

NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE COUNCIL PROJECT ON INTERVENTION IN INTERNAL
CONFLICT: THE CASE OF RWANDA

By Gilbert M. Khadiagala
African Studies Program
SAIS, The Johns Hopkins University
Washington, D.C.
GKhadiag@mail.jhuwash.jhu.edu

First Draft

BACKGROUND

Post-colonial Rwanda was born out of a decisive reversal of power from the minority Tutsi to the majority Hutu occasioned by the 1959 revolution. The revolution inaugurated an era of massive movement of refugees in the region, endemic communal violence, and political frailty. In the early 1980s, the government of Juvenal Habyarimana and the one-party state he had erected since 1973, the National Revolutionary Movement for Development (Mouvement Révolutionnaire National pour le Développement, MRND), was under siege from three fronts. First, as the Habyarimana government grew more authoritarian, the intra-Hutu common political front frayed, shifting military and economic power to the president's narrow northern ruling elites.

Second, inequitable access to resources heightened intra-Hutu cleavages amidst a worsening economy. With the highest population density in mainland Africa (256 persons per square kilometer), Rwanda typifies the dilemma of overpopulation and resource scarcity compounded by severe dependence on coffee production. By the second half of the 1980s, with economic growth rates falling behind a burgeoning population, the government admitted that it could only feed five million people. Internal and external economic shocks were to worsen the class and regional polarization, contributing to the general weakening of the Habyarimana state. Economic decline and external pressure for democratization galvanized domestic opposition groups to demand political reforms. In response, Habyarimana appointed a commission in September 1990 to work out a National Political Charter that would allow the establishment of different political parties.¹

Third, against the backdrop of economic and political weakness, Tutsi exiles in Uganda organized in the Rwandese Patriotic Front (RPF) invaded in October 1990. Caught in an uncertain exile, RPF units that had been part of Uganda's National Resistance Army (NRA) took the initiative, at the opportune instance of regime weakness, to force the issue of return, restoration of citizenship rights, national unity, and an end to a dictatorial system that generates refugees.

1. For good analyses of the background to the conflict see David Norman Smith, "The Genesis of Genocide in Rwanda: The Fatal Dialectic of Class and Ethnicity," *Humanity and Society*, vol. 19, no. 4 (November 1995), 65-67, 150; Mahmood Mamdani, "From Conquest to Consent: Reflections on Rwanda," *New Left Review*, vol. 26, no. 2 (March-April 1996), 15-16; Philippe Platteau, "Land Relations Under Unbearable Stress: Rwanda Caught in the Malthusian Trap," *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, vol. 34 (1998), 1-47; and Gerard Prunier, *The Rwanda Crisis: History of a Genocide, 1959-1994* (Kampala: Fountain Publishers, 1995), 88-90.

The Internationalization of the Conflict

Between the RPF's invasion in October 1990 and the signing of the Arusha Agreement in August 1993, the conflict went through two significant stages that form the background to UN intervention: external military intervention to support the belligerents; and regional mediation efforts to end the conflict. Regional mediation had two primary phases: November 1990-May 1992; and June 1992-August 1993. These phases are important to analyses of the dynamics of the conflict and international efforts to address it.

A. Foreign Military Intervention

The fledgling Habyarimana government invited foreign military support in the fall of 1990 support from its allies, Belgium, France, and Zaire to meet the RPF's threat. Responding to this appeal, Belgium sent 535 troops and France sent 300 troops ostensibly to protect their nationals in Rwanda. Zaire's Mobutu Sese Seko dispatched about 1,000 troops that were deployed in direct combat against the RPF. External support enabled the Rwandese army to inflict heavy casualties on the RPF. But as the war raged on, however, Zaire and Belgium withdrew their troops, the latter citing a legal obligation to remain neutral in war situations, while Mobutu's undisciplined troops left in ignominy. After the withdrawal of Zairian and Belgian troops, France was left as the principal supporter of the government. French military commitment to the government included the provision of troops and military advisers, the supply of heavy weaponry such as armored personnel carriers, reconnaissance vehicles, communications equipment, and helicopters. France also provided financial guarantees for purchases of small arms, mortars, and grenade launchers from Egypt and South Africa. Military assistance and training enabled Habyarimana to boost the government army, *Forces Armees Rwandaises* (FAR), which grew from 5,200 in October 1990 to 15,000 by mid-1991, and 30,000 by the time the Arusha negotiations began in June 1992.²

Uganda's military and political support for the RPF was indispensable to its initial survival. Stemming from the RPF's long-term alliance with Ugandan President Yoweri Museveni's NRA, Uganda provided arms, food, and gasoline, and willingly opened its southern

2. For analyses of French role see Alison Des Forges, Leave None To Tell The Story: Genocide in Rwanda (New York: Human

border as a military launching pad and place of refuge. In the face of widespread condemnation for the invasion, Museveni remained a dependable RPF ally in regional and international diplomatic circles.

B. REGIONAL MEDIATION

Phase One, 1990-1992

The first phase of regional mediation efforts stemmed from Habyarimana's desire to isolate the RPF and Uganda. In a predictable spate of self-denial, this strategy entailed mobilizing the support first, of Belgium and its European allies to use their economic muscle on regional actors, and second, to enlist Tanzania and Zaire as mediators between Rwanda and Uganda. Three weeks after the invasion, Belgium sent its Prime Minister, Wilfried Martens, to East Africa to persuade regional leaders to prevail on Museveni. Martens proposed the creation of a regional intervention force to supervise a cease-fire, with Europe furnishing logistical and financial support. Belgian diplomatic intervention led to regional consultations in November 1990 focusing on a cease-fire and possible establishment of a peacekeeping force.

Efforts to use Tanzania's influence over Museveni to curtail Uganda's logistical and military support to the RPF culminated in various summit meetings in Tanzania in late October 1990. Habyarimana promised to initiate a dialogue with both the internal and external opposition under the auspices of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to end the conflict and resolve problem of Tutsi refugees. But this dialogue stalled, predicated, as it were, on Tanzania and Uganda persuading the RPF to essentially return to Uganda. Tanzania's diplomatic intervention failed to stop the war because of Habyarimana's unwillingness to concede the legitimacy of the RPF.

Subsequently, Habyarimana prevailed on Mobutu to embark on a series of diplomatic initiatives to break the impasse. Mobutu's mediation starting on October 26, 1990 in Gbadolite, Zaire, proposed a cease-fire agreement to be supervised by a 15-man OAU Neutral Military Observer's Group (NMOG) drawn from Zaire, Burundi, Tanzania, and Uganda. Mobutu's mediation created a negotiating process without altering fundamentally the government's view of a cease-fire as a prelude to RPF's withdrawal back to Uganda. Even though Mobutu made

overtures to the RPF during these talks, the government either refused to participate or sent representatives who had no negotiating mandate. The government's unyielding stance was demonstrated when it scuttled the deployment of OAU military observers, insisting on stationing a military team on the Rwanda-Uganda border to prevent further incursions by the RPF.

