

The Rwanda Hit List: Revisionism, Denial and the Genocide Conspiracy II

By Keith Harmon Snow

Keith Harmon Snow is a war correspondent, photographer and independent investigator, and a four time (2003, 2006, 2007, 2010) Project Censored award winner. He is also the 2009 Regent's Lecturer in Law & Society at the University of California Santa Barbara, recognized for over a decade of work, outside of academia, contesting official narratives on war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide while also working as a genocide investigator for the United Nations and other bodies.

The Dehumanization of Hutu People

Any person of Rwandan, Ugandan or Burundian origin, no matter their sex, age or ethnicity, or their civilian or military status, who has sought asylum from or in any way annoyed the Government of Rwanda (GOR), will be persecuted, subject to intimidation, arbitrary arrest, and detention without trial, if not torture, forced labor, extrajudicial execution, or being 'disappeared'.

Rwandans inside and outside Rwanda are accused of 'genocide' or 'complicity in genocide' through fabricated evidence, coerced testimonies, bribery, and petty jealousies. There is no possibility of any kind of fair trial procedure in Rwanda and no possibility of freely investigating facts, or identifying and securing witnesses.

The categories 'extremist Hutu' and 'moderate Hutu', like the general categories of 'Hutu' and 'Tutsi,' are complex and not easily negotiated in the context of 'genocide', 'terrorism' and other violence in Rwanda from 1990 to the present. The labels 'genocidaire' and 'Interahamwe' are freely applied by the RPA/F regime to demonize anyone they see fit, no matter the veracity or falseness of the claims against those they accuse.⁷

The GOR under the one-party control of Paul Kagame projects a shiny veneer of tourism, development and 'entrepreneurism', but submerged barely under the surface of this veneer there exists a climate of absolute terror and there are profound ethnic divisions leading towards war. We are beginning to see this more openly with the approach of the 2010 elections.⁸

Rwanda (and Uganda) is run by a secretive criminal military organization in parallel with formal government structures, responsible for the systematic and intentional deaths of: scores of thousands of persons in Rwanda from Oct 1, 1990 to April 5, 1994; hundreds of thousands of persons in Rwanda from April 6, 1994 to December 31, 1995; tens of thousands of persons in Rwanda between January 1, 1995 and January 1, 2010; between 200,000 and 700,000 Rwandan refugees in DRC and for the deaths of between 100,000 and

300,000 Burundian refugees in DRC between September 1996 and September 1997; and millions of persons of Rwandan, Congolese, Burundian and Ugandan origin in DRC between September 1996 and the present day.⁹ Language has also been manipulated for the dehumanization of all Hutu people. For example, the label 'Interahamwe' has come to stand for 'extremist murderous Hutu militias' and has usually been translated from Kinyarwanda to mean "those who attack together." Yet President Paul Kagame and the RPA/F military-intelligence apparatus applies this terminology to mean "anyone who is in opposition to the Rwandan Patriotic Army/Front movement, its government, or its elite clandestine networks," and in the case of Paul Kagame, even to "anyone I don't like," and the labels 'Interahamwe' and genocidaire are used to dehumanize all Hutu people everywhere, just as the Jews were dehumanized by National Socialism in Germany prior to and during World War II. This has created the political, social and economic conditions for the perpetration of genocide by the RPA/F government, and its collaborators, and this dehumanization has been perpetuated through the international mass media, human rights institutions, think tanks, non-government organizations, and foreign governments everywhere.

The dehumanization of all Hutu people, and the persecution of anyone in opposition to the RPA/F, was supported as early as 1988 by certain international 'legal' and 'human rights' institutions working as clandestine agents and/or accomplices to the RPA/F agenda.

