A case study on the government’s exercise of power during the reconciliation process in Rwanda
Abstract

Rwanda experienced one of the most horrendous atrocities in our modern history in the summer of 1994 when a genocide occurred within the country, and in the aftermath the nation had to deal with this history and rebuild its society. This essay examines the reconciliation in post-genocide Rwanda with the aim of investigating potential power mechanisms during this process. The study researches the policies implemented by the government of Rwanda during this process and what effect they potentially can have on the reconciliation in the country. The focus is on the policy of National Unity and Reconciliation and two of the main instruments within this government policy, which are Gacaca and Ingando. The analytical framework for this study is Steven Lukes’ theory on three-dimensional power, which was applied as an analytical lens to examine the power exercise by the RPF government. The essay used an abductive approach to research the subject and a case study as the chosen method for the study. The results of the research confirms that there are several instances of power exercise, both within the two and three-dimensional concept of power as described by Lukes. Certain aspects of the RPF’s policies aimed at reconciliation can be seen as power exercise by the government and potentially be problematic for a successful reconciliation process.
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1 Introduction & Research Problem

In the aftermath of a conflict, when broken societies attempt to recover, the issue of how to reconcile with the past and move towards a new future emerges. This is a particularly hard task when the violence has been extraordinarily horrendous and destructive, as was the case for Rwanda, which from April to July in 1994 experienced one of the worst atrocities in our modern history when hundreds of thousands or perhaps more than a million people were killed during the Rwandan genocide, mainly by Hutu extremist targeting the Tutsi minority (Amstutz, 2006:541, Kinzer, 2014:93, Sarkin, 1999:767). And not just killings, but other types of physical and psychological violence were committed as well, such as torture and rape (Gubin et al, 2005:299). Although the scale of the violence had not previously transpired in Rwanda, the two main groups in their society, Hutu and Tutsi, have an extensive history of animosity and violence between them (Gubin et al, 2005:299, Prunier, 2009:xxx, Sarkin, 1999:772-773). The rift in the Rwandan society has its roots before the colonial period, but the colonisers worsened the issue and deepened the rift. German colonizers divided the population into two main groups, Hutu and Tutsi, and assigned certain privileges to the Tutsi. Later on the Belgian colonizers continued this practice and reinforced the rift between the inhabitants (Amstutz, 2006:543). After the genocide of 1994, a comprehensive reconciliation process was necessary to account for the events, deal with the past and for the country to move forward. With their history of animosity and violence, it is crucial to ensure a successful rapprochement.

According to Lederach, a reconciliation process is essential for a post-conflict society to prevent future occurrences of violence between former adversaries (Melvin, 2010:935). A successful reconciliation process helps to ensure lasting peace in a situation where re-emergence of a previous conflict might otherwise be more likely (Miall et al, 2011:246). The process can, if successful, decrease the animosity between former opponents by facilitating an understanding between different groups/actors in the society, by attempting to deal with underlying grievances and misconceptions (Melvin, 2010:935, Miall et al, 2011:246). A reconciliation process is neither guaranteed to be successful nor to solve these issues; however, it increases the possibility. If a successful reconciliation process can go a long way to prevent further conflict, it is then important to research this process to ensure its success.
There are different opinions on which approach that are appropriate to reconciliation in general and in the case of Rwanda specifically (Miall et al, 2011:258). To ensure the long-lasting success of the reconciliation process, a focus on aspects that are ingrained in the society and culture are crucial to combat structural and cultural violence. These aspects are usually harder to combat as they can be hard to detect, requires a longer process to change and additionally something that people might not be aware are influencing them (Lukes, 2005:27). It is additionally important change the perception of one another and tackle underlying grievances and misconceptions in-between previously hostile actors (Melvin, 2010:935, Miall et al. 2011:249).

The Rwandan post-genocide reconciliation has often been praised for its success at tackling the enormous problems the country faced after the genocide (Kinzer, 2014:94, Montei, 2011:82, Thomson, 2011b:442-443). However, some scholars have questioned the government’s implementation of certain aspects in the reconciliation process and some of its side-effects and consequences. The Gacaca courts have for example been effective at prosecuting the countless perpetrators, but some scholars have questioned the often proclaimed success of this system (Amstutz, 2006:553-554, Thomson, 2006:386).

Some scholar have additionally claimed that the government is using the reconciliation process to consolidate their grip on power (Mgbako 2005, Melvin, 2010, Thomson, 2006:374). Furthermore, even if the reconciliation process in general can be seen as a success, that does not subsequently lead to the conclusion that there are no issues present. The government of Rwanda has near-total control of the reconciliation process, and subsequently has a lot of power during this process (Haynes et al, 2011:123, Thomson, 2011:373). The question follows if the government, with the power they have as the main actor in control of the reconciliation process, might use this power for their own advantage or what effects their power during this process might have. There is the potential for misuse of the reconciliation process, intentionally or unintentionally, where policies might have unintended consequences. Whether intentional or not, the misuse or abuse of power might not only be counter-productive towards the reconciliation process but can possibly also work as spoilers for the peace and worsen the situation, widening or creating a rift rather than bridging differences.
Therefore, this research will apply the theory of three-dimensional power, as defined by Steven Lukes in his book ‘Power: A Radical View’ from 1974, with the aim of increasing the understanding of the aspects of power that are in play during the reconciliation process (Lukes, 2005). The focus of Lukes concept is on the aspects in society that are deeply ingrained, and hence suitable to examine for this case as they are imperative for the reconciliation process (Lukes, 2005:25ff). Investigating power dimensions is important as the misuse of power might potentially affect the conciliation process. This analytical framework will be used to examine the government’s policies and how they might be understood in terms of power aspects.

