some measure of Hutu-Tutsi tension, but it also finished having significantly injured the Hutu vision of the king. Traditionally, the king was superior to the divisions of Tutsi, Hutu, or Twa, for he was king for all Rwandans. But threats from the king and rejection of the king by a Hutu representative was only the beginning. Once the Commission did finish their inquiry, they presented their results to the CSP and the mwami, the president of the CSP. The CSP,

215 Harroy, 239; Carney, Rwanda Before the Genocide, 87–91.
216 Harroy, Rwanda, 239; Linden and Linden, Church and Revolution in Rwanda, 252; Carney, Rwanda Before the Genocide, 87; Murego, La Révolution Rwandaise, 1959-1962: essai d’interprétation, 871–74. Each scholar lists a slightly different number and it is not clear which source highlights the exact count. Harroy says there were 10 Hutu and 10 Tutsi, Linden and Linden list 15 members, Carney lists 10, and Murego does not list a number.
217 Murego, La Révolution Rwandaise, 1959-1962: essai d’interprétation, 874; Linden and Linden, Church and Revolution in Rwanda, 252. Linden includes the Kinyarwanda word for “haters of Rwanda,” inyangarwanda.
218 Linden and Linden, Church and Revolution in Rwanda, 252; Carney, Rwanda Before the Genocide, 87; Harroy, Rwanda, 240 n. 1. Carney cites Linden and Linden regarding this event, therefore both have the same description, that the king grabbed Gitera’s throat. Harroy described the event more directly as if he was there (although this is not clear),” saying, as Harroy wrote it, “fit le geste de l’étrangler doucement à deux mains, puis le repoussa en murmuran: ‘…attention, Joseph…’.”
219 Linden and Linden, Church and Revolution in Rwanda, 252.
based “on the mwami’s recommendation […] rejected all of the committee’s conclusions.”

These leaders did not stop there, however. Mutara flat-out denied that any animosity between Hutu and Tutsi existed, and the CSP prohibited use of the ethnic terms Hutu, Tutsi, or Twa in government records. The Hutu were furious and increased their resistance to the Tutsi-top-heavy government. This was exactly what they had argued against in their manifesto –

“Therefore, in order to keep a close check on this racial monopoly, we strongly oppose, for the time being at least, the discontinuance of the practice of entering Muhutu, Mututsi, or Mutwa on official or personal identity cards.” It would make it far too easy, they argued, to lose sight of acts of segregation and lose the ability to empirically notice discriminatory practices without noting group belonging. Nevertheless, these internal disagreements remained. In the next two years, Mutara would be dead, his half-brother replaced him and then exiled, and the Hutu Uprising inverted the power dynamic whereby Hutu took charge of the country. Over the following two years, Rwanda became independent from Belgian colonial rule in 1962 and also exercised the first Hutu-led massacre of Tutsi. The “Hutu Manifesto,” and its catalyst, “Mise au Point,” made an incontrovertible influence on Rwanda’s trajectory for the rest of the century.

As this chapter has shown, the Hutu have been key actors in the historical narrative of Rwanda’s history during the Twentieth Century. They enabled the White Father’s success in

---

222 Carney, 91; Linden and Linden, *Church and Revolution in Rwanda*, 255.
223 Carney, *Rwanda Before the Genocide*, 91; Linden and Linden, *Church and Revolution in Rwanda*, 251–54. At this point already, Kayibanda had formed the political party MSM and the Gitera the party APROSOMA. These, and other, scholars are at this point in time begin to draw parallels to the French Revolution and hence with the revolutionary events in 1959 refer to them as a *jacquerie*.
225 Carney, *Rwanda Before the Genocide*, 107; Prunier, *The Rwanda Crisis: History of a Genocide*, 55 n. 22; Newbury, *The Cohesion of Oppression*, 193; Mamdani, *When Victims Become Killers*, 123; Des Forges, *Leave None to Tell the Story*, 38. Mutara’s death has numerous reports – Newbury states the official report lists a brain hemorrhage, Prunier states it was possibly anaphylactic shock from a vaccine (which could have also been an assassination), and Mamdani asserts that, regardless of the cause, it enabled the revolution later in the year.
Rwanda by providing them an audience to evangelize, and in return, the Hutu received an education and social opportunities that provided some of this group the opportunity to advance socially. These opportunities and honed skills, especially in language and cultural education, directly enabled the Hutu évolués to publish a public contradiction to their national leaders’ statement in early 1957. This manifesto and the events that followed show that the Rwandans were in dialogue about their own future, they were not simply relying on Belgian colonial leaders to create it for them. As part of this dialogue, it is essential that the manifesto describes racial or ethnic relations from the évolués perspective, as this is key to understanding Rwanda in the years that independence become increasingly imminent.227 Lastly, as the next chapter will discuss, these discussions prior to the UN’s visit in late 1957 received attention and successfully legitimized the évolués. Doing so assisted in replacing Rwandan social structures of deference to the king and Catholic church with a rising sense of nationalism.228 The insistence present in the “Hutu Manifesto” to identify the deeply-held social inequality within Rwandan culture and to work to shift it was a significant event that directly influenced Rwanda’s immediate future.

228 Linden and Linden, Church and Revolution in Rwanda, 254.
Chapter 4: The UN, Belgium and the US Respond, 1954-1960

“All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.”

Article I, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948

“Our country [Belgium] undertook the task of developing them and raising the population as a whole to a level of civilization comparable to our own.”

The Ten-Year Plan of Ruanda-Urundi, 1952

Mason Sears was a troublemaker. Or at least, that is what the United States Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, thought of him. Sears had been a member of the United Nations Trusteeship Council’s Visiting Mission to Ruanda-Urundi in 1954 and, while in the position of a nominated member to the UN and representative of the United States government, had expressed support for a timeline for decolonization and statement that directly contradicted official US policy. He suggested “time limits for the attainment of various stages of self-government,” instead of reminding his fellow men on the Mission that the “task of infinite difficulty and delicacy, (and) zeal needs to be balanced by patience.”

Perhaps fortunately for Sears and to reduce his chances of getting in trouble again, the United States did not need to nominate a representative for the subsequent Visiting Mission in 1957. Instead, the four representatives of the mission came from Haiti, Australia, Burma, and France. For Dulles, it was less that Sears had misspoken and more that Sears’ stance was not only a public but also an international misstep for US policy. International discourses about colonial rule included the US since at least

---


after the First World War. Specifically, the US was part of the deliberation wherein Belgium accepted the colonial mandate of Ruanda-Urundi as an outcome of the Treaty of Versailles. Likewise, the US government reviewed draft agreements when the League of Nations Mandate changed to a United Nations Trusteeship, which Belgium still oversaw, in 1942. Since the US was consistently involved with these processes, it is not surprising that the US government was still a member of this official international conversation into and past the 1950s. This is noteworthy because of the US’s involvement, but also the status of domestic and international affairs that increases the significance of America’s involvement. US domestic affairs included significant racial tensions in the era of Jim Crow laws. This combined with Red Scares and anti-communism tied the Civil Rights movement to communism in the eyes of US officials. The US government did not want this connection to leave its borders, especially not to make its way to Africa. Officials specifically feared that the US would lose legitimacy if groups equated domestic racial tensions to decolonization, and they feared that communism would overtake Africa, therefore disrupting the delicate power balances keeping the Cold War from becoming one of hot combat. Indeed, US domestic issues were not separate from international action. US actions had indirect involvement with African colonial affairs via the UN, which the US used as a tool of foreign policy. Belgium and the UN Trusteeship Council, separated by one degree of hierarchy, oversaw the colony of Ruanda-Urundi. This two-tiered oversight aided in creating the false binary that it was either Belgium or the UN who moved Ruanda-Urundi in the direction of


independence.233 While significant actions from both parties were catalysts for this process, it is also important to remember the role that Rwandans played as well.