The terms 'genocidaire' and 'Interahamwe' are meaningless due to the constituency and fluidity of these terms. For example, the President of the Interahamwe, presented to the world as an extremist Hutu killing organization, was Robert Kajuga, a Tutsi businessman. Similarly, the treasurer of the Interahamwe was Dieudonne Niyitegaka, a Hutu businessman resettled in Canada in reward for his collaboration to accuse and frame other Hutus with 'genocide'. The RPA/F had infiltrated and controlled the Interahamwe, and this renders the terminology, and its ideological force, meaningless.

The criminal parallel structure behind the Rwandan government has been identified by numerous experts and investigations, including more than seven United Nations Panels of Experts between 2000 and 2009;¹⁰ the high court indictments of Spain¹¹ and France¹²; the exhaustive analyses by eminent Rwandan experts, including Dr. Filip Reyntjens¹³; the work of investigative journalists like Charles Onana, Wayne Madsen and myself¹⁴; the Michael Hourigan report assessing blame for the presidential assassinations of April 6, 1994; the Robert Gersony report documenting RPF/A atrocities against tens of thousands of Rwandans in Rwanda in 1994; the Helmut Strizek report to the ICTR titled Discredit the Hutu Population Forever;¹⁵ ICTR defense attorneys Chris Black, Peter Erlinder, John Philpot, Phil Taylor and others; the McKinney hearings; and research by academics; and by many credible sources, human rights documents, testimonies and other examples in the public record.

Even Tutsis--the supposed victims (of the supposed Hutu conspiracy)--have been persecuted by the victorious and extremist RPA/F Tutsi regime in Rwanda. We all know the standard story about 800,000 to 1.2 million Tutsis killed. Well, these numbers are wrong, and the constituency of the dead is wrong. It cannot be denied that hundreds of

thousands of Tutsis were killed in Rwanda, especially if we confine our discussion to the 100 days of genocide from April 6 to July 1994.

Clearly, there is evidence of persecution and threats of persecution against Tutsis based on the established realities about acts of genocide committed by members of the Hutu ethnic group in Rwanda between April 6, 1994 and July 1994, and there has also been retaliatory violence, post-1994, against Tutsis. However, there is substantial documentation about the RPF/A regime killing Tutsis, because this elite Tutsi rebel force did not trust any members of the Tutsi minority who stayed in Rwanda after President Juvenal Habyarimana came to power in 1973: Rwandan Tutsis were generally eliminated, internally displaced, assassinated and/or forced to flee Rwanda.

The Genodynamics Project of academic researchers Dr. Christian Davenport and Dr. Alan Stam, both U.S. citizens, has seriously challenged the Rwanda genocide mythology. Stam and Davenport were labeled 'genocide deniers' by the mass media and the Tutsi expatriate community after publishing their interim research on 'genocide' in Rwanda and they are persona non grata in Rwanda today.¹⁶

There is overwhelming evidence establishing that crimes defined, prosecuted and/or punished as 'genocide' in Rwanda, whether before 1994, in 1994, or after 1994, were for reasons other than ethnicity. The GOR itself admits that both 'Tutsis and moderate Hutus' were victims of the violence in 1994. Thus while these acts of violence may constitute war crimes, crimes against humanity, and other crimes--including acts of genocide--the allegation that Hutus were both the victims and the perpetrators of the 1994 violence does not on its face meet the specific intent required of 'genocide' as defined by the international Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.¹⁷ The current regime is responsible for massive bloodshed against all ethnic groups in Rwanda, and the façade is supported internationally due to the economic, political and military interests at stake.¹⁸ The International Criminal Tribunal on Rwanda (ICTR) also supported the façade, as confirmed by Carla Del Ponte, the former Chief Prosecutor of the ICTR, in her memoirs.¹⁹

People accused of 'genocide' in Rwanda have been brought before the so-called 'community-based' Gacaca tribunals repeatedly, compelled by the GOR to revisit their cases until a guilty verdict is established; many innocent civilians have been tried and retried until they were found guilty. After one Gacaca tribunal found the accused persons innocent the citizen judges fled for their lives, were captured, returned to their Gacaca and 'compelled' to retry the case, and returned a guilty verdict. Human rights experts have criticized the Gacaca system as a mechanism of terror used to silence critics.²⁰

Footnotes.