1.1 Purpose and Aim of the study

The purpose of this study is to hopefully contribute to the field of reconciliation in general but more specifically to the research on the Rwandan reconciliation process. To facilitate an understanding of which power aspects that might be in play during a reconciliation process and the potential use of power that can occur.

The aim with the study is to research the Rwandan governments policies towards reconciliation, to investigate the use of power by the government during this process. To highlight potential issues of power exercise and to what extent it can be problematic for the reconciliation process.

1.2 Research Questions

- What have been the government’s main policies towards reconciliation?
- What examples of different types power exercises can be observed in the Rwandan reconciliation process?
- Can any instances of misuse of power by the government during the reconciliation process in Rwanda be observed?

To best answer these research questions, an abductive approach will be applied as it enables this study to investigate this case with a new analytical framework and to examine
individual phenomena that might be part of general structures (Danermark et al, 2002:88). Furthermore, a case study will be the chosen method as it allows this study to go in-depth into the Rwandan reconciliation process and get a better understanding of their specific case, which should enable this essay to answer the research questions.

1.3 Previous Research

Previous research on reconciliation is essential and necessary for this research and therefore it is relevant to discuss the field. There is a wide range of literature on the subject with different opinions and theories on what the correct approach towards reconciliation is (Miall et al, 2011:258). Simply defined, reconciliation is a process with the aim of changing previously violent relationships into peaceful ones, to reconstruct a divided society after a conflict (Melvin, 2010:935, Miall et al, 2011:246). This transformation of relations in between former adversaries is not only on an individual level but from a collective standpoint as well, and a long-term process that is not only about being kind but to change the perception one has of one another (Hodgkin, 2006:200). According to Miall et al (2011:246), “Reconciliation – restoring broken relationships and learning to live non-violently with radical differences – can be seen as the ultimate goal of conflict resolution”.

According to Lederach, it is essential to rebuild relationships, as he perceives the interaction among adversaries to be the basis for conflict as well as for long-term solutions (Melvin, 2010:935). Long-term reconciliation is essential to transform societies in the long run from a conflict resolution aspect (Miall et al, 2011:246). According to Miall et al, there is a need to deal with the past when there has been a lot of animosity among former enemies, the society needs to tackle the issues of the past if they are to be able to create a new future (Ibid, 2011:249). Also Lederach states that it is a necessity to deal with the adversaries experiences of the past and their perception of things if one wants to move forward (Melvin, 2010:935).

Some common approaches to apply towards reconciliation are truth commissions, trials, reparations and amnesty to name a few (Miall et al, 2011:252-257). Miall et al separates the reconciliation process into four stages, ending violence, overcoming polarization,
managing contradictions and the ‘fourth stage’ which they consider to be the final stage, when one is celebrating differences, not just tolerance but rather even appreciated the differences (Ibid, 2011:260-261).

More specifically on the reconciliation process in Rwanda, there are quite a bit of literature on the subject. The majority of the literature is books or peer-reviewed articles from different journals that discusses and evaluates the reconciliation process in Rwanda. The debate about Rwanda and their development is a very polarised topic (Hintjens, 2015:133). It is divided into two camps, one that questions the government’s strict control of society, sees them as instilling fear and insecurity in the society and manipulates the narrative to assert blame to the Hutu will caring for their ‘own’. The other camp instead points to the miraculous recovery from the nation, pointing to efficient reforms and a prosperous economy and a government that has a genuine interest in improving the lives of all Rwandans (Hintjens, 2015:134).

It does not seem to exist any previous research on reconciliation that focuses on the power dimensions and more specifically use three-dimensional power as an analytical framework. This indicates a research gap that this paper would fill and makes the research relevant as any previous work on this subject is non-existing. This means that there is no other research to compare to or draw inspiration from but could also be a reason for why no one has deemed it valuable to do this kind of research previously. This topic will be discussed further and more thoroughly on the next page.

1.4 Relevance of the study

Research on reconciliation is understandably relevant, as it studies a process with the aim of preventing re-occurring violence and to ensure that peace lasts, and to study the effectiveness of certain reconciliation process can potentially improve their success. Furthermore, for Rwanda specifically, the research into their reconciliation process could increase the knowledge about how to approach their issues as they seem to have a re-occurring pattern of violence in-between groups in their society. However, what makes this study contribute to the field is the investigation of the power dynamics/mechanisms during a reconciliation process.
In previous research on reconciliation, power aspects are not a common theme of those studies. In the few works where you find researchers mentioning power, it is usually not a core feature of the study. In the case of Rwanda for example, there are instances where the researcher uses the word power or they mention the government’s action in terms of them exercising power, but power is not used as an analytical tool or lens through which one tries to understand the process.