The US, Belgium, and the UN were various nodes of an intricate network, further complicated by representations of individuals and organizations, domestic or foreign policies. The interactions of this vast network show simultaneously the level of international attention on Rwanda in the late 1950s as well as Western powers’ low expectations of Rwandans. This chapter highlights Rwanda’s role in the history of the United Nations and will investigate three elements of these international exchanges. First, it identifies and discusses the intersection of these international interactions. Second, it discusses the extent to which Rwandans successfully manipulated the UN Visiting Mission’s priorities prior to their visit in September and October of 1957. Lastly, it will analyze and describe to what degree the United Nations did or did not support human rights in Ruanda-Urundi.234 This chapter concludes by stating the Rwandans were a significant actor in the process to achieve independence, in addition to the Belgians and the UN, even though in the short term Rwandan political influence was not as significant as hoped. This shows Rwandan agency in these larger historical processes even to the point of forwarding the process of genocide. Within these interactions, human rights abuses continued, but elicited minimal concern from the UN. This disregard occurred despite the requirements of Article 76 of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.235 This, therefore, displays that discrimination, the third stage of genocide, is clearly established at the conclusion of the 1950s. This atmosphere then enabled the fourth phase of genocide, dehumanization, to take root.

233 For additional discussions on the rejection of the metropole-colonial binary and multidimensional actions in colonialism, see Heather Streets-Salter, World War One in Southeast Asia: Colonialism and Anticolonialism in an Era of Global Conflict (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).
234 Bennett, One World, Big Screen, 5; Anderson, Imagined Communities.
Preparations for the Visiting Mission of 1957 at the UN consisted of creating the Mission itself. This required selecting four men from different countries represented on the Trusteeship Council to ensure that Mission composition changed each visit. In Rwanda, there were also preparations. Before each Visiting Mission, Rwanda experienced a flurry of political activity to display that it was continuing to improve socially and politically to the UN’s satisfaction. For example, during a previous visit in 1954, the mwami officially prohibited certain types of forced labor. In February 1957, the Conseil Supérieur du Pays (CSP) published an official communication for the Visiting Mission to review prior to their visit in September, which reviewed the CSP’s goals and methods to proceed towards independence. The Hutu évolutés also read the communication and, shocked at how it failed discuss the intense subordination and abuse of Hutu, published a response that included a discussion of the entrenched preferential social treatment of Tutsi over Hutu. These written conversations initiated the beginning movements that resulted in the revolution two years later. As Rwandans moved into this future, these publications and Western responses demarcate Rwandan’s choosing to accept the colonial language and ethnic divisions between Hutu and Tutsi. By means of analyzing these exchanges, these highlight the labor and human rights abuses that took place in Ruanda-Urundi.

Even though the UN oversaw the trusteeship system and possibly had more capability and power than Belgium, Belgium’s relationship with the trusteeship territory of Ruanda-Urundi was politically continuous and contiguous by nature of the metropole-colony connections and the presence of colonial officials in residence in Ruanda-Urundi. This contrasted with the UN Visiting Mission’s intermittent inspection visits to the territory that occurred approximately every three years. Considering how first Belgium responded to the political activity in Rwanda in

---

1957 shows their perspective of these political movements and reveals their treatment of human rights.

To reference the entirety of a government as a group actor is sometimes necessary. After all, while the Belgian government may be a group of people, this group aims to act in concert to accomplish domestic and foreign policy goals. If this were the case (as it will be later when discussing the perspective of the US), then a nebulous reference to a faceless bureaucratic entity would be both helpful and adequate to describe this group’s actions. However, in this situation, the expression of Belgium’s official stance on Ruanda-Urundi came not from a bureau but from the governor: Jean-Paul Harroy.

Harroy became governor of Ruanda-Urundi in 1955, a decade after he completed his doctoral dissertation on the degradation of African soil as a consequence of colonialism. Since that time, Harroy worked with UNESCO regarding the “African floral and fauna,” continuing to study soil science. If one wonders how Harroy became Governor of Ruanda-Urundi, it seems that Harroy wondered himself. As he described the offer from the Belgian Minister of Colonies, he recalls first being asked if was seated before the delivery of the proposition: “Do you want to become the governor of Ruanda-Urundi?” He started a few months before the Bandung Conference and then two years after filling the position, Harroy witnessed unfold the interactions between the Hutu and Tutsi elites regarding the UN’s 1957 Visiting Mission.

---

238 Harroy, Rwanda, 114 & 117.
239 Harroy, 117.
240 Harroy, 118.
241 Carney, Rwanda Before the Genocide, 77; Moyn, The Last Utopia, 95 & 108. The Bandung Conference occurred in April 1955 as a meeting of Asian and African states where in they agreed on a platform of anticolonialism and self-determination as a “perquisite…to Human Rights.”
In his role, Harroy shouldered the yoke of representing the Belgian government during the subsequent UN visits. But whether he anticipated it or not, the position required it, and so when the Visiting Mission interviewed him three-quarters of the way through the visit, his responses expressed not only Monsieur Harroy’s views but also those of the Kingdom of

---

243 There are additional sources that relay more directly the Belgian government’s opinions and goals of Ruanda-Urundi. These annual Reports of the Administering Authority do exist in the United Nations’ archive, but this author was not able to obtain access to them prior to the deadline for this research.
Belgium. Harroy hints at this dual role of an individual representing a larger entity when he begins to describe “‘my’ reactions to the historical phenomena that took place around me,” the quotations indicating that his views are than just for one person.\textsuperscript{244} When the Visiting Mission questioned him about the Rwandan political exchange from February to March 1957, he responded with the following:

This is the key problem of the country. The whole history of Ruanda and Urundi led the minority group of Tutsi … to subjugate politically, socially and economically the majority Hutu…where it is fair to recognize that in the past, the dominant class brought services (mainly, security, order and protection) to the dominated class. Contemporary evolution has practically emptied the role of Tutsi protector of Hutus; but, remanence of the past, the habit remains in the hopes that the Tutsi are entitled to expect benefits from the Hutu […] The Hutu, formerly without reaction, acquired the results of education and increased economic strength and, as a result, started to protest more and more strongly against the latest states of affairs that made it impossible for Tutsi to insist on them certain types of benefits. These protests were once rare and cautious. A first sign of the Hutu's emancipation in motion is that these protests are beginning to multiply.\textsuperscript{245}