With futile regional mediation efforts to stop the war, the focus shifted to finding a regional solution to the problem of Rwandese refugees. The conference on Rwandese refugees in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, in February 1991, brought together Rwanda's neighbors, the OAU, and the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR). Habyarimana promised to remove all obstacles impeding the voluntary return and reintegration of refugees. In return, Uganda, Burundi, Tanzania, and Zaire agreed to naturalize and integrate refugees who opted to settle outside Rwanda. With no end in sight for the war, Mobutu reinvigorated his efforts to find a durable cease-fire culminating in an agreement at N'sele, Zaire, on March 29, 1991 which proposed the immediate cessation of hostilities as a prelude to negotiations on power-sharing. At N'sele, the Habyarimana government, for the first time, agreed on direct negotiations with the RPF.

Further favoring the negotiations were fundamental changes in the domestic balance of power engendered by Habyarimana's internal reforms. These reforms created a new multiparty constitution and led to the formation of political parties sympathetic to the RPF's position. In a major breakthrough in April 1992, the major political parties signed a protocol that established a coalition transitional government. As part of this agreement, Habyarimana conceded to the start of negotiations with the RPF.³

Phase Two, June 1992-August 1993: The Arusha Peace Process

Tanzania, under the broad mandate of the OAU, mediated the Arusha peace talks from their inception in June 1992 to their conclusion in August 1993. To provide additional sources of leverage, representatives from France, Germany, Belgium, the UN, and US attended the talks as observers. Similarly, Burundi, Uganda, Zaire and the OAU sent observers to give the talks an African imprimatur and demonstrate regional anxiety about a settlement. The multilateral nature

3. For accounts of this phase of the conflict see Filip Reyntjens, "Constitution-Making in Situations of Extreme Crisis: The Case of Rwanda and Burundi," *Journal of African Law*, vol. 40, no. 2 (1996), pp. 234-3; and Bruce Jones, "The Arusha Peace Process," in Howard Adelman and Astri Suhrke, eds., *The Path of a Genocide: The Rwanda Crisis from Uganda to Zaire* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1999), pp. 131-136.

of the Arusha talks provided a wider international context of power, but in reality the essentially token participation of major Western countries and the UN from the outset helped shape expectations about the extent of international commitment to Rwanda's peace process. During the negotiations, these expectations weighed heavily on decisions about the resources for implementation, postwar economic reconstruction, and refugee resettlement.

From the start of the negotiations, the Tanzanian mediators focused on reaching agreement on a durable cease-fire as a means to build confidence. Previous attempts to establish cease-fire mechanisms in the N'sele agreement of March 1991 provided a blueprint for the negotiations, facilitating a quick agreement that established a 55-man OAU Neutral Military Organization Group (NMOG) composed of troops from Mali, Nigeria, Senegal, and Zimbabwe. As the first multilateral military intervention in the conflict, the NMOG led by Nigeria's General Ekundayo Opaleye, had the limited task to create and supervise a buffer zone in the north between RPF and government positions.

With the cease-fire holding and the NMOG structures in place, the mediators steered the parties to power-sharing talks sequenced around protocols that addressed various facets of the conflict. By early 1993, the parties had signed a number of protocols, including the rule of law and establishment of democratic rule, and power sharing during the transitional period. The mediators faced a major challenge in February 1993 when Habyarimana threatened to withdraw from the negotiations and unleashed his extremists on Tutsi and Hutu moderates. The threat to the negotiations was averted when the RPF broke the cease-fire and launched a large-scale offensive against government troops, doubling the territory under its control and advancing to a few miles of Kigali. French authorities again saved Habyarimana from the RPF advance by sending more troops, bringing the number to at least 680, comprising four companies, including paratroopers.

The confrontation in February 1993 was a turning point in the conflict, creating propitious circumstances for the mediators to prod the parties back to negotiations. In a high-level meeting in Dar es Salaam on March 7, 1993, the parties reconstituted the cease-fire and agreed on the mechanisms for the gradual withdrawal of French troops and their replacement with an international monitoring force. As part of these efforts, Paris sought a UN force, culminating in UN Security Council resolution 812 on March 12, 1993 that authorized the formation of an international force "under the aegis of the OAU and the United Nations entrusted

with the protection of, and humanitarian assistance to, civilian population and support the OAU force for the monitoring of the cease-fire.” A UN reconnaissance team recommended that this mission, the United Nations Observer Mission Uganda-Rwanda (UNOMUR), be deployed on the Uganda side of the border to prevent the supply and reinforcement of RPF.

During the final phase of the negotiations between March and June 1993, both belligerents favored a strong but neutral force under UN leadership to implement the agreement. In a joint letter to the UN on June 14, 1993, the government and RPF suggested a rapid UN deployment after the signing of the agreement to “permit its speedy implementation and, in particular, the establishment of a broad-based transitional government thereby avoiding excessively long intervals, which might be detrimental to the peace process.”⁴

The Arusha Peace Agreement incorporated six protocols signed by the parties over the twelve months of talks: the N’sele cease-fire agreement, the rule of law, power sharing, repatriation of refugees, integration of armed forces, and miscellaneous provisions. Central to the transition was a multiparty Broad-Based Transitional Government (BBTG) and Transitional National Assembly (TNA) that would be established thirty-seven days after the signing of the agreement. Before their establishment, the Agreement allowed Habyarimana’s government to retain power on condition that it would neither usurp the mandate of the BBTG nor introduce new legislation. The transitional institutions would supervise local, parliamentary, and presidential elections in 1995, twenty-two months after the establishment of the BBTG.

C. UN INTERVENTIONS

a) UNAMIR, August 1993-April 1994

1. The principal circumstances that prompted third party intervention

The United Nations Assistance Mission in Rwanda (UNAMIR) intervened to implement the Arusha Peace Agreement, an Agreement that had been carved out of a deeply polarized

4. “Joint Request by the Rwandese Government and the Rwandese Patriotic Front to the Secretary-General of the United Nations Concerning the Stationing of a Neutral International Force in Rwanda,” in The United Nations and Rwanda, 1993-1996, p. 166.

society. Most observers correctly saw Arusha as a political rather than a peace Agreement.⁵ From the outset, the interveners confronted three major obstacles. First, the Agreement was erected on a moderate multiethnic political center that attempted a power sharing mechanism against the overwhelming odds of entrenched Hutu power. Second, compounding the Agreement's internal fragility was an unstable regional environment that had a debilitating effect on the implementation process. Third, both the mediators and parties to the Arusha Agreement staked its implementation almost exclusively on international actors who were unwilling and unprepared to expend resources on meeting most of its provisions.