One book that stands out in this aspect in the case of Rwanda, is Susan Thomson’s “Whispering Truth to Power: Everyday Resistance to Reconciliation in Post-genocide Rwanda”. However, this book rather looks into the perception the citizens have of the reconciliation process and questions the praised success of the post-genocide reconciliation process, but it does not investigate the power aspects of the regime policies (Thomson, 2013). In this study, the aim is instead to focus on the power mechanisms behind the policies and what effects they might have on the success of the Rwandan reconciliation.

Not only is the application of power as an analytical framework rare, but the application of explicitly the three-dimensional power as defined by Steven Lukes is not something I have seen. The lack of this kind of research on the subject could of course also indicate that there is no necessity for it. However, the reason this theory was chosen and why it is relevant to study, is the veiled aspects and long-term effects that three-dimensional power dynamics can possibly have. When Lukes talks about the exercise of three-dimensional power, he states that it can have the characteristics where the actor is not aware that power is being exercised over oneself (Lukes, 2005). Furthermore, the examples of three-dimensional power tend to have long-term effects on groups such as, education or propaganda, changing norms or perceptions and the culture in the society. It is mainly for these two reasons that I deem the application of the three-dimensional power as an analytical framework relevant, and consequently also this study.

The application of this specific analytical framework is not only relevant as it has not been done before, but moreover since it can illuminate potential issues of power exercise of the government during this reconciliation process. To highlight the exercise of power will enable us to understand what power mechanisms that are in play during reconciliation.
processes and what effects it might have. It will help us evaluate the process and its success as well as point out potential issues with the government's approach and in that sense increase our knowledge of how to improve reconciliation processes with the purpose of preventing future occurrences of violence in-between former adversaries. Possible findings in this study might not only be relevant for the case of Rwanda. If potential power issues within the reconciliation process are identified, it can mean that an evaluation of similar aspects in other reconciliation process could be of relevance.
2 Analytical Framework

In this chapter, the analytical framework that will be applied in this study will be explained and discussed, first with a brief discussion about the concept of power in general before going into detail about the three dimensions of power as explained by Steven Lukes and then lastly addressing criticism against this concept.

2.1 Power

Power is an equivocal concept and the definition of the term is often contested, therefore it is relevant to briefly explain the concept and different views on what power is and how to understand it before going into detail about the specific definition of power that has been chosen for this study. Power can mean many and completely different things depending on the contexts it is used in, the term might also differ depending on the culture, society etc. Here the focus will be on power within social science and more specifically politics.

When discussing the term power, one basic core assumption most concepts begin its assumption from, although they might differ in many ways, is that “A in some way affects B” (Lukes, 2005:30). We all affect others in numerous ways and regularly in everyday life, so for it to be considered ‘power’ or being worth examining or studying, we can presuppose that it needs to be in a significant way that A affects B, or as Lukes says, “in a non-trivial way” (Ibid, 2005:30). However, then other subsequent questions arises, how and in what way does A affects B and is it a deliberate action from A?

When Lukes talks about power, the concept is connected to the exercise of power and also more on asymmetrical power (Lukes, 2005:64). Additionally the focus is on power over others, power as domination (Ibid, 2005:12). Parsons’ however, view it more as an authoritative actor legitimately exercising power, for the common or collective good. The way other scholars view power, as a coercive action, with threats etc. should not be seen as power according to Parsons’ if it is exercised without justification or legitimacy (Ibid, 2005:31). Furthermore, also in-action or a failure to act has its consequences and
therefore, non-intervention can sometimes be viewed as a certain form of power (Ibid, 2005:77).

One distinction that can be made, that is common for the three different dimensions brought up in Steven Lukes book, and therefore also the assumption this research will presuppose. Is the assumption that, “A exercises power over B when A affects B in a manner contrary to B’s interests” (Lukes, 2005:30).

2.2 Dimensions of power

The analytical framework that will be used for this research is the concept of three-dimensional power as defined by Steven Lukes in his book “Power: A Radical View”, henceforth abbreviated to PRV (Lukes, 2005). First published in 1974, Lukes tried to address the questions of “how to think about power theoretically and how to study it empirically” (Ibid, 2005:1). The book became very influential within the power debate and social sciences, his work is still relevant today and after many requests the book were republished in a second addition in 2005, the original book together with two new chapters (Ibid, 2005:1). Lukes created his concept, three-dimensional power, as he believed that the first- and second-dimensions of power that had been defined by earlier scholars, were inadequate. According to Lukes it’s important to focus on the aspects that are least observable or least accessible to that observation, as he states that “power is at its most effective when least observable” (Ibid, 2005:1). In the first edition, the focus of PRV was mainly on power as domination or power over (Ibid, 2005:12).