Harroy is not incorrect in his description. There is linguistic, social, and political evidence that Rwandan society elevated Tutsi at the expense of Hutu at least as far back as the mid-seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{246} This tension preexisted within Rwandan society. And yet, Harroy does not acknowledge the influence of Belgian colonial rule in the early twentieth century as a factor in this cultural relationship. He does not remind his interviewers, and by extension the UN or its member nation-states, of how Belgium instituted identification cards in the 1930s or how Belgians worked with the White Father missionaries to establish and support divergent educational paths for Tutsi and Hutu. Of course, he had nothing to gain by divulging this past. Nevertheless, despite the preexisting divergence in Rwandan society, Belgium certainly had a

\textsuperscript{244} Harroy, \textit{Rwanda}, 231. Original text: “…je m’efforce surtout de livrer “mes” reactions faces aux phénomènes historiques qui se déroulaient autour de moi…”

\textsuperscript{245} Harroy, 231.

\textsuperscript{246} Vansina, \textit{Antecedents to Modern Rwanda: The Nyiginya Kingdom}, 134–35.
manipulative hand in the process. Harroy admits that the dichotomy that “Mise au Point” and “the Hutu Manifesto” exchanged was problematic and a deep social issue. While he also adds that this conversation with the UN created “an exceptional springboard and advertising agent” for the writers of the “Manifesto,” he does not articulate the nuances of how Belgium influenced this historical movement. Nevertheless, Harroy’s conviction agreeing with “this key problem” remains consistent that this social tension was “at the forefront of our [Belgian] concerns.”

At first, Harroy appeared to be socially engaged, even progressive, in his support for this difficult conversation. While this snapshot looks favorable for Harroy, his tone throughout his memoir indicated a lack of seriousness and even mockery or ineptitude regarding his duties. Harroy, by the nature of his position as governor, legitimized the Rwandan discussion, which the UN further amplified through its incorporation in the 1957 Report. However, a few examples from his memoir hint at his personality and show the internal politics behind the curtain of bureaucratic window-dressing.

After describing his interview with the Visiting Mission, Harroy continues discussing related events, including the report “from the Dorsinville mission…” The reference here is not to a town or city, as the name might first indicate, but is instead to a person: the chairman of the Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, Max Dorsinville, ambassador from Haiti. Here, Harroy does not call the Visiting Mission by its formal name, usually only as ‘the mission’

---

247 Harroy, _Rwanda_, 232. Original text: “…auteurs de ce manifeste un tremplin et un agent de publicité exceptionnels.”
248 Harroy, 231–32; United Nations, “T/1201,” 29. In this memoir excerpt, Harroy is expressing a shared reaction with the Belgian government department A.I.M.O. (Indigenous Affairs and Workforce), thus further displaying that his responses were not as an individual but as an official representative of Belgium. Also, in the 1954 Belgian Report on Ruanda-Urundi, the organizational chart for the territory displays the Governor as the center of governance; all other agencies, services, and even the mwami of Ruanda and Urundi emanate from this position. This chart clearly shows that while the nations may have mwami, the governor is king of the territory.
249 Harroy, _Rwanda_, 230 & 232.
250 Harroy, 232 & 247.
and twice by the chairman’s surname. This habitual reference by Harroy reveals how he perceives the UN’s visit – not as a group, such as ‘the UN,’ but as a real or proxy possession of an individual, “the Dorsinville mission.” There does not seem to be any references to Dorsinville’s Haitian citizenship, therefore this does not seem to be a nationalistic discussion. However, this specific reference shows Harroy’s complex interpretation of the visit, simultaneously oversimplifying the visit to a person, while also expressing distain for the UN as an international organization.

The visit in 1957 was Harroy’s first introduction to Dorsinville but it was not the last. Two available photos from almost four years later illuminate more of the relationship between the two. In April 1961, the UN passed a resolution that berated Belgium for its failure to implement a previous resolution that supported political dialogue and encouraged political reconciliation. But to Harroy it was not just the UN that had passed a resolution, it was also that these resolutions emplaced trust in the newly-created United Nations Commission for Ruanda whose chairman was none other than Max Dorsinville. Despite what Harroy asserted earlier in his memoir, there did not appear to be any love lost between Harroy and Dorsinville. Harroy included a photo of the two men with a caption stating that Dorsinville did not want to visit Ruanda-Urundi if he “[had] to meet Governor Harroy again.” Harroy, as if to respond to this retort with one of his own, uses not words but an image. Adjacent to the first photo, he inserted a small image of a cat. Harroy’s insolence and impertinence seeps through the page when he explains that “this is the expression of the cat Mimine as she was listening to Ambassador

252 Harroy, Rwanda, 221–22.
255 Harroy, Rwanda, 222 & 456.
Dorsinville talk to us about [the UN Resolutions].” Harroy’s own words, only the cat listened even though the UN ambassador spoke to both parties. This photographic conversation clashes with Harroy’s written recollections and illustrates the complex and intertwined relationship between himself and Dorsinville, and even by extension hints at the tension between Belgium and the UN. Further, it subsides the professional interaction of the international organization of the UN Visiting Mission traveling to Ruanda-Urundi to converse with the Governor down, in part, to the dynamic between two bickering men.

Temporarily setting aside these dynamics of personality enables a shift back to the institutional relationship between Belgium and the UN. The Visiting Mission, having finished its visit to Ruanda-Urundi in mid-October, released its report to the UN General Assembly in early 1958. The Visiting Mission Report has an overall contradictory and condescending tone, and has a veneer of bureaucracy thinly covering the violent events in late 1950s. Their incorporation and discussion of “Mise au Point” and “Hutu Manifesto” does not escape this.

While the Mission’s report does directly address both Rwandan documents almost twenty times in addition to several indirect responses or incorporations of those author’s arguments, the acknowledgement of them does not dominate the report. Rather, when the Report is contextualized within its contemporary peoples or events, the elements that do dominate are the inconsistencies and the pretentious intonation within it. This context proves to be insightful for how the Visiting Mission then incorporates Rwandan dialogue.

---

256 Harroy, 456. Original text: “Une expression de la chatte Mimine alors qu’elle écoutait l’Ambassadeur Dorsinville nous parler de 1605.” The photo is a close-up of the cat, so it is impossible to contextualize if this photo is from this time or whether Harroy chose to create this mid-century meme after the fact. The origins of the photo, however, do not matter as it was Harroy’s inclusion of the photo and its description that creates the snapshot of the relationship mockery towards Dorsinville.


