

We-versus-They: Building a Paradigm Community in Rwanda

Marobe Wama Marobe

Pan African University: Institute for Governance, Humanities and Social Sciences, Yaoundé – Cameroon

Abstract

This paper seeks to analyze how Rwandan paradigm community can be formed following two decades of unfulfilled promises of true democracy, justice and reconciliation. In doing this, Rwanda government needs to champion national unity in establishing an understanding and tolerable community than embarking on collective conviction that genocide was committed by one ethnic group (Hutu) against another (Tutsi). The paper uses a relativist approach where 'Three M-Strategy' is intertwined as an approach—to 'Mobilise', 'Mediate' and 'Monitor' all groups toward building an egalitarian society. It calls all stakeholders to embark on building a new paradigm society where everyone's voice is heard in the decision-making and implementation processes as opposed to now elite-driven and top-down approaches.

Keywords

Genocide, Hutu, Paradigm, National Unity, Rwanda, Society, Tutsi

Introduction

Rwanda is among the smallest and landlocked country in Africa. With a population of 12 million, it is only composed with three ethnic groups—The Hutu (with almost 84% of the population), Tutsi (15%) and Twa (1%). According to Nyrop (1974, as cited by Biswaro, 2013) the three ethnic groups ‘Share a common culture, language; have same kinship and clan systems and agree on a common set of social values’ (p. 187). In spite of the similarities the Tutsi and Hutu have fought each other several times since the country won independence in 1962 (Biswaro, 2013, p. 187), and as Guest succinctly put it, ‘Following 1973 *coup d’états* where Juvenal Habyarimana seized power—things are yet working well’ (2004). Guest continues that, Habyarimana who was a Hutu, by using his common slogan *rubanda nyamwishi* (the majority people) he increasingly excluded Tutsis from power and other public life hence culminated the 1994 genocide.

The 1994 Rwanda genocide was a holocaust of its own ever happen in the contemporary world, different from the Jews holocaust and Kurds killing, in Germany and Iraq respectively. What differentiates it is that, in Germany and Iraq modern weapons were used while in Rwanda traditional weapons such as machetes, knives, grenades, swords, spears, among others were used. A plethora of literatures indicate that at least 500,000 Tutsis had been killed, as well as significant number of moderate Hutus and all Hutus who opposed the killings or tried to protect Tutsi(s) (Yanagizawa-Drott, 2014; Human Right Watch, 2011; Mamdani, 2001; DeBari, 2013, among others). Therefore this was a tragedy that took place in broad daylight and night, and in both town and village at home, street, in schools, hospitals, churches, and other places where people sought refuge.

Thanks for the Rwanda Patriotic Front (RPF), by then, a rebel group for ending the sixteen weeks of massacre, from April to July 1994. It is also true that, during the last two decades RPF government has made a greater difference in socio-economic development. Rwandan economy has steadily grown with an annual real gross domestic product (GDP) of 7.5% rate as well as pursuing exemplary policies on better health services, development agenda and total intolerance to corruption. The Global Competitiveness Report 2013/14 reports that, its

macroeconomic performance has yielded it to be ranked in 66th in the world and 3rd in the sub-Saharan African country after Mauritius and South Africa, as a competitive place in doing business out of 148 countries (Schwab, 2013). On the other hand, Rwanda in partnership with Microsoft Cooperation has implemented 'One Laptop per Child' (OLPC) project that allows primary school students to access early computer skills and computer science understanding and expands their knowledge on specific subjects like Science, Mathematics and languages which other African countries like Tanzania failed to do. This target of providing OLPC in primary schools has been accomplished. The program is one among the initiatives expected to move a nation from the humanitarian assistance phase associated with the 1994 genocide into one of sustainable development to become a middle-income country by the year 2020.