The concept will be used as an analytical lens to observe the reconciliation process through, to examine the power mechanisms at play in Rwanda. It will hopefully be useful in assisting the research in understanding the use of power during a reconciliation process and reveal potential issues. Although the third dimension is the focus of this study, the one- and two-dimensional view on power will be explained below as well, as it helps understand Lukes concept and additionally that occurrences of the first- and second-dimensions can illuminate instances of three-dimensional aspects.
2.2.1 One-dimensional Power

The one-dimensional view, also referred to as the ‘pluralist’ view of power, is associated with scholars such as Dahl, Polsby and Wolfinger. Robert Dahl defined power in his article ‘The Concept of Power’ from 1957, as when “A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do” (Lukes, 2005:16). Additionally, Dahl stated that it should be a successful attempt in getting B to do what he would not otherwise do, thereby differentiating between the capacity and the success in exercising power, or also described as the potential and actual power (Ibid, 2005:16-17). For the one-dimensional view, it is the actual power that is of relevance. As the importance within this view is on the actual power, they deem it a necessity for it to be an observable behaviour for it to be counted as power. With this assumption in mind, the focus is on studying the decision-making process to examine who possesses power, or more power than others, by evaluating the success rate in the decision-making process and identifying who triumphs (Ibid, 2005:17-18). The second of the two cornerstones within the one-dimensional concept, is observable conflict. For it to be considered an exercise of power, this view also thinks a conflict needs to be present, and observable conflict (Ibid, 2005:18). The idea being that if there is no conflict present, it indicates that there is no conflicting interests, and therefore no power can be exercised.

2.2.2 Two-dimensional Power

The two-dimensional concept was pioneered by Bachrach and Baratz, who thought that the one-dimensional view was inadequate and instead claimed that power has two faces. They agreed with the assumptions made by Dahl and earlier scholars, this was what they defined as the first face of power, but that the sole focus on the decision-making process left out other additional relevant aspects (Lukes, 2005:20). The second face is when A limits or suppresses B’s ability to express or voice their issues. As explained by Lukes (2005:20), “to the extent that a person or group - consciously or unconsciously - creates or reinforces barriers to the public airing of policy conflicts, that person or group has power”. They differentiate between decisions and non-decisions. A decision being when there is a choice to be made between alternatives and non-decisions is a decision that suppresses or thwarts a potential issue, something that might be latent. For example preventing certain issues to be brought up, controlling the agenda or preventing certain
opinions to be voiced. The potential issue is suffocated before it can come to the decision-making process. That power can be exercised also when there is suppression of potential issues, that is non-decisions (Ibid, 2005:22-23). As within the one-dimensional view, the two-dimensional agrees with the opinion that it needs to be an observable conflict present for power to be exercised. The assumption being that if there is no disagreement over interests than no suppression can be made (Ibid, 2005:23).

Another valuable contribution that Bachrach and Baratz brought to the discussion of power with their second-dimension, is the addition of the bias of the system. Something that can be described as the ‘rules of the game’, or as they explain it, “a set of predominant values, beliefs, rituals and institutional procedures that operate systematically and consistently to the benefit of certain persons and groups at the expense of others” (Lukes, 2005:21). This highlighted the role institutions can have in preventing certain issues from being voiced and being to the advantage of some actors and also how this all could be systematical.

2.2.3 Three-dimensional Power

Lukes developed the three-dimensional view as he thought the previous concepts were inadequate. He lists three main reasons for this opinion and why he developed his own concept. First off, the first and second dimension put too much emphasis on studying ‘actual behavior’ and focusing on decision. Although the second dimension addressed this issue to a certain extent with the concept of non-decisions, it still limits the possible exclusion of latent issues to the decision-making process (Lukes, 2005:25). There are other ways in which individuals or institutions can exclude potential issues from the political agenda. As Lukes discusses, a decision is a choice between alternatives and more importantly a conscious choice, but the bias of the system can act in ways that are unconscious and also not produce the intended outcome of individual’s choices (Ibid, 2005:25-26). Furthermore, Lukes believed that the first two concepts focused too much on the individual aspects and disregarded social arrangements, collectives and groups, which Lukes thought was essential when analysing the exercise of power (Ibid, 2005:26). The bias of the system is not only affected and sustained by individual actions, but institutions and/or groups cultural patterns and social structures (Ibid, 2005:26). Lukes
insists that the focus on ‘collective forces’ or ‘social arrangements’ are a necessity when trying to analyse the power of controlling the agenda.

He neither believed as the first two concepts did, that a conflict needs to be present and observable for power to be exercised. Lukes claims that power can be exercised without one realising it, when someone influences the desires of others (Lukes, 2005:27-28). Not only does the actor that the power being exercise over not have to be aware that power is being exercised, but the actor exercising the power can also do the act unintentionally. For the three-dimensional view, power can also be exercised if A is determining, influence or shapes the wants or desires of B (Ibid, 2005:27).

“Indeed, is it not the supreme exercise of power to get another or other to have the desires you want them to have – that is, to secure their compliance by controlling their thoughts and desires?” (Lukes, 2005:27).