The Visiting Mission expresses inconsistencies when it gives Belgians and Rwandans mixed feedback and when it categorizes the population of Ruanda-Urundi. These inconsistencies are not only mixed messages, but falsehoods, and show Western powers manipulating information for their own means. The first prominent inconsistency is their mixed signals in communicating the progress of the colonial project. The Mission distributes both criticism and praise towards Belgium. It praises them for their inclusion of young girls and “racial integration” in education and the overall economic, social, and political progress they had overseen. The Mission even took some time to express how “certain European circles” disagree with some of the political changes in Ruanda-Urundi, but ultimately dismisses it as the political progress is “an important step towards creating an organic bond between the two States.” However, the Mission also gives these mixed signals to the Hutu and Tutsi. They praise the Tutsi (they “have a remarkable political and social sense”) but also compliment the Hutu (for no longer being “impassive” as they “once [were]”).

The second inconsistency prevalent in the report is the Mission’s reference to the population as being “homogenous despite its diverse ethnic composition.” Categorizing Ruanda-Urundi as homogenous is false, despite the caveat. Reviewing Belgian statistics on Ruanda-Urundi’s population proves this. The diversity included: three Ruandan and Burundian

---

260 United Nations Trusteeship Council, paras. 77 & 87; Claussen et al., “The Consul General at Leopoldville (Mallon) to the Department of State.” This reference by the Mission is brief but meaningful as it alludes to the political movement that the United States’ Department of State noted in 1953. Primarily organized by Belgian colonists living in Central Africa, “The Central African Congress” was a white settler supremacist movement that aimed for “massive white immigration” to aid “the natives’ climb toward civilization.” As such, this group believed in greater settler involvement in government and a significant decrease in the UN’s “meddling and hypocrisy” in the region, which they attribute to the undue influence of non-Western European nation-states having too much power within the UN. In attendance of this conference was the current Governor of Ruanda-Urundi, as well as the Belgian would, in 1954, would become the Minister of Colonies and hire Harroy – August Buisseret.
262 United Nations Trusteeship Council, paras. 19, 86, 88. In these paragraphs, the Visiting Mission expresses how Belgium had to “abandon … the scheme to standardize” the separate languages of Kirundi and Kinyarwanda and asserts “that Ruanda and Urundi form homogenous population groups…”.
Rollinson

ethnic groups, Europeans from 30 countries; several thousand occupants from “the Asian race” (spanning Ethiopia and British territories in East Africa to Oman, Pakistan, Iran, Balochistan, Yemen, and India); African “non-indigenous” groups (such as Congolese); and the métis or “mixed-breed.” Therefore, from even a cursory look at Ruanda-Urundi’s population data, it is evident that this region was not homogenous and the Mission’s attempt to claim so is incorrect, likely politically motivated to validate the otherwise illogical combining of Ruanda and Urundi into one nation.

The Visiting Mission expresses a third inconsistency when they discuss UN petitions; in this, they also convey a condescending tone in the report. As the Mission sees it, the purpose of petitions is for persons stuck between “the official views of the European or indigenous Administration[s]” to receive “a third party[‘s]” advice or aid. However, given the casual mockery they exhibit with two specific but long-term cases, it is little wonder that the UN did not receive a plethora of petitions for assistance, as they claim to expect. It seems that those who fit the model of advancement within the colonial mold received more consideration, whereas those who did not meet this criteria did not receive attention, funds, legal assistance, or other

263 United Nations, “T/1201,” 329 & 186. Given these provided metrics from the 1954 report, all Europeans combined equaled just over 0.10% of the total population. The report “Asian races” were half of that (0.05%), whereas the “African non-indigenous” were five-times as present as the Europeans, 0.56%. The population totaled to just under 4.3 million, including all listed population groups. These groups included a wide range of religions as well – Catholic, Protestants, Seventh Day Adventists, Hindus, Buddhists, Muslims (four sects), and Jews. Both interestingly and not surprisingly, there is no ‘other religion’ (as there is for some populations) to account for Rwandan traditions or spirituality.


265 United Nations, 340. Métis references children from presumably autochtones [indigenous] mothers and either European or Asian fathers. The term is a racial hierarchical term and appears to be similar in use to mulatto and other similar words.


267 United Nations Trusteeship Council, paras. 67 & 242. The Mission by-name discusses the cases and petitions of Joseph Habyarimana Gitera, one signer of the “Hutu Manifesto” (not to be confused with the second president of Rwanda), and Barnabé Ntunguka, a former chief. The former they use as an example to prove that no petitioner suffers retribution from the Belgian government. The latter they describe as “well known to the [Trusteeship] Council” and one who “passes the time in serving successive terms of imprisonment.”
means of intervention.\textsuperscript{268} Additionally, the Mission does not acknowledge the barrier that the process itself poses to a potential petitioner. As one petitioner described it, he received instructions to send his petition to the Governor (Harroy), who would send the letter to the Belgian Minister of Colonies (Buisseret), who would then send it to the final destination of the UN Trusteeship Council.\textsuperscript{269} Most of the eleven petitions from 1956 to 1958 express at least intense subordination to the Belgian government or governor, if not directly state the author’s fear of reprisal for writing the petition, regardless of the content. Lack of petitions bewildered the Mission, they did not understand why more people do not seek their assistance. They were blind to the process’s skewed power dynamics and how it necessitated a person’s vulnerability.

Moreover, the Mission mocks those petitions submitted anonymously in a likely attempt to avoid this retribution. They call the anonymous writers “malcontents” who “[resent…] being losers”, “misinformed” with “excessive [and] unwarranted” comments, as well as other general pejorative statements.\textsuperscript{270}

The Mission’s condescending tone also shades its incorporation and discussion of “Mise au Point” and “Hutu Manifesto.” Most notably in their report, they do not put the two documents into conversation chronologically, an odd articulation since Harroy understood the documents in conversation with each other and the Mission clearly saw Harroy as an authority figure and

\textsuperscript{268} United Nations, “Petition from Mr. Mohamed Bin Foz Concerning Ruanda-Urundi (T/PET.3/90),” September 17, 1958, 90; United Nations, “Petition from Mr. Zakariya Karamhanda Concerning Ruanda-Urundi (T/PET.3/86),” July 2, 1957, 86; United Nations, “Petition from Mr. Barnabe Ntunguka Concerning Ruanda-Urundi (T/PET.3/L.7),” July 3, 1956, 85; United Nations, “Petition from Mr. Barnabe Ntunguka Concerning Ruanda-Urundi (T/PET.3/81),” May 11, 1955; United Nations, “Petition from Ex-Chief Barnabe Ntunguka Concerning Ruanda-Urundi (T/PET.3/68),” November 6, 1962. These petitions describe various contemporary issues that inhabitants of Ruanda-Urundi encountered – issues navigating legal system (possibly due to discrimination against their ethnicicity or religion, or recompense of motorists killing cyclists or pedestrians), issues navigating the educational system that required fluency in French and Belgian oversight for higher education, description of forced vaccinations of people and livestock, and inconsistent treatment in hospitals that only provided more sanitary conditions when under an inspection.

\textsuperscript{269} United Nations, “T/PET.3/L.7.”