UNAMIR was deployed months after the signing of the Arusha Peace Agreement, but its clearly delineated phases reflected the parties' responsibility to make tangible progress toward implementation. For interveners, deployment was contingent on discernible movement toward peace and the establishment of transitional institutions. For the parties, however, there would be limited progress in key provisions without full UNAMIR deployment.

2. The nature of the intervention force

In planning for UNAMIR, the interveners were assisted by the existence of a peacekeeping infrastructure, the OAU's NMOG, which had been in place since June 1992 and UNOMUR, which was deployed on the Uganda side of the border and became fully operational in mid-August 1993. On August 19, 1993, the UN Secretary-General sent a reconnaissance mission to Rwanda led by General Romeo Dallaire, the Chief Military Observer for UNOMUR (and later UNAMIR's Force Commander), to examine the functions of UNAMIR and evaluate the human and financial resources required to carry them out. Dallaire's mission recommended a much smaller force than envisaged in the Arusha Agreement and what some UN military experts thought was feasible for effective implementation. UN military experts proposed 8,000 or, at the very least, 5,000 troops. In the end, there was agreement on 2,458 troops, of which 2,217 would be staff officers and troops, and 331 military observers.

The reconnaissance mission recommended a four-stage progressive deployment. Phase one provided for the deployment of an advance party of 25 military, 18 civilian personnel and

5. See for instance, Howard Adelman and Astri Suhrke, Early Warning and Conflict Management, Volume 2 of the International Response to Conflict and Genocide: Lessons from the Rwanda Experience (Copenhagen: DANIDA, 1996). For other analyses of the Arusha Agreement see Gerard Prunier, The Rwanda Crisis, pp. 159-191; and Patrick J. O'Halloran, Humanitarian Intervention and the Genocide in Rwanda (London: Research Institute for the Study of Conflict, January 1995).

three civilian police after formal authorization by the Security Council. This force would secure Kigali and establish the “essential condition needed to permit the secure installation of the transitional Government,” which, the mission acknowledged, “may not be installed until the end of 1993.” Slated to take 90 days, this phase was also to lead to the integration of UNOMUR and NMOG in UNAMIR, concluding with a total military force of 1,428.

Phase two, taking 90 days, was to focus primarily on disengagement, demobilization, and integration of the armed forces and gendarmerie. The end of phase two would coincide with full deployment of the 2,548 military personnel. During phase three, which would last about nine months, UNAMIR was to complete the integration of the forces and reduce its staff to approximately 1,240 personnel. In the final phase, lasting about four months, a reduced mission of approximately 930 military personnel would assist in securing the atmosphere required in the final stages of the transitional period leading up to the elections. Three weeks beyond the 37 days (October 5, 1993), the UN Security Council passed resolution 872 endorsing the plan of the reconnaissance mission and established UNAMIR for an initial period of six months. UNAMIR’s authorizing resolution warned that its deployment beyond 90 days would be contingent on a determination that “substantive progress has been made toward the implementation of the Arusha Peace Agreement.”⁶

When it was fully deployed, UNAMIR consisted of military forces and civilian observers from Bangladesh, Belgium, Ghana, and Tunisia. In addition to Force Commander, General Dallaire (assisted by Ghana’s Brigadier Henry Kwami Anyindoho), Jacques-Roger Booh-Booh, the Special Representative of the Secretary General (SRSG), was the head of both the civilian component and the entire UNAMIR.

There were frictions between the military and civilian components from the start of the intervention. As the SRSG, Booh-Booh, was the overall head of UNAMIR, but the delay in establishing his office in Rwanda meant that General Dallaire led the mission for some time, a fact that was to create a gap in command between the civilians and military. With the creation of the civilian administration, the military became subordinated to it; yet as General Anyindoho notes, the administrative support system was weak, incompetent, and uncooperative: “the majority of the personnel in the Administration and Management Division of the mission did not

6. “Security Council Resolution Establishing UNAMIR for a Sixth-Month Period and Approving the Integration of UNOMUR into UNAMIR,” *The United Nations and Rwanda, 1993-1996* (New York: The United Nations Blue Book Series, Volume 10, 1996).

appear to possess the requisite background to give them the necessary confidence for the day-to-day handling of their responsibilities.”⁷[7] Furthermore, civilian control of financial resources led to conflicts with the military. According to Anyindoho: “A force Commander who has been given troops to command in an operation must have a say in the financial control of that mission. Why will he not be given assets to control the force? Flexibility, which is a principle of administration, seems to have been ignored in UNAMIR even though our first Chief of Administration happened to be a retired Colonel.”⁸

3. Goals of the intervention

Conflicting goals about deployment and intervention marked the enterprise from the outset. The Arusha Agreement called on UNAMIR to “assist in the implementation of the Peace Agreement, more especially through the supervision of the implementation of the Protocol of Agreement on the Integration of Armed Forces of the two parties as well as the provision of all kinds of assistance to the competent authorities and organs.”⁹ The protocol envisaged that demobilization, disengagement, and integration of a new army would be completed between seven and nine months. Under this plan, there would be a new integrated army of 19,000 men, divided on a 60-40 percent basis in favor of the government. The demobilization and gradual integration of the rest of the soldiers in civilian life was to start with the voluntary publication of lists of soldiers targeted for demobilization, the establishment of assembly points, monetary payments to individual soldiers, and the formation of a secretariat for rehabilitation and social integration. Throughout this exercise, UNAMIR was to demarcate assembly points, including the establishment of an expanded Demilitarized Zone (DMZ), create the demobilization procedures to supervise the disengagement of forces, and train the new armed forces.

The protocol also provided additional security roles for UNAMIR: guarantee the overall security of the country, especially verifying the maintenance of law and order; ensure the security of distribution of humanitarian aid in conjunction with relief operations, and with repatriation and resettlement programs; assist in the tracking of arms caches and neutralization of

7. Henry Kwami Anyindoho, Guns over Kigali: The Rwandese Civil War-1994, A Personal Account (Accra: Woeli Publishing Services, 1997), p. 8.

8. Anyindoho, Guns over Kigali, p. 9.

9. References to protocols in the Agreement are drawn from United Nations, The United Nations and Rwanda, 1993-1996, pp. 170-200.

armed gangs; aid in the recovery of all weapons in the hands of civilians; undertake mine clearance operations; and monitor the observance by the two parties of the modalities for the definite cessation of hostilities. Article 64 of the protocol stipulated that the Neutral International Force shall be “informed of any incidents or violation and shall track down the perpetrators.” In its initial role, UNAMIR was to provide security in Kigali, a task that would be linked to the formation of the BBTG and TNA.