Besides the aforementioned positive developments, efforts to recover from genocide wounds are dawdling and rolling back thus create a future paradox. The Government still launch and conduct other discriminative initiatives such as 'Ndi Unyarwanda' (I am Rwandan) campaign where all Hutu regardless of either innocent or criminals are called to apologize for the Tutsi compatriot in the pretext of looking beyond what divides Rwandans; ...and strengthening the culture of accountability as well as unity and reconciliation' (RDTJ, 2013). Equally, Rwandan Platform for Dialogue, Truth and Justice (RDTJ) argues that:

Criminalisation of the Hutu in the pretext of 'Ndi Umunyarwanda Campaign' will not pave the way to justice of all victims of the crimes of genocide, or to an inclusive dialogue, or to a genuine reconciliation. It is unfair practice for one side to ask for forgiveness whilst the other side is being shielded and not demanded to follow the same practice (2013, p. 6).

This concedes what at one time Human Right Watch (HRW) Report reported. The report indicates:

Despite of gacaca achievements, it also illustrates the price paid by ordinary Rwandans for the compromises made in the decision to use gacaca to try genocide-related cases, including apparent miscarriages of justice, the use of gacaca to settle personal and political scores, corruption, and procedural irregularities (2011, p. 1).

Thus, what we see the existing relative peace and security has been a bride prices that citizens pay through foregoing some of obvious issues like thinking outside the box with the government. Universal political participation, equality before the law, freedom of speech and press remain uncertain. Today, opposition political parties whose leaders are Hutu (example United Democratic Forces (UDF)-Inkingi, PSI-mberakuri, and Democratic Party for Renewal (PDR)-Ubuyanja among others) are banned on the basis of allegation of an extremist political ideology (RDTJ, 2013, p. 6). While some of Rwandan who are Hutu in particular their rights to vote and/or stand for public office were taken away by the Gacaca court in terms of articles 70 and 76 of the Organic Law No. 40 of 2000 and No.16 of 2004 respectively (Idib.). In doing so, the country political elites are increasingly eliminating oppositions and anyone who try to critic the government, under a pretext of having genocide ideology. For example, the January 2014 killing of former Rwandan spymaster Patrick Karegeya who had fled Kigali in 2007 teaming up with a group of military generals to form the Rwanda National Congress (RNC), a group that faults President Kagame, of turning into a dictator was a retaliation of the Kagame's government.

Why author think this way is because two weeks after the killing, Kagame arrogantly said 'It is a matter of time before those who have betrayed Rwanda face consequences. ...You cannot betray Rwanda and get away with it. There are consequences for betraying your country'. Several Kagame opponents are killed including former Interior Minister Seth Sendashonga (who was killed in Kenya) and former managing director of the Rwandan Development Bank Theogene Turatsinze (who was killed in Mozambique). While these atrocities are taking place—torture, arrest, detention and harassment have become an order of the day to anyone thinking out of the box. Therefore although Kagame is one among of few African leaders with determined and focused development ideology, his actions tarnish a good image he has. And this concedes his other side of his personal ambition while acquainting the famous words of Burkina Faso historian, Joseph Kizerbo 'silence, development in progress' (Mkandawire, 2013, p. 30).

Not only that but also powers have been concentrated into the hand of executive in particularly the Presidency, leaving legislature and judiciary as the cosmetic organs— 'yesss...' and 'rubber

stamp' organs of the executive. Thus in Rwanda, the president has formed a ruling class that identifies and owes allegiance to him while manipulating and controlling other government organs. This reminds us the alarming words of French philosopher, Montesquieu that 'If the legislative power is united with the executive power in the hands of one person or anybody of officials, there can be no liberty, nor can there any liberty if power to judge is not separated from legislative and executive power' (Bongyu, 2014).

It is against this backdrop that the paper seeks to make a critical analysis on how Rwanda can re-embark on building paradigm society of its own in spite of what happened. The paper argues that Rwandan society needs to prosper in all discourses—social, political and economic. To do this, the paper uses relativist thoughts intertwined with 'Three M–Strategy' as an approach—to 'Mobilise all groups', 'Mediate all groups' and 'Monitor them' towards building a new society. It calls all stakeholders inside and outside the country in particularly political elites to re-embark building new pluralism society where everyone's voice can be heard in the decision-making and in the implementation process as opposed to now, elite-driven and top-down approaches.