\textsuperscript{270} United Nations Trusteeship Council, “Report on Ruanda-Urundi (T/1402),” paras. 18, 112, 125, 302.
relied on his interpretation of the situation. They do provide attention to each of the documents briefly, but thoroughly summarizing each one in turn. The Mission continues to reference the two documents throughout the report, integrating sometimes a confirmation of an issue or disagreeing with the expression of a partial element. The Mission calls the Hutu Manifesto “prudent” and says that “Mise au Point” is a “more reliable source” than the previously mentioned “misinformed petitioners.” However, the Mission does not engage in a debate with these documents. This shows that while they took them seriously enough to acknowledge the political dialogue, which legitimized it, they did not perceive that it had any true staying power that a debate might necessitate. While it was common for other discussions from the Conseil Supérieur du Pays to be the talk of the town in the local media, this attention from the Mission enabled something different. In this case, as the governor agreed, these debates highlighted the “key problem” in the nation and Mission’s discussion only furthered this dialogue.

This springboard, however, did not launch the conversation to the levels of the US federal government’s awareness. It is true that American foreign policy focused on the African continent in the 1950s. Although the focal points of the policy changed through the years, it did not home in on a micro-event that clearly fell under the purview of the territory’s colonial power. Initially, US foreign policy focused on Africa, whereas later in the decade it would shift to a focus on Africans. The initial focus prioritized resources, including minerals and especially uranium, and land accessibility for potential military and other strategic uses. The pining for resources was

---

271 United Nations Trusteeship Council, para. 31; Harroy, Rwanda, 230. Perhaps this failure to recognize the political and linguistic fluency of these Rwanda political groups is a blindspot of the colonial system, the same one that insists on referring to Ruanda-Urundi as a “homogenous” area.
274 Harroy, Rwanda, 230.
real, especially given that Ruanda-Urundi exported 2,771 tons of “ore and metals” in 1954.\(^{277}\)

This focus on the gains of the territory also included a focus on Belgium, most especially and repeatedly its tendency to be “highly sensitive to any criticism of her colonial administration.”\(^{278}\)

Harroy shared this sensitivity, especially from critiques from the UN. He defended Belgium’s work, especially when discussing the violent tools of Belgium’s empire. As he described the recently reduced and nearly-prohibited practice of whipping, Harroy seems almost wistful for the “presence of the strong method” whose forbidden usage was not only “repudiated by the whole of the native hierarchy” but contributed to the Belgians loss of authority of the peoples of Ruanda-Urundi, too.\(^{279}\)

As if to support his defense of “being abused and treated as an odious colonist,” he also relays the story of his Rwandan cook from 1937 who he claims said, “Nowadays, there are no more Whites. You hesitate to give the chicotte…you are not real chiefs. […] in 1905 – I saw a German [officer] … [hang] twenty people on trees [in one week]. That was a man!”\(^{280}\)

A second example of Harroy’s sharing the defensiveness of his countrymen is

---

\(^{277}\) United Nations, “T/1201,” 79. These items were second only to coffee (9,014 tons exported for 558,860,00 francs) and oil (4,097 tons for 21, 604,000 francs). In short, Belgium exported twice as much oil for only one-tenth of the financial benefit, and four times the amount of coffee to yield only two and one-half of the value. It is no wonder that the US aimed to be a part of this trading system.


\(^{279}\) Harroy, Rwanda, 246. Original text: “Cette abrogation réprouvée par toute la hiérarchie autochtone, n'avait pas peu contribué également à énerver l'autorité parmi des populations plutôt admiratives que réprobatrice en présence de la manière forte.”

\(^{280}\) Harroy, 237 & 246 Original Text: " Avec la certitude de me faire injurier et traiter d'odieux colonialiste, je rapporterai ici ce que m'a dit à Rutshuru en 1937, quand je dirigeais le Parc national Albert, mon cuisinier rwandais Shabani: «De nos jours, il n'y a plus de Blancs. Vous hésitez à donner la chicote. Vous ne pendez plus. Vous n'êtes pas de vrais chefs. Dans ma jeunesse -ce devait être vers 1905- j'ai vu arriver sur ma colline un Hauptman allemand qui après une semaine avait déjà pendu vingt personnes à des arbres. Ça, c'etait un homme!”"; United Nations Trusteeship Council, “Report on Ruanda-Urundi (T/1402),” para. 243; United Nations, “Petition from Ex-Chief Barnabe Ntunguka Concerning Ruanda-Urundi (T/PET.3/72/Add.1),” June 21, 1954, 72; Adam Hochschild, King Leopold’s Ghost (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 1999), 120–27. In the 1957 Mission report, they praise Belgium for finally ceasing to whip prisoners, but also note that “restrictions on diet” were a possible replacement. The UN petition (T/PET.3/72/Add. 1) indicates that this practice of not giving prisoners food
from his first few months as governor in early 1955. When a local priest requested his permission to work with his parishioners to build their own cathedral (instead of wading through the bureaucratic process via the Minister of Colonies in Brussels), Harroy approved the bishop to forgo the bureaucracy and gave permission to use local labor believing that “it is healthy for the people to build their own cathedral.”\textsuperscript{281} Proud of himself, Harroy concludes assuring the reader of his memoir that he never had issues with that diocese because of this willingness to share his power with those in the territory. These two examples show that Harroy cared deeply about his reputation and how others perceived him, traits that he exemplifies on behalf of Belgium. He tells these stories to assure readers of how kind and generous he was as governor.

The US focused on Belgian sensitivity, but they did not neglect their own. Across the 1950s, American foreign policy increasingly became concerned with future bonds with Africa that would be “mutually advantageous economic relationships.”\textsuperscript{282} This hope for a continued relationship changed throughout the decade, however. The increased focus on US - African relations echoes a third trend in the 1950s: certainty. While the US started the decade certain that it would be “at least a decade” until political and economic events significantly shifted, only four or allowing community members to deliver food already existed in 1956. The specific whip referenced here, a chicotte, was, as Hochschild vividly describes, “a whip of raw, sun-dried hippopotamus hide, cut into a long sharp-edged corkscrew strip.” Punishments frequently involved several dozen lashes, causing unconsciousness, to one hundred or more, which caused death. Belgian colonists whipped children and adults alike. In the Congo, this was the routine punishment for failure to harvest the quota of rubber. This disciplinary practice carried over to Ruanda-Urundi.

\textsuperscript{281} Harroy, \textit{Rwanda}, 120; A.G.M.Afr., “Églises,” 1.2 1956, 1956-1957, Rapports Annuels, General Archives of the Society of Missionaries of Africa; A.G.M.Afr., “Extension des Missions,” 62, 2 1955, 1955-1956, Rapports Annuels, General Archives of the Society of Missionaries of Africa. Original text: “Personnellement convaincu de ce qu’il est sain que les peoples construisent eux-mêmes leu cathédrale, je promis d’intercéder auprès du minstre…..” The White Fathers’ archives confirm that this cathedral was built in 1955 and that the finished structure was about 20,000 square feet (or one-half acre). While their annual reports praise the leadership of the Brothers and Fathers involved, the reports do not mention the labor responsible for the completion of the project.

\textsuperscript{282} Shaloff, “National Security Council Report (August 1957).”
years later in 1957 foreign policy reports added a caveat to their title that these policies only applied “prior to the calendar year 1960…due to marked political changes probable [then].”