Dallaire’s reconnaissance mission, however, proposed a more modest mandate for UNAMIR. Thus, instead of “overall security” in Rwanda, the mission suggested that UNAMIR “contribute to” security only in the city of Kigali: “Owing to the presence of several battalions of government forces in Kigali and the introduction into the city of the RPF leadership with a fully equipped RPF battalion, the Mission would establish a weapons-secure area in and around Kigali.” Outside Kigali, while UNAMIR’s role in monitoring the cease-fire and demobilization of troops was to remain intact, the mission proposed a reduction of the assembly points, cantonment points, and integrated training centers from a total of 48, as suggested by the two parties, to 26. With regard to maintaining civilian security through monitoring the activities of the gendarmerie and communal police, the mission changed the mandate to “investigate and report on incidents regarding the activities” of the police. On the security components that provided for disarmament of militias and civilians, the mission, conscious of the difficulties caused elsewhere simply ignored them.

These contrasting postures toward the goals of the intervention were captured in UN Secretary-General’s report following the reconnaissance mission: “The concern of all parties was that, should the neutral international force not be deployed in a timely manner, a political vacuum might occur if the transitional Government was not established in Kigali. The mission responded by clarifying the decision-making process at the United Nations and by stressing that the dispatch of a peacekeeping force to Rwanda would depend on a final determination by the Security Council.”

Members of the Security Council, wary of an open-ended intervention, opposed not just the provisions of the Arusha Agreement, but also the timing of deployment. UNAMIR was created in a global context characterized by apprehensions about the wisdom of international peacekeeping. Boutros-Ghali took the lead in presenting the Arusha Agreement as an “opportunity for the international community to contribute to the successful implementation of

the peace process,” and constantly warned that delays would “seriously jeopardize” the agreement. But in the Security Council, where it mattered most, Rwanda was not a high priority. Growing US apprehension about funding peacekeeping operations was heightened by the killing of 18 US soldiers in Mogadishu, Somalia, two days before Security Council debate on UNAMIR began. Following the Somalia debacle, the Clinton administration came out with a new peacekeeping policy, termed Presidential Decision Directive 25, that stressed limiting the costs and risks of peacekeeping.¹⁰

The first contingent of UNAMIR under General Dallaire arrived in Kigali at the end of October 1993, but it became fully operational at the end of December 1993 after the integration of NMOG into UNAMIR and the creation of a weapons-secure area in Kigali manned by Belgian and Bangladeshi troops. With the deployment of nearly 1,300 peacekeepers, 400 Belgian soldiers ushered the RPF civilian leaders and 600 soldiers into Kigali, the first move in the establishment of the BBTG.

Lurking in the background of the deployment, however, were domestic and regional power realignments that were unfavorable to implementation of the Agreement. Internally, extremist opponents of the Arusha Agreement organized by Habyarimana’s supporters and their militias redoubled their efforts to defeat the implementation of the Agreement at three levels. First, their main propaganda instrument, the Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines (RTLMC), began broadcasting in August 1993 by openly calling on the population to reject the Agreement and to prepare to fight against the installation of an RPF-dominated government. Second, the extremists increased the recruitment and training of militias in ostensibly “self-defense” programs and expanded the arming of the presidential guard and gendarmes. At the end of August 1993, amid the escalating levels of violence, Prime Minister Uwilingiyimana, warned that growing insecurity did not “augur well for the implementation of the agreement because security is a prerequisite for successful implementation.” In November and December, reports of escalating ethnic massacres conducted by armed Hutu militias throughout the country clouded the implementation climate.

10. For discussion of this directive and impact on Rwanda see Michael N. Barnett, “The UN Security Council, Indifference, and Genocide in Rwanda,” *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (1997), pp. 551-78; and Bruce D. Jones, “‘Intervention Without Borders’: Humanitarian Intervention in Rwanda, 1994-1994,” *Millennium*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (1995), pp. 225-49; and Alan J. Kuperman, *The Limits of Humanitarian Intervention : Genocide in Rwanda* (Washington, D.C. : Brookings Institution Press, 2001).

At the regional level, the Rwandese peace process was dealt a severe blow by the military coup in Burundi on October 21, 1993 in which the elected Hutu president, Melchior Ndadaye, was assassinated and Tutsi-Hutu conflicts violence ensued. Ndadaye's death at the hands of the Tutsi military only helped to inflame ethnic passions in Rwanda, giving opponents of power sharing more ammunition than Tutsis were bent on dominating the two countries. Most observers regard events in Burundi as the most important trigger to the unraveling of the Agreement, largely because it undercut the moral and organizational positions of Hutu political parties that previously had been the core of the consensus for negotiations and power sharing.

Stripped of the initial mandate of overall security, UNAMIR operated from the end of 1993 not just on shoestring resources, but in a dangerous political vacuum that signatories of the Arusha Agreement had predicted. In mid-December 1993, the SGSR, Booh-Booh, held talks with the RPF and the government in which both sides issued a joint declaration reaffirming their commitment to the Arusha Peace Agreement and the installation of transitional institutions by the end of the same month. The Secretary-General's December 1993 report to the Security Council noted that the cease-fire had generally been respected and recommended the early deployment of troops designated for phase two of the operation, thereby increasing UNAMIR to its peak strength of 2,548 military personnel.

Attempts to constitute transitional institutions, however, stalemated in late December 1993 as a result of severe disagreements over representation in the BBTG and TNA. These disagreements stemmed from Habyarimana's demands for the revision of some of the provisions of the Agreement that barred his supporters from representation in the transitional institutions. Although Booh-Booh crafted a temporary compromise that led to the installation of Habyarimana as the interim president on January 5, 1994, the deterioration of the security situation in the country worsened the implementation process. UNAMIR had the mandate to contribute to the security of Kigali in collaboration with the local police, including enforcing the ban on weapons. Yet, UNAMIR's modest mandate could not meet the flagrant distribution of arms to militias and civilians by roving Hutu death squads responding to the RTLM's call to exterminate Tutsis. In January and February 1994 there was a multiplication of incidences of violent demonstrations, roadblocks, assassination of political leaders and murder of civilians. In January, 1994, responding to a report from a close confidant of Habyarimana about plans by the *Interahamwe* to exterminate Tutsis in Kigali and the intensified stockpiling of arms, General

Dallaire sought permission from the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) in New York to use overwhelming military force. The DPKO, however, informed General Dallaire that such action would go beyond the UNAMIR mandate that authorized him to contribute to the security of Kigali in collaboration with local authorities. As violence escalated, the DPKO relented in early February 1994, authorizing the peacekeepers to assist Rwandese police, on a case-by-case basis, to recover illegal arms. In spite of this action, UNAMIR's capacity to seize weapons and provide security was hampered by the rules of engagement that required it to work with local police, which was allied to the *Interahamwe*.