Examples of how this can be achieved is through processes of socialization, control of information and also through the mass media (Lukes, 2005:27). According to Lukes, the perhaps most effective and insidious use of power is to prevent a conflict to arise (Ibid, 2005:27). But this would not be considered power if it had to be an actual observable conflict. Furthermore, he sees an issues with assuming that grievances needs to exist for power to be exercised, that people would not be harmed by the use of power just because they have no grievances regarding it (Ibid, 2005:28). For the third-dimension it is seen as a powerful exercise of power if A shapes the perception of B, so that B has no grievances and thereby accepts the situation or their role in how things are.

So for the three-dimensional approach, Lukes put emphasis on institutions, groups and collective action and not just the observable conflicts, but the underlying power structures in societies that shape the way we perceive things and act, the ways in which A might use power over B without B having any grievances or be aware of the power being exercised.
2.2.4 Comparing the different dimensions of Power

The advantage with the one-dimensional concept is that the focus on the decision-making process and the observable conflict makes it something that is quite easy to distinguish and study. But the very narrow focus also means that it is quite limited in what aspects of power it can highlight. The study area aspects are quite obvious as one can easily examine the decision-making process, but all the other aspects of power exercise that are not as visible are excluded from the concept. Therefore this dimension misses many important aspects of power exercise in the society that are less visible and therefore possibly even more important to study. The issues that are excluded from the decision-making process are not considered, leaving out a valuable part of understanding the power of how certain issues is brought up on the agenda. Another issue with the one-dimensional view, that Lukes brings up, is that by only focusing on and studying the decision-making process, they were reproducing the bias of the system that they were supposed to study (Lukes, 2005:38).

The two-dimensional addresses these issues to a certain extent as it acknowledges the problem with potential issues and the rules of the game. That power can be exercised by controlling the agenda and what issues that are being brought up for discussion and/or decisions. The two-dimensional view is still lacking as the focus is still around or involving the decision-making process and therefore missing other relevant aspects of society that are more ingrained and might not be observable in the same sense, which is a pre-condition for the two-dimensional concept. Aspects that might influence and affect actor’s possibility to voice their opinion or preventing potential issues from coming to light (Lukes, 2005:20-24).

The three-dimensional view, enables a ‘sociological’ and not only a ‘personalized’ explanation and analysis of the dynamics in the society that prevent potential issues to be voiced, such as institutions or systems (Lukes, 2005:40). It also focuses on the aspects of power that are less visible and the power dynamics that are not as self-evident as in the first two dimensions.
The reason this analytical framework is suitable for the case of Rwanda and this research is that the three-dimensional approach to power helps to illuminate power structures that might not be perceivable at first. Whereas the one- and two-dimensional concepts highlights important issues of when power can be exercised, it is more straight forward and only helps to theoretically think about how power can be exercised rather than illuminating underlying issues. That the government exercises power when they draft a new law is quite obvious, but the deeper aspects of power structures in the society that are more ingrained in the society and culture is usually harder to detect. This is important because changing and creating norms, is shaping the perception amongst the population and possibly also their interaction in the society (Lukes, 2005:26-27). During a reconciliation process, the perception of people, norms and culture in the society is relevant for the outcome of the process. Perhaps even more if actors are not aware that their views and desires are shaped by education, propaganda, indoctrination and similar socialisation tools (Ibid, 2005:27). That is why the three-dimensional framework is essential to illuminate these aspects and to discover potential issues. If it might be creating a rift in the Rwandan society between Tutsi and Hutu instead of the aimed goal of reconciliation. The long time frame is also why Rwanda is suitable as a case to apply the three-dimensional concept onto, since twenty years has passed, it should be enough to see signs of changes on the aspects that Lukes talk about in his three-dimensional power concept, such as norms, education, socialization.

2.3 Other views on power and criticism of the three-dimensional view

Most criticism of Lukes third dimension is directed towards the questions of how one can study or measure these aspects. If these aspects that Lukes focuses on is underlying, not necessarily observable events, how can one study the exercise and measure the success of power from this aspect. For Lukes, many mistakenly associate the term exercise of power with an individual’s conscious action, but he proposes to instead include groups or institutions and unconscious decision when speaking of exercise of power (Lukes, 2005:42). Additionally he believes there is an issue with studying or trying to evaluate ‘successful’ exercise of power, that A might try to affect B and getting him to correspond or comply to the wishes of A, but only when B’s behaviour is corresponding to what A wanted can it be said in that way to be ‘successful’. But there might be several other
outcomes as well, that affects B’s behaviour and contrary to B’s wishes but that does not necessary mean it corresponds to the ultimate wishes of A. That shows the issue of focusing on studying ‘successful’ exercise of power rather than just the exercise of power (Lukes, 2005:43). In the next chapter, under sub-heading 4.8 Operationalisation, will it be described how this study aims to identity the three-dimensional aspects.

In the later edition of PRV, Lukes acknowledges that his description in the first edition was inadequate. In his second edition he addresses the critic against his concept and does a more thorough explanation of the concept. First off, he believes his focus was too much on the exercise of power in the earlier edition, he states that “power is a dispositional concept”, that the point is to identify “an ability or capacity”, and that power does not necessary have to be exercised. Additionally that it focused on the ‘power over’ and ‘domination’ and therefore neglected other aspects. (Lukes, 2005:109).