This leads to the fourth trend of American foreign policy over the 1950s: new recognition of multiple groups in Africa. This recognition of groups displays not only the diverse and heterogeneous composition of populations, but also the interconnectedness of Africa as part of a global community. Official documents specifically begin acknowledging the presence of “Asian or other minorities” in 1958, even though report analysts had included white settlers as part of the demographic explanation since 1953. The demographic picture, or at least the official recognition of it, grew increasingly complex. The caveat for 1960 remained through 1958, although the 1959 it shifted to warn of the “increased likelihood of an eventual racial explosion,” and warned that several territories “will likely become independent [by 1964]…although [Ruanda-Urundi will do so] at a slower pace.”

These discussions of change highlight the American perspective of events occurring in Africa, including reoccurring concerns with political and economic forces. By considering static concerns from these same reports, additional concerns become visible.

Although the American view of Central and East Africa shifted over the decade, there were concerns that remained consistent. The two most dominant themes present in the reports are fear of communism and acknowledgement (but failure to discuss) racism. From the Red Scares and the Cold War, the fear of communism comes as no surprise within the social and political climate of the United States. Reports from at least as early as 1922 and extending at least into the

---

1960s consistently mention needs to block access to land, resources, or people from communists as well as fears about decolonizing population’s vulnerability from communist invasion. In short, these express the policy of containment. The American foreign policy stance drew and relentlessly enforced this boundary to guard liberal democracy.

Foreign policy did not so clearly express the second policy that remained consistent. The idea, history, and elements of racism are deeply complex, and this paper only begins to outline them. Suffice it to say that 1950s American foreign policy did not appear to recognize any of the complexity of racism. Reports began to highlight that the US had limited ability to directly involve themselves in certain affairs given the “extremely distorted picture Africans have been given concerning the race problem,” and that policy recommended actions that would “seek to correct [the] distorted African view.” These politics seem to identify the perception that Africans did or could see a direct connection between the racial inequalities in the United States to relations between white settlers and Africans, as well as some forced internal hierarchies, such as the Tutsi and Hutu. The complicated, but consistent, treatment of racism is also apparent in the way the US incorporated the Union of South Africa in foreign policy. While included, reports routinely list South Africa as an exception to a policy, increased awareness of its influence on neighbors, or requiring encouragement to forego repressive policies. Only selectively

286 Fuller, “The Belgian Chargé (De Selys) to the Secretary of State.” The previously mentioned National Security Reports and National Intelligence Estimates from the 1950s-1960s further reveal this trend.
288 Harroy, Rwanda, 222 n.1 As one potential example of this, Harroy reports that “several chiefs” confided in him during the 1957 Visiting Mission that “we are humiliated” that the UN sent Dorsinville, a “black-skinned man,” and did the UN not Ruanda-Urundi deserved the presence of a “white-skinned man.” One wonders if these chiefs were Tutsi (most were) and this is the elitist dynamic playing out, or if perhaps this was a reinterpretation of the exchange, given Harroy’s flair for the dramatic throughout his memoir.; Schwar and Shaloff, “National Intelligence Estimate (October 1959).” Additionally, in this 1959 report, there was a ghostly passing reference to “memories of Mau Mau” in Kenya.
referencing South Africa’s policy of apartheid, the US policies inherently see but do not explicitly admit commonalities between apartheid and America’s Jim Crow laws. Nevertheless, as the US transitioned into the 1960s, policy shifted. At the start of the new decade, foreign policy included a previously unstated phrase that did not change everything, but at least proves that some views had evolved: “Above all, [Africans] want to be accepted and to be treated as equals with dignity and respect.”

With all this policy guidance – contradictions and inaccuracies from the UN, judgements and sweeping assertions from the US – Harroy felt frustrated. From his perspective, Belgians made progress in Ruanda-Urundi. They abolished whipping and were investigating alternative disciplinary actions. Communities built more churches and cathedrals. Belgium’s Ten-Year plan from 1952 was progressing and created various democratic structures. The 1957 Mission urged a steady hand with the political progress but to also balance the social progress of elevating Hutu into higher echelons of society. With the end of the decade, though, this encouragement for a steady transition turned to reprimand. In 1960, the UN scolded Harroy for not doing enough or doing it fast enough. Despite these frustrations, Harroy continued to work to remain compliant with the UN’s Charter and move towards independence, even with

---

292 Harroy, Rwanda, 118 & 221; United Nations Trusteeship Council, “Report on Ruanda-Urundi (T/1402),” para. 37. Harroy describes this letter in February 1958, so it is unclear if this was a separate conversation or directly from the Mission’s report. Either way, he had the distinct impression of the importance of the message and its political priorities.
Belgians in the Congo asserting their disagreement. Brussels, Harroy knew, reinforced him and that consoled him.  

While Harroy felt political pressures, it does not appear that Belgium felt similar pressure to ensure treatment of peoples in Ruanda-Urundi honored their human rights. Whipping gave way to lack of access to food. Churches continued to be sites of labor abuses with the governor’s blessing to use local labor to build new brick structures. These were not irregular occurrences, but the status quo under Belgian colonial rule, as shown by the casual, even blasé, incorporation of these events and others like it into official records. The United Nations Visiting Mission from 1957 contributed to the continual existence of human rights abuses by stressing contradictory and confusing official policies that strove to invalidate those who voiced descent from the trusteeship system. Therefore, the Mission’s report did not represent an international organization acting as a bastion of idealism, but instead was that of a political organization that glossed over human rights abuses and mocked those who aimed to document those issues via petitions. The United States foreign policy over the course of the 1950s displayed behavior that was no better and failed to reckon with its own history and present as it produced policy to interact with the future African states.

As Stearns, Moyn, Mazower, and others have argued, nation-states comprised the UN and they were a significantly manipulative factor in its operation. Nation-states – especially the US – saw the UN as a tool of foreign policy, not an international, idealist actor. Much as Mason Sears, defender of timelines to independence in 1954, could not both express his personal opinions and those of the United States, nation-states themselves could not both defend their own interests and not usurp the idealist structure of the UN. As Amrith and Sluga argued, this
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dynamic between the UN and its members was complex. Considering the UN’s actions over time shows that this dynamic was malleable, shaped to the goals of nation-states – and sometimes even individual – drivers of a process. The UN fell prey to this in the late 1950s in Ruanda-Urundi with the continued involvement of Dorsinville. One element remains yet unanswered – during this era, who was the driving force for independence in Ruanda-Urundi - the UN or Belgium?

Considering this question from the vantage point of Independence in 1962, emphasis falls to Belgium and not the UN. Therefore, it is not surprising that Africanist scholars do not usually prioritize the UN as an actor in this historical dialogue. Indeed, after the political dialogues of 1957, it was the Belgians who supported the Hutu rise to power. They supported it generally, to protect their interests, and specifically, by appointing a Special Resident who would oust Tutsi leaders and fill their vacancies with Hutu.\(^\text{295}\) However, despite this known outcome, scholarship should work to avoid the temptation to consider this period around 1957 anachronistically. Actions in 1957 did not predetermine 1962’s Independence success.