Ethnicity, Politics and Violence: What went wrong?

Political elites have been wrongly presented politics in Rwanda from colonial times to the post-colonial era. The plethora of literatures existing validates that (Yanagizawa-Drott, 2014; Biswaro, 2013; Caplan, 2007; Kintu, 2005; Mamdani, 2001; Hintjens, 1999). For example, I found Biswaro (2013) argument convincing as he argues:

It was first German and then Belgian colonialism that created and nurtured the country's ethnic rivalry between the majority Hutu and the minority Tutsi. The rivalry was constructed on the basis of a myth of Tutsi superiority over the Hutu in order to serve both the colonial policy of divide-and-rule and the colonial division of labor. The Tutsi were designated as the administrative supervisors and the Hutu as the labor force of the extractive colonial economy.unfortunately after independence nationalists, failed to crush the ethnic stereotypes. This time around, it was the elitist role-reversal whereby Hutu elites succeeded in taking the reins of power from the Tutsis (p. 188-9).

Generally Biswaro view's echoes Remigius Kintu view's that was prepared upon request and presented to the United Nations Tribunal on Rwanda, Arusha - Tanzania on March 20, 2005. He (Kintu) vindicates that 'Belgian colonialism did very little to alleviate the brutality, enslavement, dehumanization and all sorts of suffering which Hutus endured for centuries at the hands of Tutsi minority who controlled that country with an iron hand' (2005, p. 2). This is why Mahmood Mamdani argues that 'The Rwandan genocide is testimony to both the poisoned colonial legacy and the nativist nationalist project that failed to transcend it' (2001, p. 38). This is true following the new rulers President Grégoire Kayibanda failure to halt ethnic marginalization and stereotypes. These practices culminated the 1973 *Coup d'Etat* where Major Juvénal Habyarimana seized power. Things did not work well as Habyarimana (Hutu) continued with Kayibanda's oppressive policies and excluding the Tutsis from power (Biswaro, 2013; Guest, 2004). For example, he banned all political parties and formed *Mouvement de Rassemblement National Démocratique* (MRND) which all Rwandans were obliged to join. Also during Habyarimana regime's all citizens who had fled and sometimes others settled as refugees to near countries including the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Tanzania and Uganda were denied to return home in the pretext that 'Rwanda is too small, too poor and over populated to welcome back all refugees in exile' (Biswaro, 2013).

Given such policies, pressures and frustrations of the refugees who the majority were Tutsis established an organization called the Rwandese Patriotic Front (RPF) in 1987 to facilitate the repatriation of Rwandan refugees back to Rwanda (Yanagizawa-Drott, 2014; Biswaro, 2013; Caplan, 2007; Guest, 2004). Later the RPF changed its objective and became the toppling of the Habyarimana regime and establishing new regime. Simply so, in early 1990s the RPF backed by Uganda launched fighting back as retaliation to the exclusion policies of the government. Hence, the Tutsi return to power after the 1994 genocide.

The same tendencies seem to be upheld by the RPF government. Power has been concentrated into one hole in particular the President. Policy of elimination is upheld to those who critique the government. Thus people are increasingly prisoned, tortured, humiliated, killed and those who survive flee the country to escape the hands of ruling elites. When the government concentrates all powers into one arm (the executive) of the government—that control social-

cultural, political and economic, it controls the minds and the whole psychology of the people. This is what Acemoglu and Robinson (2012) vindicate that 'Powerful people always and everywhere seek to grab complete control over government, undermining broader social progress for their own greed'. In the same vein, Susan Thomson has argued that 'one-size-fits-all' institution in Rwanda is highly destructive to the Rwandan people when it ignores other pressing social problems such as dire poverty (2011, p. 21). As the case to point Johanna DeBari has come to conclude that: 'Although Gacaca is highly successful in Rwanda 'on paper', a large portion of Rwandans are still in desperate need of more relief' (2013). On the same ground also HRW report (2011) noted:

Commenting on Gacaca's contribution to reconciliation, the wife of one convicted man said: Gacaca has left Hutu and Tutsi even more divided than before. A number of interviewees agreed and spoke of increased tensions between the two ethnic groups. A few—far fewer than the number of genocide survivors—said that gacaca had helped relieve ethnic tensions and gave examples of individuals who were now able to greet or speak with each other (p. 125).

By all indicators, this gives a clear picture when you compare to a number of national per cent between Hutu, Tutsi and Twa. Since Hutu are majority in number of almost 84%, then such interviewee's response are convincingly. This is because if one is to draw a representative sample throughout the country then, eight out of ten respondents are hopeful to be of Hutu origin since they are the majority in the country. It is evidence then that under *Ndi Umunyarwanda* campaign that was launched in November 2013 by the President continues to hunt the country where hatred and divisions are now-built for future disputes considering that, the campaign falls the same ambit in criminalizing, dehumanizing and undermining the broader social progress. In the long run this campaign will have two major implications: one is criminalizing all Hutu to confess of committing genocide crimes and then dictating them to ask forgiveness and second is continuing to divide more the country. Therefore without underestimating the government, this campaign really do not help the country in building the national unity and a paradigm Rwandan community. In advance, it creates and raises tension, hatred and divisions hence in the long run it will manifest future violence as that of 1959, 1973 and 1994. The government should not use such campaign and other alike as a political strategy

of reducing people's ability to react through discouraging them to feel powerless, and thus, giving the political elites room to do whatsoever they want. For example, Rwanda has a limited and sometimes no freedom of press and expression. Also in today's world Rwanda still has only one Television channel while freedom of press is compromised only if you do not critic the government than extolling it.

Thus it should be understood that in Rwanda, the state leadership has been a core to the problem that people are repetitively faced with. As Lemarchand articulates 'Politicians pit the ethnic groups against each other to achieve their political goals' (Cited in Biswaro, 2013). It is on this experience too, Johanna DeBari argues: 'Ignorance of personal individual stories and factual events of the genocide has greatly impacted society and impeded the reconciliation process' (2011). This is the obvious situation in Rwanda. The ethnic groups have been and are used for political goals as a means when politicians are clinching to power.

Therefore, while Rwandans commemorate twenty years after the genocide, majority citizens also account for these failures. Such wounds remind us the segments that fuelled genocide. It also reminds us for the failure of international community to stall the genocide, as it was in Somalia 1990s while managing immediately Kosovo crisis in 1999. Thus, these wounds must be healed. Stakeholders should establish and embark on new arrangements, programs, policies and spirit of transmitting and constructing a better community. 'Transitional justice' and 'positive peace' are indispensable as long as the target remains to achieve sustainable peace, security and stability. This calls major potential causes of future conflict to be removed, as well as their violent manifestation. Therefore, we need a thoughtful approach where the government, international community including: United Nations (UN) and African Union (AU) and other stakeholders may resolve this problem to better re-transform Rwandan society into a paradigm community.

Building new acquainted history through 'Three M- Strategy'

Truth, forgiveness and reconciliation are strong attributes and responsible agents if one is to build strong and egalitarian society. Although these concepts differ but they mean a lot in

building a post-genocide society like of Rwanda. The Germany philosopher Immanuel Kant while explaining theory of justice he profoundly believed that neither promotion of human enjoyment nor happiness can lay sound ideas about justice, but the truth about human beings that is relevant to considerations of justice can. He thus reminds Rwandans that truth is a key aspect which leads to justice. Mahatma Gandhi words that 'the weak can never forgive. Forgiveness is an attribute of the strong' begs some questions that: when and how should forgiveness come in? Moreover since forgiveness and reconciliation are intertwined concepts then Rwandans and theirs leaders need to learn how to reconcile and forgive as a real strategy of restoration of fractured relationships of emotion, grief, grievance, pain and anger. We employ a relativist approach as guiding theory.