Z The French term *genocidaire* has universally been used to castigate innocent Hutus as deeply sinister and evil.

8 This double reality--economic advances and political regression--has been seen before in cases, for example, such as Chile, backed by western powers, under General Augusto Pinochet.

9 The question of mortality statistics by ethnic category have been addressed by Filip Reyntjens, Christian Davenport, Alan Stam and others, leading to the conclusion that the number of Hutu deaths in Rwanda during the so-called "100 days of genocide" of 1994 exceed the possible numbers of Tutsi deaths, a complete inversion of the claims by the GOR, and its supporters and allies, who have always maintained some 800,000 to 1.2 million Tutsis killed in the "Rwanda genocide".

10 E.g., Final report of the Group of Experts on the DRC submitted in accordance with paragraph 8 of Security Council resolution 1857 (2008); e.g., Report of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the DRC, October 2003; Final report of the Group of Experts on the DRC submitted in accordance with paragraph 18(d) of Security Council resolution 1807 (2008); Final report of the Group of Experts on the DRC submitted in accordance with paragraph 8 of Security Council resolution 1857 (2008).

11 Spanish Indictment (Judge Fernando Andreu Merelles), February 2008. The 182 pp. Spanish indictment charges President Kagame and forty members of the RPF/A regime with the deaths of more than 300,000 civilians, detailed in Prefecture-by-Prefecture totals.

12 French Indictments (Judge Jean-Louis Bruguiere), December 2006.

13 Filip Reyntjens, The Great African War, Cambridge University Press, 2009.

14 E.g., Wayne Madsen, Genocide and Covert Operations in Africa, 1993-1999, Edwin Mellen Press, 1999; Howard French, A Continent for the Taking: The Tragedy and Hope of Africa, Vintage Books, 2005; and International Non-governmental Commission of Inquiry into the Massive Violations of Human Rights Committed in the Democratic Republic of Congo (Former Zaire) 1996-1997, International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development, 1998.

15 Dr. Helmut Strizek, Discredit the Hutu Population Forever, Report by Dr. Helmut Strizek, Expert Witness in "The Prosecutor v. Innocent Sagahutu," Before the International Criminal Tribunal For Rwanda, (Case No. ICTR 2000-56-1), entered into ICTR records October 30, 2008.

16 See, e.g., Christian Davenport and Alan C. Stam, "What Really Happened in Rwanda," Miller McCune, 2009.

17 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Approved by the United Nations General Assembly in Resolution 260 A (III) of December 9, 1948, came into effect on January 12, 1951.

18 See, e.g., the conclusions of the *Genodynamics Project* of Dr. Christian Davenport and Dr. Alan Stam or the countless human rights reports documenting RPA/F atrocities, e.g., Rwanda: Civilians Trapped in Armed Conflict; The Dead Can No Longer Be Counted, Amnesty International, December 19, 1997.

19 Carla Del Ponte and Chuck Sudetic, Madame Prosecutor: Confrontations with Humanity's Worst War Criminals, and the Culture of Impunity, The Other Press (NY), 2009.

20 Kenneth Roth, "The Power of Horror in Rwanda," Los Angeles Times, April 11, 2009.

Source: <http://www.africanexecutive.com/modules/magazine/articles.php?article=5138&magazine=277#>

Downloaded on April, 2010

Freedom of speech

Let us all be grateful that we have freedom of speech that is protected by our US Constitution; or do we? With the advent of "hate speech laws", we can go to prison for saying something. With the new idea (very new) that we can actually "injure" a person if we say something that offends someone else, then "offensive" speech is now open to be regulated by law. Of course no one can say something that doesn't offend someone, somewhere; so freedom of speech is in great jeopardy here in the good ol' USA. Please think of this when politicians start to propose laws that restrict someone's right to say whatever they want to say. The USA could become very much like Rwanda in a very short period of time.

posted by smartaswhip on May 29, 10 at 1:05 am |
4 of 6 people liked this comment.