In the late 1950s, the UN was not one-dimensional and was still a major player for Ruanda-Urundi’s political stability. The UN’s diverse composition involved both American aims to use the organization as a political tool of foreign policy and Communist alliances on the Trusteeship Council aiming to outmaneuver Western powers in a microcosm of the Cold War.\(^\text{296}\) The conversations that eventually led to independence, including the Rwandan political documents of “Mise au Point” and “the Hutu Manifesto,” had only just begun. In fact, homing in on 1957 reveals that the UN’s role was not trivial, as it was five years later, but significantly


influential. The planned presence of the Visiting Mission in September 1957 was the catalyst for the year’s manifestoes. This visit, in combination with discussion over a timeline for independence and the creation of democratic institutions, made the UN an “accelerator of change.” This explains why Mason Sears, member of the 1954 Visiting Mission representing the United States, received such reprimand from his superiors and America from its peers for encouraging dialogue about a deadline for independence.

While the UN provided the impetus for action, Belgium and their European ally, the White Fathers, were not themselves idle. They had supported the rise of Hutu engagement political and social dialogue through education and social networking, as well as the shift in the generational composition of the White Fathers that made them more sympathetic to the Hutu situation. The Hutu had the drive to gain independence and the Belgian-Catholic political alliance provided institutional support to see it to completion. It does not appear that the UN supported this move towards independence, despite the requirements of Article 76 of the Charter that required assistance in “[Ruanda-Urundi’s] progressive development towards self-government or independence…” Instead, the Visiting Mission as representative of the UN engaged in confusing directions, mocking dialogue, and blind ignorance of the power dynamics of situations. While they praised Belgium for nearly abolishing whipping, they mentioned but did not interrogate Belgium’s replacement disciplinary practice of “restrictions on diet,” despite the recording in at least one petition that ‘restriction’ meant ‘completely prohibited.’ Access to food was already understood to be a basic human right since the First World War. It was even something that the Belgians themselves had profoundly struggled with over the course of the
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World Wars, events that members of the Belgian colonial leadership likely lived through at least once.\textsuperscript{300} This makes it all the more appalling that colonial leaders manipulated this resource and that members of the Visiting Mission tolerated it. This insistence on power manipulation to maintain a position of dominance might explain why the revolutionary process became so violent. As Frantz Fanon explained, “the very same [people] who had it constantly drummed into them that the only language they understood was that of force, now decided to express themselves with force.”\textsuperscript{301}

After all these considerations, did the Hutu or Tutsi political narratives succeed in influencing the Visiting Mission in 1957? At least in the short term, the answer is no, they did not. This analysis shows that, despite their acknowledgement and engagement with “Mise au Point” and “Hutu Manifesto,” the Mission had limited sympathy for peoples in Ruanda-Urundi. Over the subsequent years though, changes shifted the answer to the question to an affirmative influence. The power struggles and debates about social inequality and politics were grassroots movements in Ruanda. Yes, the Belgian and Catholic institutional systems were a vital support that enabled these nascent expressions to grow into movements and an eventual government. In that regard then, the combined powers outmaneuvered the United Nations.

In conclusion, this suggests that the debate about Belgium versus the UN is a false binary. Belgium certainly was not enthusiastic about empowering Ruanda-Urundi to be an independent nation-state, much less recognizing it as the two separate entities that it historically was. They were far more focused on shaping Ruanda-Urundi into a territory that it could benefit


\textsuperscript{301} Frantz Fanon, \textit{The Wretched of the Earth: Frantz Fanon ; Translated from the French by Richard Philcox ; Introductions by Jean-Paul Sartre and Homi K. Bhabha}, trans. Richard Philcox (New York: Grove Press, 2004), 42.
from economically. Likewise, the UN, guided significantly by the US, was more of a recorder than an influencer. Thus, instead of treating actors in these events as a binary, scholarship should treat this period of Rwandan history like an optical prism treats light. Rather than framing this era as a race between only two diametrically opposed forces, studies of this narrative require a bright light to illuminate the events so that, like the prism, the elements of the event separate as unique parts that remain connected and eventually join at a confluence. Seeing this separation reveals the path to the final events while also avoiding oversimplification, deterministic, or anachronistic methods. Rwanda was not merely the location of the events of this time. Instead, it was the inhabitance of peoples from scores of locations around the world and maintaining focus on this diversity and the works of peoples in Ruanda proves to be the keystone to this historical narrative. It is not only context but also illumination for the actions of all other groups.
In 2017, Paul Van Haver, widely known by his stage name Stromae, canceled his tour scheduled to travel to Rwanda. Suffering hallucinations and other adverse side effects of antimalarial medications prescribed for his travel to Africa, Van Haver expressed sorrow for the last-minute change. This was not just a public relation move to soothe disappointed fans but seems to have genuine feelings of morose behind the words. Van Haver was not just traveling for fans, but to visit his father’s homeland. His father, Pierre Rutare, was a Tutsi born in 1958 and was killed during the genocide in 1994. Thus, the lyrics from “Papaoutai” then take on more than just an artist’s imaginative but bitter words but convey the heartbroken views of a child who will never see his father again. Born to a Belgian Flemish mother and Rwandan Tutsi father, he was raised and educated in Belgium. Heavily influenced by multiple cultural experiences and his musical education, “Papaoutai” reflects on his father’s death in the Rwandan genocide. This
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deeper understanding of a simple pop song then becomes a way to understand the real consequences, if only for one child, of the outcome of the Rwandan pre-independence movement.

Considering Van Haver’s family against the history detailed in this thesis provides an outline for Rutare’s departure from Rwanda. Given Van Haver’s birth in 1985, it is likely that his father fled Rwanda from one of the diasporas throughout the 1960s or 1970s. Since his father was an architect, he either acquired these skills in Rwanda or went to Belgium to do so. Traveling to Belgium for a refugee would have been simultaneously an odd and obvious choice. Fleeing to a French-speaking country suggests that Rutare spoke French. Identified by contemporary Rwandan sources as Tutsi, this strongly suggests that the colonial government taught him French in hope of perpetrating the colonial hierarchy rooted in the Hamitic Hypothesis. Regardless of educational track, Belgian colonial propaganda, including education, highlighted the subordination of Africans to Belgians. However, education would have also supplied the cultural awareness to fit in more readily into Belgian society. This story, deduced from the diasporas and persecution against Tutsi and Tutsi sympathizers in the late twentieth century. However, an interview in the Rwandan newspaper, The New Times, in 2015 with a relative of Stromae validates these details.

Van Haver’s father, Pierre Rutare, was a Tutsi born in 1958. When he was twenty years old, he “ingeniously managed to acquire a passport […] and later, a Belgian visa” to study architecture. He met Van Haver’s mother, Miranda Marie Van Haver, in Brussels while he was at university. The year after Van Haver’s birth, Rutare finished his degree and shortly after
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returned to Rwanda to work with his father (Van Haver’s grandfather) as an architect. Less than a decade later, he died. Stromae’s music provides a compelling example of the way that families affected by the genocide process the trauma, thus connecting the past events to present cultural expressions. Likewise, the various news articles that collectively inform the Van Haver/Rutare family story show how different national and local communities from America, France, Belgium, and Rwanda acknowledge their role in the historical process and moment of the Rwandan genocide.