A relativist approach argues that 'there is no universal applicable theoretical constructs for development without any consideration of its uniqueness and diversity' (Mbaku, 2004). Linking to this theory, anthropologist George Peter Murdock once wrote 'Africa has more distinct peoples and cultures than any other continent' and thus to build a better society in Rwanda we must take into consideration all relevant elements in dealing with social divisions, tensions and other related problems. According to relativist approach 'social arrangements of a certain society or group are always subject to change' (Orcutt, 2004). This is because social rules and expectations guide behavior in many situations of the society. Thus to say, since the RPF regime denies existence of ethnicity in Rwanda and, since President Kagame has not ceased to make reference to Hutu and Tutsi in his speeches, policies and social schemes, then Rwanda society needs to use the relativist approach that emphasizes recognition of social diversity and its particularity while theorizing its development processes. It is difficult simply to ignore the existence of the three major ethnic groups and yet believe that people will forget. Thus we stress an egalitarian society that that involves mutual acknowledgment of past, understanding and tolerance of the present and future generation and changing of destructive attitudes and behavior into constructive relationships toward sustainable peace. There should be no building of negative image of either party that it threatens the other. This is because 'social relationships are formed and changed through interactional processes that have a spontaneous and dynamic character (Orcutt, 2004). The question now should remain to be how and in what ways, can Rwanda society get there?

To this case, Rwanda society needs to implement simultaneous ‘Three M–Strategy’ towards building a paradigm community. The essence here is in fourfold: (1) to ensure proper inclusion of all competing faction groups inside and outside the country, (2) to provide free, equal and proper utilization of national resources, (3) to empower citizen through involving them in decision making, and (4) to integrate the whole ethnic groups. This may be done from the individual level and/or group level to national level towards integrating the whole Rwandans. If this works well, then it will build a sense of country’s belongingness as a precedence of making stable and equal society all the time. Through this way the question of national unity may be well addressed as well. Also political leadership will be addressed in particular if politicians draw power from citizens and thus are controlled and monitored not to manipulate and intimidate the masses. State institutions too, will be run in accordance with people’s will, legitimacy and just laws. To my bewilderment, if the challenge of African development is lack of unity why our countries should be engulfed with vertical wings as opposed to horizontally?

While trying to answer the above questions, there are three fold issues that are: to ‘*mobilise all groups*’, ‘*mediate all groups*’ and lastly ‘*monitor them*’ towards building a new paradigm society. We stress the need for Rwanda government, international community and all other stakeholders (inside and outside) to rethink on how to implement the Three M–Strategy. Through mobilisation, differences will be sorted out, raise awareness on national issues while forging a better strategy of acting together and ultimately brings changes in the society. This will lay out a basic foundation for the future society’s prosperity. While mobilising, there should be effort done to mediate Rwandans and all its contentious groups to resolve their differences. Of such problem mediation style is the most effective approach because will ensures peaceful settlement of conflicts between the parties involved. Mediator(s) must create a cooperative and assertive environment to achieve win-win solutions thus actuate the paradigm community in Rwanda. Mobilise and Mediate also should go simultaneously with monitoring. All stakeholders should actively work together in order to create new paradigm society. Effort must done to monitor all groups in Rwanda in order to keep in check all ineptitude leaders with effective institutions and sustainable democracy or watch Rwandan society continues falling apart once more.