Free speech and the genocide against Tutsis in Rwanda

The arrest of Professor Erlinder seems to have outraged many people who call themselves liberals and find it fundamentally wrong for someone like him to be arrested for his position on the Genocide against Tutsis in Rwanda. However, there are a few missed points his supporters are ignoring here. 1. Rwanda, like many European nations, has the right to enact a law criminalizing the act of denying the genocide. Don't forget that almost 1,000,000 people were hacked to death by fellow neighbors in a government sponsored and supervised genocide. Denying that this ever took place is adding insults to an injury. How would the American population feel if someone came out to deny that Slavery ever took place in this country or that 9/11 attack ever took place? 2. That freedom of speech so many people cherish here allowed the genocide to happen in Rwanda. The hate radio station also known as RTLM broadcasted hate speeches and coordinated the killing on the air. Without this radio station, the government had no other efficient means to coordinate the killings as it did. This radio station was not jammed to save lives because some people in the US argued that it would be against freedom of speech. There is a distinction between freedom of speech and hate speech. Yes, freedom of speech like

other freedoms has its limitations when it's a matter of national security. If Bin Laden's hate speeches are not considered under the freedom of speech here, why is it OK for others to assert that the RTLM broadcast was entitled to freedom of speech? 3. It's one thing to defend criminals but it's another to deny that the crime committed was a crime. Professor Erlinder has the right to defend genocidaires but has no right to crusade that the genocide ever took place. Defenders of Guantanamo Bay detainees don't claim that 911 terrorist attacks ever took place. They do their job of defending the suspect but are not working tirelessly to change the history of 911 attacks. Unfortunately, professor Erlinder uses his academic cushion to discredit the history of the genocide in Rwanda, deliberately refusing to use the G word rather calling it a Civil war. His intent is clear even to non lawyers like me. Just because he is well educated doesn't mean that he couldn't commit a crime. The Holocaust was engineered by bright minded Nazi. I am sure their families and colleagues didn't see them as harmful. Before jumping to conclusion that Professor Erlinder is that innocent, I would like to remind his supporters that the victims of the genocide in Rwanda were real human beings. They have not committed any crime to be butchered they way it happened. It saddens me as a survivor to see someone with a bright mind so driven to discredit my experiences as mere lies. It equally concerning that people in the academia world who are supposed to "teach" future generation of Human Rights Defenders and are entrusted with the educator platform can harbor such damaging ideologies and are fully supported by their institutions. I am not a conservative, I am simply a human being trying to make a sense of what is happening to Humanity.

posted by [survivor94](#) on May 29, 10 at 7:51 am |
2 of 3 people liked this comment.

Stay Out Of It

He went to Rwanda and got himself into this, now he needs to get himself out. The United States shouldn't offer him any protections in Rwanda and shouldn't be working on this issue at all. If I decide I want to take over Norway will the United States government protect me?

posted by [SMBowner3](#) on May 29, 10 at 7:59 am |
1 of 3 people liked this comment.

Hate Speech v. Hate Crimes

Smartaswhip's comments regarding "hate speech" are factually incorrect. In the United States, the First Amendment continues to protect almost all speech, no matter how detestable. Notable exceptions include the slander and libel of an individual (religions, ethnic groups, etc. are not protected), and words that would incite imminent violence and that is a very high legal standard to apply (strict scrutiny to be precise). By contrast, hate crimes are a way of elevating things which are already a crime, for example murder, assault or vandalism, but are motivated by a particular bias based upon hatred for the group that the victim is part of or perceived to be part of. This is not that radical a concept as the motives of the criminal (mens rea) are often taken into account in deciding which crime has been committed (for example, first degree murder v.

2379/A

manslaughter) and in sentencing. As Americans we continue to enjoy the greatest freedom of speech of anywhere in the world and I defy anyone to prove otherwise.