UNAMIR's glaring impotence forced General Dallaire to send another cable to New York on February 1994 warning that the success of the peacekeeping operation would be in jeopardy without prompt confiscation of arms stockpiled by the militia. He predicted "more frequent and more violent demonstrations, more grenade and armed attacks on ethnic and political groups, more assassinations and quite possibly outright attacks on the UN peacekeepers."¹¹ When General Dallaire requests for a robust mandate fell on deaf ears, Belgian authorities made pleas to the Security Council. The US and the UK, however, vehemently opposed the enlargement of UNAMIR operation, citing the costs and risks of exceeding the original peacekeeping mandate. In a letter to the Secretary-General on March 14, 1994, Belgian Foreign Minister, Willy Claes echoed General Dallaire's concerns:

Current political developments in the situation in Rwanda are not encouraging . . . As you are aware, the deadlock in the formation of a broad-based transitional government is leading, despite the efforts of your Special Representative, to a deterioration of the political climate. The Rwandese army appears increasingly annoyed by the parties' procrastination, while information on the stockpiling of weapons by the various militias is becoming even more compelling. Even some of the leaders admit that a prolongation of the current political deadlock could result in an irreversible explosion of violence . . . It seems to me, however, that [the] higher profile of the United Nations on the political level should be accompanied by a firmer stance on the part of UNAMIR with respect to

11. Dallaire's role is analyzed in Linda Melvern, *A People Betrayed: The Role of the West in Rwanda's Genocide* (London: Zed Books, 2000). See also Dallaire, "The Changing Role of UN Peacekeeping Forces: The Relationship between UN Peacekeepers and NGOs in Rwanda," in Randolph Kent and Shashi Tharoor, eds., *The Role of Peacekeeping* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), p. 208.

security . . . Unless the negative development we are witnessing are halted, UNAMIR might find itself unable to continue effectively its basic mission of playing a major supporting role in the implementation of the Arusha Peace Agreement.¹²

Frantic efforts by UNAMIR, Western ambassadors, and regional states failed to break the deadlock on the formation of a transitional government throughout the spring of 1994. In February 1994, Booh-Booh issued a blunt warning that unless Rwanda's feuding parties showed seriousness in implementing the Arusha Agreement the UN forces would be withdrawn: "Rwandese politicians ought to assume their responsibilities before the country sinks into insurmountable hardships. We have made lengthy consultations and efforts to solve the situation, but the UN's patience is running out. If war breaks out again, the UN mandate would be seriously compromised and we would have to pull out." With the impending expiration of the UNAMIR mandate at the end of March 1994, leaders of Rwandan human rights associations and NGOs pleaded to the Security Council "to maintain and reinforce" UNAMIR because its withdrawal "would be interpreted as abandoning the civilian population to the worst of calamities."¹³

The Secretary-General's report at the end of March 1994 recommended the extension of UNAMIR's mandate for additional six months with a new deadline and dire warning: "In the event that the transitional institutions are not installed within the next two months and if, by that time, sufficient progress in the implementation of the next phase of the Agreement has also not been achieved, the Council should then review the situation, including the role of the United Nations." On April 5, 1994, the Security Council resolution 909 extended UNAMIR's mandate until 29 July 1994. The big problem remained lack of movement on domestic reconciliation, a task that regional states shouldered in a last minute effort to prevent what Tanzania's President Ali Hassan Mwinyi called a "Bosnia on our doorstep." Summoned before his regional peers in Dar es Salaam to explain his consistent opposition to the formation of transitional institutions, Habyarimana promised to honor his word, but all progress was reversed when his plane was shot down on its return to Kigali. Habyarimana's death on April 6, 1994 began the genocide that

12. "Letter dated March 14, 1994 from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Belgium to the Secretary- General Expressing Concern that Worsening situation in Rwanda May Impede UNAMIR's Capacity to Fulfill Its Mandate," in United Nations and Rwanda, 1993-1996, p. 244.

13. John Baptiste Kayigamba, "Rwandan Human Rights Groups Plea to International Community," Inter Press Service Feature, March 26, 1994.

killed more than 800,000 people in ninety days, mostly Tutsis and moderate Hutus. The genocide triggered the resumption of the civil war until the RPF troops restored order by taking Kigali in July 1994.

International response to the unfolding genocide followed the pattern that had prevailed since the start of the implementation process. Of critical significance was whether UNAMIR, under its constrained chapter VI mandate, would stay the course following the disintegration of civil authority. Two days after the crisis started, General Dallaire sent a cable to UN headquarters about a “campaign of terror, well planned, organized, deliberate, orchestrated,” and directed against opposition leaders and “particular ethnic groups.” He called for a revision of the mandate to counter the genocide, but, in secret and informal discussions that ensued in New York, the priority was how to pull out of Rwanda. After the *Interahamwe* brutally killed ten Belgian peacekeepers, the security of foreign troops took precedence as Belgium withdrew its 420 soldiers, and shortly thereafter, Bangladesh followed suit. The Belgian withdrawal deprived UNAMIR of its best troops and strengthened international pressure for total withdrawal.

Two weeks into the genocide, Boutros-Ghali presented three options to the Security Council on the position of UNAMIR. The first option proposed the immediate and massive reinforcement of UNAMIR, changing its mandate and authority so that it could coerce the opposing forces into a cease-fire. The second option called for the reduction of UNAMIR to about 270 personnel who would remain to “act as an intermediary between the two sides in an attempt to bring about a cease-fire.” The third option was a complete withdrawal. Boutros-Ghali claims that he had a strong preference for forceful action since it would “give UNAMIR the credibility to deal effectively with the situation . . . I reminded the Council that the consequences of a complete withdrawal of UNAMIR, in terms of human lives lost, could be very severe.”¹⁴ On April 21, the UN Council passed resolution 912 to withdraw the peacekeepers, leaving a token force of 270. UNAMIR’s withdrawal gave extremists an opportunity to wage the genocide for two more months. Although Boutros-Ghali described the withdrawal as a “scandal,” it merely ended a phase that had started with unrealistic expectations enshrined in the Arusha Agreement. As General Dallaire has admitted: “The UN Mission, and those Rwandans it was intended to secure, fell victim to an inflated optimism to which I contributed, thereby