Reforming political order towards building a paradigm community

Through building up free and independent institutions

Seeking to re-establish fabric society, there is a need for a pragmatic approach that combines peace-building and state-building as model for the alike post-genocide society as it was in South Africa. Society disintegrates because there are less or no incentive institutions to support a needed society. Rwanda should establish extractive socio-economic and political institutions that are capable, accountable and responsive to the citizens' needs. Strong institutions help Rwanda to mobilise the citizen, mediate and monitor them in a lied rules and procedures that will resolve ethnic division, tension and conflict. It is also important to note that having strong institutions in Rwanda with clear separation of power the country will flourish than how it is now. It will also build citizens' trust and confidence for the country's prospects of popular participation and deliberation. The President institutions should not assume too much power, as Montesquieu once argued 'those who have power have a tendency of abusing it' (Bongyu, 2014). We have seen this as for instances in 2000s the president decided to change national anthem and colour of national flag without even the consent of the parliament.

State institutions such as administrative bureaucracies, legal systems, police, and military should operate following rules and procedures to build citizens' trust and confidence for the country's prosperity. This will establish and develop new rules that are– 'more inclusive, representative and responsive that incorporate stakeholders who have not had a voice, including women and those from ethnic minorities, and in some cases oppressed ethnic majorities' (Domingo, 2013).

Road to Democracy, Justice and Reconciliation

Like many other societies emerging from civil wars; the post-genocide society of Rwanda, needs true democracy and justice in order to resuscitate, rehabilitate and strengthen new forms of political order of popular participation of the masses. It should focus on civil and political rights, and in particular on equal distribution of power, that in turn, support more inclusive policies for development and greater equity. However, the continued system of RPF's power consolidation as referred by Filip Reyntjes 'Tutsisation' in Rwanda is as a ticking bomb and it

suggests as if the RFP government has forgotten the country political crises of 1970's and 1990's that were power struggle instances and hence overthrown the country's first two Presidents.

Furthermore, the current system in the country has seemed to be not enough to provide, a true avenue for reconciliation. For instances, political parties critic to the government have been always termed as having genocide ideology. Democratic Party for Renewal (PDR), Rwanda National Congress (RNC) and United Democratic Forces (UDF) are citing examples. Thus the party leaders of the aforementioned political parties have been either jailed or listed as terrorists or daily being intimidated and whenever possible they are assassinated. Cases such as assassination of Kayumba Nyamwasa and Patrick Karegeya are evident. Taking Karegeya as example of whom was an ex-Rwandan spymaster fallen out with the incumbent in 2004 after questioning the tendencies to hoard political power. He was arrested and jailed three years for indiscipline before fleeing into exile in 2007 teaming up with a group of military generals to form RNC, the group that faults the President, of turning into a dictator. Finally, in January 2014 he was assassinated in South Africa. Arrogantly, Kagame responded as stated earlier 'you cannot betray Rwanda and get away with it', signifying his government involvement. More surprisingly is that international community has failed even to condemn these tragedy apart from South Africa where the event took place. On the other hand, UDF leader, Victoire Ingabire was blowed following her call for equal treatment to all perpetrators of crimes. She was convicted of conspiring to harm the country through war and terror, and minimizing the 1994 genocide that tore apart the nation and therefore jailed for 15 years. This is why the international community needs to play a more proactive role to quell such abuses and strength democracy and justice. However, if no solid efforts are taken to make those who committed these tragedies accountable for their actions, then the international community continues to provide room for other atrocities, let alone, losing its credibility.

Therefore, for quite long Rwanda has remained at odds in a sense that while 'Hutu demands democracy, recognition that they are the political majority, the Tutsi demands justice, a claim that the right to life must precede any recognition of a political majority' (Mamdani, 2001). Thus, how to reconcile these seemingly conflicting demands requires high degree of commitment and going beyond the 'notion of victors' justice to that of 'survivors' justice'.

Nevertheless, the adoption of *Ndi Umunyarwanda* campaign is an indication that the government has embarked on a collective conviction that genocide was committed by one ethnic group (Hutu) against another (Tutsi) and this must be discouraged. Also under this campaign, where the Hutu and/or their children are obliged to ask for forgiveness from Tutsi who are textfied to be the victim is unacceptable practice because it sends wrong signal toward reunification of the country and national unity as well.