Two other prominent concepts of power that developed as a critic against Lukes concept of power are Clarissa Hayward’s concept of de-faced power and Michel Foucault’s thought about power. Hayward wanted to re-conceptualize the understanding of power as she did not believe power was a tool that could be used, to put the focus on social boundaries that did not just constrain actors but rather could enable them as well (Hayward, 1998:1,2,9). People can according to Hayward also be limited by actions in which they have no interaction with the actor or when they were not the intended target either (Ibid, 1998:17). Neither Foucault believed that power could be an instrument, something that someone could possess or wield (Nilsson, 2008:83). He even goes further and claims that power is everywhere and cannot really be viewed as part of structures either. For Foucault, the government cannot control all the power relations in society but rather is part of and side-effect of the power relations in society (Ibid, 2008:84).

Both these concepts bring important aspects into the debate and aspects that should be considered for the Rwandan case. That it might the be social norms and boundaries that have had an effect on Rwandan society and their reoccurring pattern of animosity and violence. However, since this study aims at investigating the power exercised by the government and these two concepts do not believe power is something that can be used as an instrument, they are not suitable for this research. Furthermore, I believe the three-dimensional concept is more suitable in the case of Rwanda as there has been a history of
intentional separation and discrimination of the two ‘ethnic’ groups, first by colonizers and then by the different iterations of Rwandan governments after their independence, therefore there is a deliberate action. Since there seems to have been deliberate action, three-dimensional aims at highlighting these issues. The aim with this research is to investigate the use of power as an instrument, and therefore neither de-faced or Foucault can be used as an analytical framework.

2.4 Operationalisation

This section aims to clarify the different pillars of the three dimensions of Lukes that is the analytical framework for this study, to enable one to easily identify and differentiate different aspects of these dimensions and indications of power exercise within the reconciliation process in Rwanda.

Lukes himself outlined ‘distinctive features’ of the three dimensions in his book to summarize the different dimensions (Luke, 2005:29). I have combined these aspects together with examples mentioned by Lukes throughout the book of how these dimensions can be exercised and created a table with key features below (Ibid, 2005).

_One-Dimensional View of Power_

- decisions and decision-making process
- (key) issues
- observable (overt) conflict
- formal decision making bodies
- (subjective) interests, seen as policy preferences revealed by political participation

_Two-Dimensional View of Power_

- decision-making and non decision-making
- issues and potential issues
- observable (overt or covert) conflict
• (subjective) interests, seen as policy preferences or grievances

Examples of two-dimensional exercise of power, creating barriers, setting the agenda, rules of the game, mobilization of bias

*Three-Dimensional View of Power*

• decision-making and control over political agenda (not necessarily through decisions)
• issues and potential issues
• observable (overt or covert), and latent conflict
• conscious as well as unconscious acts
• subjective and real interests
• groups, collectives and institutions
• behavior of social structures and cultural patterns

Examples of three-dimensional exercise of power, education, control of information, control of media, propaganda, processes of socialization.

The analytical framework for this study will be a combination of the three dimensions, where the 1st and 2nd dimensions will serve as illuminating examples of power exercise that indicates aspects of three-dimensional power. The three-dimensional power exercise is the focus of this study, however as these aspects are often covert and therefore harder to identify and also patterns or structures within the society, culture or institutions, the aspects of 1st and 2nd dimension will enable the research to identify individual phenomena to then examine if they are part of or manifestations of general structures in line with the 3rd dimension, within the Rwandan society. This in accordance with an abductive approach as describe earlier and also a reason why this approach was the choice. And additionally, many of the aspects of 1st but more specifically two-dimensional power are also expressions of three-dimensional power exercise. Lukes states that, “Furthermore, it is important to understand that power in its more overt one- and two-dimensional forms has all kinds of three-dimensional effects” (Lukes, 2005:122).
3 Methodology

This chapter will present the methodological choices made for this research to investigate the problems outlined in the introduction and to answer the research questions. First the choices of approach and method for the research and information gathering will be explained and discussed, then the advantages of doing a case study and why it is suitable for this particular case and furthermore a discussion of the limitations and delimitations of this study. Then finally end with an operationalisation of the analytical framework to easier being able identify the examples of power during the research.

3.1 Abduction

When approaching a research with an abductive method, one can develop a different and possibly deeper or more developed concept than from the initial understanding/concept. The researcher has an event, that one then connects to a rule and which concludes with a new assumption regarding this event (Danermark et al, 2002:90-91). It is also possible to ‘redescribe’ or ‘recontextualise’ events when using abductive logic as one’s research approach. Recontextualising is to observe and interpret an aspect within a new context or with a new frame and then to explain it, to understand something in a new way (Ibid, 2002:91). Which should be useful for this research, as it tries to look at a specific event with a new analytical approach.