14. United Nations and Rwanda, 1993-1996, p. 43.

creating expectations that the UN did not have the capacity to fulfill.”¹⁵

5. Scenarios for improving goal attainment

Earlier or Later Intervention

In the preliminary phase of the implementation, the gap between the parties' inordinate optimism and the reality of international bureaucracy centered on the timing of establishing UNAMIR. Conscious of the brittle nature of the settlement, the RPF and government had, in their joint letter to the Secretary-General in June 11, 1993, requested an accelerated UN deployment. As a result, the Agreement set a 37-day timetable (that is, September 10, 1993) for establishing transitional institutions. In setting the timetable, the parties received prior warning about possible delays, according to Boutros-Ghali: “At the time of the Arusha discussions, the United Nations made clear to the parties that the decision to deploy a United Nations force rested with the Security Council and that, if approved, the deployment could take up to three months. Given their serious concerns that any inordinate delay in establishing the transitional government might endanger the peace process, the parties had none the less decided to adopt the accelerated timetable.”¹⁶ The unrealistic timetable was compounded by the slow and staggered deployment, weakening the implementation process from the outset. Furthermore, intramural UN debates on reducing UNAMIR's meager forces on the ground considerably undercut the legitimacy of the intervention.

Use of more or less powerful military intervention force

Since the report of the reconnaissance mission recommended a reduction of troop levels to what most critics thought was a less credible intervention, the consensus has revolved around the lack of a “robust” mandate for UNAMIR in meeting the challenge of the extremist forces. Although the ability of the UNAMIR to deal with extremism with a Chapter VI mandate is often exaggerated in some of the revisionist accounts of the UNAMIR's role, there is no doubt that dealing early with instances of militia violence would have made some differences. At the decisive moment when the civil war resumed, Dallaire has claimed that given 5,000 troops and an enhanced UN mandate, he would have prevented most of the killings. By April 6, 1994,

15. Dallaire, “The Changing Role of UN Peacekeeping Forces,” p. 208.

16. United Nations and Rwanda, 1993-1996, p. 24.

UNAMIR's strength stood at 2, 539, but the number quickly dwindled to 1,705 after the withdrawal of Belgian and Bangladesh troops. UN Security Council's resolution of 912 of April 21 further reduced this number to 270 men with a mandate to secure a cease-fire and assist in the resumption of humanitarian efforts. As the Deputy Force Commander of UNAMIR remarks: "A force that was already under a weak mandate, poorly equipped and suffering from maladministration had had its final blow . . . We felt abandoned by those who established us and locked between the RGF and RPF protagonists who did not seem to appreciate our presence in their country, and yet both sides said again and again that they needed our presence."¹⁷

Use of a differently configured military force

In addition to being lightly equipped and underfunded, UNAMIR comprised primarily of Third world military units with inadequate training, equipment and logistics. Deputy Force Commander Anyindoho has pointed to these problems: "Right from the beginning of the mission, UNAMIR was beset with logistics problems. Apart from Belgium, all the contingents came from developing countries with a weak logistics base at home. For example, the country that provided the bulk of the logistics support for the force had many problems with shipment and delivery of vehicles, engineer stores, and drugs for the force . . . Logistics, engineering and medical support should never have been provided by a typical Third World country. It is my hope that such a mistake is never repeated in the formation of a new mission. The deficiencies in those areas reflected very badly on the force from the very beginning, and served to exacerbate the situation during the early days of the civil war and beyond."¹⁸ Other revisionist accounts have suggested that the outcome in Rwanda could have been significantly altered with the deployment of well-trained, equipped, and commanded 5, 000 troops drawn primarily from a single country.¹⁹ In this scenario, the introduction of a large combat force could have stemmed the violence around the capital and prevented its escalation to the countryside. But in Rwanda, no such county was available.

17. Anyindoho, Guns over Kigali, p. 55.

18. Anyindoho, Guns over Kigali, p. 8.

19. See, for instance Scott R. Feil, Preventing Genocide: How the Early Use of Force Might Have Succeeded in Rwanda. A Report to the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict (New York: Carnegie Corporation, April 1998), pp. 37-8.

Rules of Engagement

UNAMIR's Chapter VI rules of engagement were closely tied to the implementation of the Arusha Agreement: the use of force was limited to self-defense or after the authorization of higher echelons; if provoked, the soldiers were instructed to use non-aggressive and cooperative behavior and enlist the help of Rwandese gendamerie, UNAMIR's designated local partner. General Dallaire redefined some of these rules, but these efforts were either inadequate or too late. In the end, when the civil war resumed in April 1994, UNAMIR as a peacekeeping force had no peace to keep.

6. Evaluating the outcomes of intervention

Both the military and non-military components were insufficient to resolve the conflict. On the non-military side, as Anyindoho has shown: "It appeared everybody at the UN in New York looked at UNAMIR as one of the easiest missions that was going to accomplish its assigned role in twenty-two months, so a team was hurriedly assembled to administer it. Nothing could have been more militarily inept . . . For sometime, all successive administrators of UNAMIR were unfortunately non-effective."²⁰ On the military side, the hasty withdrawal at the height of the civil war undermined UNAMIR's relevance and efficacy in the conflict. The failure of UNAMIR has been captured in the post-genocide consensus about the abandonment of Rwanda. The implacable hostility of key Western countries in the Security Council to strengthen UNAMIR's mandate showed a clear absence of international commitment to the implementation process. General Dallaire summed up the central problem of political will: "The United Nations wanted to send me more troops, but sovereign states made sovereign decisions not to do so."²¹

7. Exit strategy

UNAMIR had a clear exit strategy staggered over twenty-two months and timed to coincide with the elections that would mark the end of the transitional period.

20. Anyindoho, *Guns over Kigali*, p. 9.

21. Dallaire, "The Changing Role of UN Peacekeeping Forces," p. 208, also noted that "UNAMIR suffered several important shortcomings from the very beginning. This was due, in part, to a conscious decision by the Security Council seemingly to classify the crisis in Rwanda as a low risk priority."

b) UNAMIR II, July 1994-March 1996

1. The principal circumstances that prompted third party intervention

UNAMIR II intervened in mid-May 1994 at the height of the genocide and the total collapse of order; large-scale massacres of civilians continued unabated throughout the country; and Kigali was effectively divided between the RPF and Rwandese government forces. With no adequate protection, as many as 3,000 civilians in Kigali had taken refuge in public places and religious sanctuaries. There were an estimated 250,000 internally displaced persons in the north, 65,000 in the east, and 1.2 million in the south and southwest. In addition, 400,000 Rwandan refugees had fled to Burundi, Zaire, Tanzania, and Uganda.