The National Unity and Reconciliation Commission and Centre for Conflict Management should lead this in effort toward promoting greater cohesion and interaction of Rwandan society. If this approach is more self-driven and bottom-up, then people will be more ready to accept the decisions that go against them because they have a part in the decision-making process. Claude Ake did emphasize that 'In as much as development is democratized so that the people become its agents, its means and end, then development will be construed' (2000, p. 88) As a result the egalitarian society in Rwanda will be established if there is paradigm shift from prejudice and bigotry to justice and tolerance where issues of political representation, true democracy, justice and reconciliation, among others will not remain as a far-fetched dream.

Champion of national Unity

There should be strong hold of the government and all other stakeholders to champion core national unity, values and solidarity as a way to minimise ethnic identities, division and tension that had risen up. Programs such as *Ingando*, *Itorero*, *Ry'igihungu*, seminars, among others are indispensable in this process. It is through these where they will be a true paradigm shift from of hatred, division and fear to that of love, humanity and togetherness.

From national level to bottom, state actors to non-state actors, as well as formal to informal institutions including community-levels, should re-embark and re-work together toward overcoming all the prevailing differences. This also sends a message that national capacities for conflict management should be strengthen to address all inequalities, impunity, ethnic division and tension, and other discriminatory tendencies before dispute or conflict escalates.

Respecting principles of good governance

It has become a caricature in Africa and to African leaders to violate their constitution and rule of law norms on their own greed. This tendency has been affecting democratization process in many of the Anglophone and Francophone countries in Africa. No wonder therefore political elites have failed to relinquish from power peacefully such as of recently 2015: Pierre Nkurunziza and Blaise Compaoré of Burundi and Burkina Faso respectively. More than that Cameroon President, Paul Biya has routinely changed the constitution no matter the cost and the opposition shouts. For example in 2008 Biya changed the constitution to remove term limits. The same happened in Uganda, Togo, Algeria, Namibia, among others. Rwandan President, Paul Kagame followed on the same ambit as the parliament has passed a constitutional amendment enabling him to run for a third consecutive term in 2017. The proposal has been backed by the Supreme Court and it is expected to be approved during the national referendum. Therefore we should expect to see Kagame ruling as a president until 2034 as this amendment although has cut presidential terms from the current seven to five years and maintain a two-term limit, Kagame is made exceptional. Therefore he will be allowed to run for another seven years when his current mandate ends in 2017 and still according to the suggested amendment be qualifying to run for other two-terms of five years each. This is unacceptable practice and should be annulled if democratic principles are to be respected. What we see is how other organs of the government are weak, legislature and judicial, and how are used as a rubber stamp by the executive branch. In simple reasoning Kagame cannot be advised to retire with his advisers, therefore he is there to stay. This is because outside of the President's ruling class, the President has more enemies than when he became a President. And in a little spoken opposition parties like Rwanda everything is done according to the ruling party.

However, the society like Rwanda needs good governance to ensure existence of democratic norms, accepted and nurtured by citizens and their government. We have seen that the existence of bad governance (exploitative, oppressive and exclusion) of the past on how did they contribute much to the 1973 *Coup d'Etat* and the 1994 genocide. Therefore, Rwanda must converse the history and establish new political culture which will guarantee political stability in the country. Thus political leaders in Rwanda have to respect the good governance principles such as rule of law, participatory, transparent and constitutional ruling. The

government here has to be close to its people by involving citizens in the development and implementation of policies and programs that affect them in their localities (Wama, 2014). Such system will ensure sustainable human development, end corruption, effective democracy, protect human rights and freedoms as well as ensure free, fair and vibrant economy in a given society.