This thesis has argued that it is necessary to understand the moments preceding Rwandan Independence as the beginning of the larger narrative of the Rwandan genocide. The late 1950s was a time of dynamic identity formation for the Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda, and within this decade 1957 was a watershed time. The events from that year included CSP’s “Mise au Point” and the évolués “Hutu Manifesto,” as well as the mwami’s Jubilee, and the United Nations Trusteeship Council’s triennial Visiting Mission. The subsequent events followed, including 1958’s Hutu-Tutsi Commission, and reveal that events of 1957 solidified the vocabulary and social roles of “Hutu” and “Tutsi” and hence solidified the twisted, manipulated roles that Belgian colonial rule implanted upon their entrance as colonial ruler in the 1910s. This cementing of ethnic roles and social roles and restrictions within them meets the definition of at least the first stage of genocide – classification. While the vocabulary and social perceptions were not new to Rwandans, indeed they had used them for centuries, this was the point of acceptance, a renewed commitment to these terms. The second stage of genocide, symbolization, occurred with the use of the identification cards in the 1930s, providing the ability to isolate
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groups from the population. Also at this time, the beginnings of the stages of discrimination and dehumanization also occurred and only accelerated moving into the 1960s and Rwandan independence.

The introduction asserted that, to study the 1994 genocide, scholars must begin with the late 1950s. It is at this time, especially in 1957, when Rwandans chose to maintain the social segregation of the ethnic groups, Hutu, Tutsi, and Twa. This act demarcates the beginning of the process of genocide that concluded in July 1994. In other words, the late 1950s was a watershed moment. These years included various events that would drive forward the independence movement and drive a wedge between groups to emphasize their binary stances, summarized in the colloquialism ‘if you aren’t with us, then you’re against us.’ This turbulence established social and political elements that became fundamental to the feasibility of the genocide forty years later.

To understand the crucial late 1950s means to understand the various actors interacting simultaneously. The main historical actors interacting are the Missionaries of Africa (White Fathers), the Tutsi ethnic group, the Hutu ethnic group, and international state-level actors (the United Nations, Belgium and the United States). Due to the complexity of these interactions, this thesis identified and analyzed the history and behavior of each group in turn. Isolating each group while also progressively layering and synthesizing preceding explanations allowed for appropriate analysis for each actor that with each additional actor complicated but informed the events of Rwanda’s pre-Independence history. Discussion of the 1950s also requires recognition
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that Rwandan society did not begin with colonialization and acknowledgement that elements of Rwandan society that existed at the turn of the twentieth century became elements of colonial rule. Specifically, this the introduction explained the dynamic history of the terms “Hutu” and “Tutsi”. Recognizing the history of the terms Hutu and Tutsi displays that while these are dynamic terms, they decidedly exist in the Modern Era. This is the beginning of the rejection of the mistaken explanation of the Rwanda genocide as an “ancient tribal hatred.”

Chapter One identified and discussed the role of the White Fathers in Rwanda from 1900 through the 1950s, including the use of education as a tool of empire. This discussion of the White Fathers was important because it explained the first colonialization that Rwandans experienced was religious and discussed how the White Fathers situated themselves as political actors within the colony. This discussion, thus, historicizes and contextualizes the role of religious leaders and locations during the 1994 genocide as sites of slaughter. This chapter explained the contentious relationship that the priests had with the Rwandan royalty and the power dynamics between the priests and Hutu. From showing that the Hutu viewed the White Fathers as in possession of power to displaying the White Fathers implemented that power when the priests coordinated with the Belgians to usurp the mwami, these events prove that the priests were not solely in Rwanda to evangelize, but also to acquire power.

Chapter Two identified and discussed the group of Tutsi elite who were members of the Conseil Supérieur du Pays, the mwami’s advisory council created by the Belgian colonial powers in 1954. It argues that their public political document “Mise au Point” aimed to manipulate the United Nations Trusteeship Council Visiting Mission prior to their triennial visit to the Belgian colony. Given this aim and the writing being by the CSP, despite it being in French and not
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Kinyarwandan, provides insights into their identity and thus a snapshot into Rwandan voices at a time when Western powers actively worked to silence those voices. Acknowledgement, discussion, and analysis of “Mise au Point” is important because it shows the initiation of the discussion about Rwandan ethnic groups that ignited over the following year. It also explains the impetus for “the Hutu Manifesto,” the subject of chapter three.

Chapter Three operated in tandem to Chapter Two, discussing the elite members of Hutu society, those whom the Belgian colonial officials had deemed that they had ‘evolved,’ – the Hutu évolutés. The integration of the évolutés is important not only to converse with other existing scholarship regarding Belgian colonial rule in Ruanda-Urundi, but also because it shows that Rwandans were active participants in society and with international actors during colonialism. They not only exchanged information but had political conversations at and with the elite of society. The Hutu évolutés used the master’s tools of education to dismantle the master’s house of colonial rule, but then they soon became the master themselves, subjugating Tutsi and their allies to the point of diaspora and eventually death.314 In short, this chapter shows the roots of the power inversion that occurred in 1959 when a Hutu political party seized political control and continued the push towards Independence.

Chapter Four expanded upon after the preceding two chapter’s discussions on internal events and actors. This chapter argues that, to fully explain what was happening in the 1950s in central Rwanda, necessitates discussing not only who was living in Rwanda, but also who else stake claim or interest there. Mainly, these groups were the United Nations, Belgium, and the

314 Lorde, “The Master’s Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master’s House,” 112. “For the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. They may allow us temporarily to beat him at his own game, but they will never enable us to bring about genuine change.”
United States. Discussion of these external actors is important because while it is vital to prioritize Rwandans in their own history, it is naïve to ignore the influence of powerful actors. Belgium was a powerful actor as the colonial government. The UN was a powerful actor as the catalyst for the global process of decolonization. The US was a Great Power following the outcome of the Second World War and held significant sway within the UN. This confluence of these actors, their intentions, and their concerns imprinted onto Rwanda and further inform and complicate the internal debates occurring there. This chapter also serves as a reminder that Africa exists not outside of global history, but as deeply intertwined as any other space or peoples.

The 1994 genocide in Rwanda was not a predetermined event, not even by the elite debates, human rights violations, political maneuvering, or physical violence of the 1950s. However, the longer these took place, the further events that occurred and actors made decisions that progressed Rwanda through the process of genocide until the event took place in April 1994. The start of this process began in 1957 with a political maneuver from one elite group, acknowledged and responded to by another group. Multiplied by international actors, opportunities to act appeared or disappeared according to one’s goals and resources. Discussion of the genocide and the slow historical progress towards it is not simple, but by challenging preconceived notions and giving agency to groups stereotypically deemed passive then it can become thinkable.
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