2. The Nature of Intervention Force

With no Western country willing to commit troops to UNAMIR II, Boutros-Ghali recommended an expanded force made up of African troops with Western logistical and financial support. The UN Security Council resolution 918 of May 17, 1994 agreed to a force of 5,500 troops. UNAMIR II became fully operational in November 1994 with troops from Ghana, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Mali, Tunisia, Malawi, and Zambia. Apart from the African troops, Western nations such as Australia, the US, UK, and India provided medical, engineering, and communication experts to UNAMIR II.

By the time of UNAMIR II, there was a large presence of international organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) engaged in relief and humanitarian work. Following a visit to Kigali by the Under-Secretary General for Humanitarian Affairs at the end of April 1994, there was a decision to establish the United Nations Rwanda Emergency Office (UNREO) that led the overall coordination of humanitarian relief efforts. As a collaborative framework, UNREO drew from the resources and expertise of United Nations agencies, notably the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNCHR), the World Food Program (WFP), and the World Health Organization (WHO). The UNREO strategic role was in developing basic operating procedures for the humanitarian assistance including the security of humanitarian personnel and the beneficiaries of relief assistance.

The collaboration between UNAMIR II and the UNCHR broke down in September 1994

over the alleged massacre of Hutus by the RPF. Concerned about the paucity of human rights monitors in Rwanda, the UNHCR commissioned a report that concluded that 30,000 Hutus, many of them returning refugees had been killed by the RPF. These charges reflected negatively on the protection role of UNAMIR II. Although Boutros-Ghali diffused the internecine conflict by quashing the publication of the report, the image of UNAMIR II was dented by subsequent RPF attacks on refugee camps in January and April 1995.

3. Goals of the intervention

UNAMIR II was formed to undo the Security Council's precipitous reduction of UNAMIR to 270. Its formation was preceded by Boutros-Ghali's campaign for the UN Security Council to take more forceful action to stop the massacres. Similarly, the Force Commander General Dallaire recommended a force with deterrent capability, preferably a chapter VII mandate. During informal discussions in the Security Council in early May 1994, however, there was considerable resistance from key members about "forceful action;" instead, consensus coalesced around a mission that would deliver humanitarian assistance and support the displaced persons. Subsequently, the Security Council increased the force levels of UNAMIR II for roles that were largely humanitarian: it would contribute to the security and protection of displaced persons through the establishment of secure humanitarian areas, provide security and support for the distribution of humanitarian supplies and relief operations, and monitor border crossing points.

The leadership of UNAMIR II also continued the frantic mediation between the interim government and the RPF to reach a cease-fire. After the authorization of UNAMIR II, Boutros-Ghali dispatched a high-level mission to Kigali from May 22 to 27 to support the cease-fire negotiations. But by mid-July, having captured most of Rwanda and with the government's forces in tatters, the RPF declared a unilateral cease-fire.

4. Scenarios for improving goal attainment

Earlier or later intervention

The deployment of UNAMIR II was a slow and painstaking task. Fatigued by the proliferation of peacekeeping operations, the international community was less willing to provide the resources to support the deployment. Moreover, even though African states did offer to

participate in large numbers, they possessed neither the financial nor logistical resources. At the end of July, UNAMIR II had less than 500 troops and 124 military observers on the ground. In recognition of the delays in deployment, the UN Security Council accepted Boutros-Ghali's extension of UNOMUR in June 1994 for an additional three months during which time it helped support the build-up of UNAMIR II and coordinated humanitarian assistance. By October 1994, UNAMIR II troop strength stood at 4,270 and 320 military observers. It was not until November 25, 1994 that Boutros-Ghali reported that UNAMIR II had belatedly reached its authorized strength of 5,500. At the same time, its mandate was extended to June 9, 1995 with further authorization to train Rwandese policemen and protect human rights officers for the genocide tribunal that was formed in November 1994.

Use of a differently configured military force

There was no alternative to the African peacekeepers constituting UNAMIR II. Although resource and logistics problems delayed its deployment, the composition of UNAMIR II was adequate for its limited roles.

Rules of Engagement

Authorized under chapter VI mandate, the operation's rules of engagement did not include enforcement action, but permitted a proactive role to protect civilians. The Security Council also introduced an expanded definition of "self-defense" in the authorizing resolution: UNAMIR II would be required to take action in self-defense against those who threatened protected sites and populations and the means of delivery and distribution of humanitarian relief.

5. Evaluating the outcomes of the intervention

The military objectives of UNAMIR II were modest, geared primarily to salvaging the sagging image of the UN in the face of its inaction during the genocide. Moreover, the African troops operating on shoestring budgets were not expected to make much difference to ending a war that was almost over. When the full complement of troops and materiel arrived in Rwanda in October 1994, the RPF controlled virtually all Rwandese territory and the genocide had ended.

The non-military aspects cannot be underestimated for their critical contribution to restoring an essential international presence and contributing to the coordination of humanitarian

relief efforts. Despite the delays in deployment, UNAMIR II achieved its basic mission of providing secure environment for humanitarian relief. In collaboration with the French (discussed below), NGOs, and UNREO, it secured some refugee camps, helped the return of IDPs, and assisted the new RPF government in establishing authority in areas previously under government control. Following the expiry of French intervention in August 1994, UNAMIR II assumed most of the security roles in northwestern and southwestern Rwanda. In addition, UNAMIR II adjusted its operational plans to engage in the stabilization and monitoring the situation in all regions of Rwanda so as to encourage the return of refugees and IDPs; to provide security and support for humanitarian assistance; and to promote national reconciliation through mediation and negotiations. In October 1994, UNAMIR II developed broadcasting facilities to provide Rwandese with factual information in the country, to assist in explaining the mission's mandate and, disseminate information on humanitarian programs. After the introduction of RPF troops in the HPZ, UNAMIR II conducted a number of joint operations with the government to secure the camps from bandits and armed criminals.

The non-military functions of UNAMIR II enabled it to outgrow from its limited roles of supporting relief to those of reconstruction and rehabilitation of civil institutions and infrastructure. Although UNAMIR II had neither the capacity nor the mandate to stabilize the economy, establish representative institutions, or reconstitute civil society, its presence contributed to the return of normalcy and provided confidence to some of the returning refugees and IDPs. In addition, given the absence of working local institutions, UNAMIR II did lead to their reconstitution.