Danermark et al (2002:88) states that the objects that are studied within social sciences often can be described both as “individual phenomena, and as manifestations of – or parts of – general structures”. An abductive approach is suitable when trying to study these aspects, to analyse individual phenomenons and examine if it possibly is manifestations of social structures or parts of them. And according to the authors, neither deductive nor inductive logic is useful when trying to discern if/how individual phenomena might be part of general structures (Ibid, 2002:88-92). As the aim of this study is to look into different aspects of the reconciliation in Rwanda while trying to detect power mechanisms within the process, an abductive approach is suitable for this research, as it can help to determine if there are any general patterns based on several individual
phenomena. Furthermore, the individual phenomena’s are observable events, while the
genral structures are not directly observable (Ibid, 2002:88). This in accordance with the
thinking about three-dimensional power, where the main focus is on the less observable
aspects. The approach within this study will be to use this abductive logic to look at
individual events of power exercise that are observable, more in line with the two-
dimensional concept of power, to help discern and evaluate the possible power structures
within the society and the reconciliation process, in accordance with three-dimensional
power, that are not observable in the same direct way.

It is important to finish this section with a quote from Danermark et al (2002:94) to keep
in mind. ”But we would for the moment like to once again stress that abductive logic,
applied to social science, very seldom (if ever) leads to definite truths...”. A research
project like this cannot really be expected to produce any ‘definite truths’, nor is it the
aim. Nonetheless, this study will hopefully illuminate some aspects of power exercise
during the reconciliation process and perhaps indicate some issues, which can be valuable
and insightful.

3.2 Qualitative research

The advantage of doing qualitative research rather than quantitative, is that you get more
in-depth knowledge as the focus is on fewer cases and variables, but the advantage of a
quantitative study is that one can get a larger sample-size but then lacks the in-depth
knowledge you get with a qualitative approach (Flyvbjerg, 2003:203). So the choice in
which method to use in ones research depends on what kind of knowledge the researcher
is aiming for and what the case is. It is a choice between understanding one or a few cases
or if one is aiming for more generalizable findings (Vromen, 2010:256). So for
researchers that want to focus on a single case and gain in-depth knowledge a qualitative
approach is most suitable (Ibid, 2010:255). The research problem and questions in this
study requires in-depth knowledge and the focus is on the case of Rwanda itself.
Furthermore, it would be hard to transform the use of power into variables and data that
could be analysed in a quantitative research. Therefore, for the reasons listed above, I
believe that a qualitative study is more applicable in this scenario.
3.3 Case study

Since this study attempts to get in-depth knowledge about the reconciliation process in Rwanda, I have chosen to do a case study as it provides the possibility to look into the details and get a deeper understanding of the situation. An advantage with doing a case study according to Lindvall is just this, that it gives a detailed analysis (Lindvall, 2007:271). Something that is not only the aim with this research but also a necessity to answer the complex issues of the research problem. To be able to examine the different government policies that have been implemented and to evaluate the effects of them, a detailed research is essential for this study to adequately answer the research questions. A case study is suitable for this study as it can facilitate an understanding of the complex nature of the Rwandan situation, to get a holistic view and examine the interdependence of certain aspects and seeking to identify patterns (Vromen, 2010:257). The reasoning for choosing Rwanda as the case for this study is the importance to ensure a successful reconciliation process, to prevent another occurrence of violence in-between the groups in their society, as that has been a pattern throughout their history. Additionally, Rwanda is a nation where the government has a very strict control over their country and society as well as their reconciliation process, and therefore is suitable when examining power exercise by a government during a reconciliation process.

I will here address some of the common criticism towards case studies. Often people claim that one of the weaknesses is that you cannot generalize from researching one case, or acquire knowledge about correlations and/or general situations as the focus is on an individual case (Lindvall, 2007:270, Flyvbjerg, 2003:185). However, the aim for case studies is usually not to acquire generalizations for a large number of cases (Vromen, 2010:255). And according to Flyvbjerg (2003:193), it is possible to acquire generalizations from an individual case and furthermore claims that the focus on generalizations are overvalued and instead wants to highlight the significance of examples. Additionally, case studies are at times useful as complementary to other research methods, they can aid in determining what variables that might be valuable for further research (Lindvall, 2007:270). Although it is not the aim of this research to produce any generalisations on the power dynamics in a reconciliation process, the findings of this study could, if relevant, indicate similar aspects that could be valuable to
research in the future. If one finds some issues in the reconciliation process in the case of Rwanda, those findings can help to illuminate potential issues in other cases. Especially as other research methods often are preceded and/or complemented by case studies (Ibid, 2007:270, George & Bennett, 2005: 20-21). Another criticism towards case studies are that they have a problem with its subjectivity, that they in general can have an issue with their validity (Flyvbjerg, 2003:185). This is an aspect that is important to keep in mind for researchers, but it is important for all researchers regardless of method and not something that is exclusively a problem for case studies (Flyvbjerg, 2003:197). George & Bennett (2005:22) states that,”Selection biases are indeed a potentially severe problem in case study research, but not in the same ways as in statistical research”.

According to George & Bennett, another advantage with case studies is that it gives what they call, high degree of conceptual validity, that the researcher better can “identify and measure the indicators that best represent the theoretical concepts the researcher intends to measure” (George & Bennett, 2005:19). In the case of a quantitative study, there is the possibility of ‘conceptual stretching’, when the researcher “lump together dissimilar cases” when trying to get a larger sample size (Ibid, 2005:19).