Conclusion

Therefore, although there have been slow pace to recovered from the genocide wounds, the Rwandan community prospects remains inspiring the whole people of Africa at large. The challenges, they face are enormous and undeniable, but hopes, opportunities and prospects are evident too for building paradigm community which is the successful and integrated society. Thus, there should be true democracy, truth, justice and reconciliation in one hand, and active participation and political consensus at all level(s) namely; individuals, governments, private sectors, civil societies and with other important stakeholders to build national unity where no question of divisions and tensions may be experienced as it is now. International community such as UNs and its agencies, AU, East African Community and other stakeholders should work together to deal with many of the conflicting situations proactively and timely before they escalate in Rwanda and to many other African countries in enhancing peace, security and prosperity society in the continent and world at large.

References

Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. (2012). *Why nations fails: The origin of power, prosperity and poverty*. New York: Crown Business.

Ake, C. (2000). *Feasibility of democracy in Africa*. Dakar: CODESRIA.

Biswaro, J. M. (2013). *The role of regional integration in conflict prevention, management, and resolution in Africa: The case of African Union*. Brasilia: Fundação Alexandre de Gusmão.

Bongyu, G. M. (2014, August 1). *Political governance and development*. Unpublished Class Notes, Pan African University: Yaounde- Cameroon.

Caplan, G. (2007). Rwanda: Walking the road to genocide, In A. Thomson, (Ed.), *The media and the Rwanda genocide* (pp. 20-37). London: Pluto Press.

Citizen Reporter. (2014, May 7). How the former Rwandan spymaster was assassinated. *The Citizen*, p. 2.

DeBari, J., (2013). *Reconciliation in Rwanda: Is it really working? Metamorphosis papers*. Retrieved from <http://www.coplac.org/publications/metamorphosis.php?a=Spring2013>

Domingo, P., Holmes, R., Menocal, A.R., Jones, N. Bhuvanendra, D., and Wood, J., (2013). "Assessment of the evidence of links between gender equality, peacebuilding and statebuilding" Overseas Development Institute.

Guest, R. (2004). *The shackled continent: Africa's past, present and future*. New York: MacMillan.

Hintjens, H. M. (1999). Explaining the 1994 Rwanda genocide. *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 37(2), pp. 241-286

Human Rights Watch, (2011). *Justice compromised: The legacy of Rwanda's community-based gacaca courts*. New York: Human Rights Watch.

Kintu, R. (2005). *The truth behind the rwanda tragedy*. Document prepared and presented to the U.N. Tribunal on Rwanda, Arusha, Tanzania, March 20, 2005

Mamdani, M. (2001). *When victims become killers: Colonialism, nativism, and the genocide in Rwanda*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Mbaku, J.M. (2004). *Institutions and development in Africa*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Mkandawire, T. (2013). *Fifty years of African independence: Personal reflections, distinguished Nyerere lecturer-2013*. Mkuki na Nyota, Dar es Salaam.

Orcutt, J. D. (1983). *Analyzing deviance: Dorsey series in sociology*. Dorsey Press, Indiana University

Rwandan Platform for Dialogue, Truth and Justice (RDTJ), (2013). “Ndi Umunyarwanda” (I am Rwandan) and other similar campaign initiatives: Reconciliation Or Social Division?. Retrieved from <http://ikazeiwacu.k.i.f.unblog.fr/files/2013/12/rdtj-view-on-ndi-umunyarwanda.pdf>

Schwab, K. (ed.). (2013). *The global competitiveness report 2013-2014*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.

Thomson, S. (2011). Getting close to rwandans since the genocide: Studying everyday life in highly politicized research settings. *African Studies Review*, 53(3), 19–34.

Wama, M. (2014). “Africa: Does democracy guarantee development?” *The African Executive*, Issue number 492.

Yanagizwa-Drott, D. (2014). *Propaganda and conflict: Evidence from the Rwandan genocide*.

Quarterly Journal of Economics, 129(4), 1947-1994. Retrieved from <http://www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/dyanagi/Research.html>