6. Exit Strategy

There was no clear exit strategy for UNAMIR II. In an attempt to overcompensate for its previous flaws, UNAMIR II lapsed into an open-ended mandate to the detriment of relations with the RPF government. By January 1995, its force strength of 5,740 peacekeepers and military had exceeded the authorized level of 5,500. From then on, the Security Council reduced its size within an overall policy of scaling down its peacekeeping components in preference for national and confidence building. In June 1995, the Security Council resolution 997 extended the mandate of UNAMIR II's to December 1995, but stipulated the reduction of its strength to 2,330 within three months and 1,800 within four months. The new mandate reduced the security

and protective functions of UNAMIR II, leaving it almost exclusively the humanitarian tasks of relief and rehabilitation. The RPF's discomfort with continued presence of UNAMIR II grew markedly amidst deepening mistrust between it and the UN in general. In January 1995, the RPF described UNAMIR as "costly, useless, and undisciplined." As the RPF looked for bilateral military support to boost its security needs, it perceived UNAMIR II as an impediment; moreover, since humanitarian agencies were performing the humanitarian functions of UNAMIR II, the RPF saw the latter role as superfluous. Boutros-Ghali, however, insisted on the presence of UNAMIR II to sustain the reconciliation process. In the end, the two sides reached a compromise in which UNAMIR II withdrew in March 1996 to be replaced by a modest UN office in Kigali. Security Council resolution 1050 of March 1996 created the United Nations Office in Rwanda (UNOR) to support the government's efforts in national reconciliation, building the judicial system, facilitating the return of refugees, and rehabilitating socioeconomic infrastructure.

D: OPERATION TURQUIOSE, JUNE-AUGUST 1994

1. The principal circumstances that prompted third party intervention

France's Operation Turquoise launched on June 23, 1994 occurred in the context of two months of civil war. But the war had increasingly become asymmetrical: with the capacity of the forces of the interim government crumbling, the RPF intensified its efforts to capture Kigali and seize areas on the Zairian border held by the retreating government forces. The RPF advance led to massive movement of people from the combat areas toward the southwestern portion of the country. Equally significant, the French intervened at a decisive moment when the deployment of UNAMIR II was stalemated in bureaucratic battles about funding and rules of engagement. By this time, the strength of UNAMIR had risen to 44 to 503, consisting of 354 troops, 25 military personnel, and 124 military observers.

2. The Nature the Intervention Force

Operation Turquoise comprised of 2, 555 French, and 350 Senegalese troops under the command of General Jean-Claude Lafourcade. To lend it wider legitimacy, nationals of six

Francophone states provided supportive services.

3. Goals of the intervention

In seeking authorization from the Security Council, France defined Operation Turquoise as a humanitarian mission to secure and protect displaced persons and civilians, notably Tutsi and moderate Hutus, the main targets of government militias. In its authorizing resolution 929 of June 22, 1994, the Security Council called for a “temporary operation under French control and command using all necessary means to achieve the humanitarian objectives of UNAMIR II.”

There was no unanimity in the UN Security Council about Operation Turquoise, a fact that was captured in the description: “a reluctant decision of a divided council.” In and out of Rwanda, the concern stemmed largely from France’s previous support for Habyarimana government and potential problems of coordinating the mission with UNAMIR II. On the verge of gaining control of the country, the RPF was implacably opposed to French intervention, seeing it as a means to save the faltering regime. To allay these fears, the Security Council specifically mandated cooperation between Operation Turquoise and UNAMIR II even though both were to retain their separate identities. From the outset, therefore, the objectives of Operation Turquoise were inextricably linked to the broader humanitarian efforts of UNAMIR II.

4. Scenarios for improving goal attainment

Within a day of UN Security Council authorization, French forces intervened from Zaire, with the speed and decisiveness that shamed UNAMIR II. Operation Turquoise was established under a Chapter VII mandate, allowing the use force, but in the end, it encountered little opposition on the ground.

5. Evaluating the outcomes of the intervention

Operation Turquoise occurred at the height of RPF advance into southwestern Rwanda, with 1.2 million people from the northern and central regions beginning to move into Zaire and 1.5 million to the southwest. The military capability and ease of entry enabled the French to set up a safe Humanitarian Protection Zone (HPZ) in southwestern Rwanda, despite RPF opposition. Working closely with UNAMIR II, Operation Turquoise saved lives and halted the mass exodus

of refugees into Zaire, as had happened in Goma to the north. French intervention and presence stabilized the HPZ, where French soldiers resettled IDPs into refugee camps, provided security, and disarmed some of the militias among the refugees. As the RPF gains led to more Hutu refugees into the HPZ, the French signaled their intention to use force to prevent RPF entry into the protected areas. Overall, it is estimated that the intervention saved between 12-15,000, and prevented many more from streaming across the Zairian border. UNAMIR II mediated between the RPF and French forces, allowing RPF representatives to visit the HPZ and reassure wary Hutus about the new government's intention. UNAMIR II also worked closely with Operation Turquoise to develop an operational plan that ensured the orderly transition of HPZ to UNAMIR II prior to the departure of the French forces in August 1994.²²

Operation Turquoise has been criticized for granting of refuge to Hutu perpetrators of genocide and facilitating their safe exit into Zaire with their arms intact. In addition, French forces never made any effort to stop the inflammatory broadcasts by the defeated government from its security zones. These criticisms reflect the long-standing tensions between the RPF and France, but they diminish the extraordinary humanitarian efforts of saving lives and managing a difficult situation. Moreover, the limited humanitarian engagement in the end disabused opponents of the intervention of the initial concerns that the French would provide military support for the faltering Hutu government. Perhaps as a demonstration of the importance of Operation Turquoise, there were repeated international appeals for its extension to bolster UNAMIR II, but the French stuck to their deadline.

6. Exit Strategy

The French were authorized to remain in Rwanda for a maximum of two months, with the option of leaving earlier if Boutros-Ghali decided that UNAMIR II had the capacity to replace French forces. Operation Turquoise ended on August 22, 1994, two months after the intervention.

22. For balanced analyses of Operation Turquoise see Arthur Jay Klinghoffer, The International Dimension of Genocide in Rwanda (New York: New York University Press, 1998), pp. 82-85; Anyindoho, Guns over Kigali, pp. 99-110; and Prunier, "Operation Turquoise: A Humanitarian Escape from a Political Dead End," in Adelman and Surhke, The Path of a Genocide, pp. 281-307.

CONCLUSION

The failures of international intervention in Rwanda have spawned a policy and academic industry. What is often glossed over in all the excellent scenarios about how the world could have arrived at different outcomes is that the belligerents expected external actors to save them from a weak agreement. The history of conflict and mistrust between the parties compelled them to seek stronger international superintendence in the less charitable post-Somalia international environment. The failure was political rather than technical, stemming from an unwillingness to muster the resources to launch a credible peacekeeping effort. UNAMIR II somewhat salvaged the tattered reputation of the UN, improvising in resources and mandate, making good of a bad situation. Similarly, Operation Turquoise gave the French the opportunity to undo some of the consequences of their previous intervention in Rwanda.