3.4 Limitations

Since this research is a desk study, there are some understandable limitations to the research. As I did not have the opportunity to do my own field research in Rwanda, I had to rely on secondary sources when examining the power dynamics in the Rwandan reconciliation process rather than conducting my own evaluation of the situation there. However, this did not become an issue during the research as there is a wide range of literature on the Rwandan genocide, the current situation and the reconciliation process available. There are many suitable books, journals and articles that were adequate for answering the research questions of this study. Furthermore, since there is now more than twenty years since the genocide occurred and the reconciliation process has been ongoing for almost two decades, enough time have passed for the current literature and this study to evaluate aspects of the process and certain policies.
The main possible obstacle for the research was whether the relevant data was accessible to me. At the start of this research I thought it might be hard to get access to all the relevant information necessary to do a fair evaluation of the reconciliation process, but this was not the case and there was enough research and information about this subjects. Moreover, it was especially difficult to obtain data that could indicate any misuse of power, if that has been the case. Another possible limitation of this study and the access of information is that I do not speak Kinyarwanda, the official language in Rwanda, or French. This of course means that some research and documents are not accessible to me. However, there was no issue finding the information in English as the Rwandan situation is a well-covered topic, but it is nonetheless important to keep this aspect in mind. Furthermore, I am not that acquainted with the Rwandan culture and it is important to realize their specific context in which the reconciliation process is occurring in to understand the policies and their effect.

The aspects that indicate three-dimensional power can be hard to measure and that could subsequently limit the possibility to evaluate the power dynamics during the process. But the long time frame will also be an advantage in this aspect, as many of the indicators of three-dimensional power that Lukes mentions require a certain amount of time to pass for it to have an effect or to be visible. There are some research and information that show signs of the aspects as discussed by Lukes and I believe there is enough data for this study to at least to a certain extent do an evaluation of the power dynamics in the reconciliation process in Rwanda.

3.5 Delimitations

The delimitations for this study is first and foremost that the research will focus only on Rwanda and their situation, concentrating on their post-genocide reconciliation after the 1994 incident. As discussed more thoroughly above regarding the choice of a case study as the method, the reasoning for this being that the aim is to examine their specific reconciliation process and to illuminate potential issue. Important aspects of their modern history will be used to help understand their society and current problems, but the focus will be on the current process that was initiated after the genocide in 1994.
Furthermore, the focus of this study will be on the government of Rwanda and their role in the reconciliation process. The reason for choosing them rather than other important reconciliation institutions such as churches or civil society organizations, is that the Kagame administration has been in control in Rwanda since the end of the genocide and been the primary actor deciding the approach towards reconciliation (Haynes et al, 2011:123, Kinzer, 2014:93, Thomson, 2011:373). Therefore it seems fitting to examine and evaluate their role in the process, as it is their policies that have been shaping the process. Subsequently, the focus of this research will be on their policies and implementation of them. Moreover, I have chosen to focus on two of the main instruments of the government’s National Unity and Reconciliation policy, ‘gacaca’ and ‘ingando’, as there is a need to delimit to certain aspects of the reconciliation process to be able to adequately cover the topic and these to policies are the ones arguably have the biggest impact. This focus will hopefully highlight potential issues with the governments approach towards reconciliation.

Lastly, the main focus will be on three-dimensional power, but not exclusively as the one and two-dimensions of power will be included in this research as they will contribute by illuminating power mechanisms at play and also possible assist in detecting and understanding they three-dimensional aspects. However, when analysing the reconciliation process the emphasis will be on the three-dimensional, as that concept focuses on aspects that are deeply ingrained in society such as norms, culture, education and socialization. I think these aspects are essential to evaluate if one wants to understand and transform the perception amongst groups in society, particularly former adversaries.

3.6 Material

With these considerations in mind, this will be a desk study as my research questions can best be answered by examining the different policies that the Rwandan government has implemented and how the process has progressed throughout the years. So my focus will be on reading and assessing previous research on the reconciliation process in Rwanda as I believe it will increase my understanding and to get a better grasp of the situation than if I would conduct my own field research. First of there are a lot of renowned scholars and experts that have already done their field research of the situation in Rwanda, and for me as a novice it is valuable to rely upon already
established work by experts. Furthermore, considering the sensitive nature of the subject in Rwanda and the suppression of opinions by the government (Melvin, 2010:941, Montei, 2011:81, Thomson, 2006:377-378). It is likely that my own field research interviewing Rwandans would not lead to any new relevant data as people would probably be hesitant to be honest with my regarding the topic. Additionally, this will give me the opportunity to focus on investigating the power dimensions in the reconciliation process by assessing the information and literature that is already out there. Therefore, the material used for this study will mainly be second hand sources but that is nothing I find problematic

3.6.1 Sources

The selection of literature for this research was to research and use peer-reviewed articles and books, but no specific selection choices were made other then searching for literature that was relevant to the topics I was aiming to research and instead tried to include such a wide variety of information as possible. It is worth pointing out once again as explained in the previous research section, that the topic of Rwanda and their reconciliation is a very polarised subject, which is divided in two camps and according to Hintjens the scholarly work tends to have the narrative of one of those two camps (Hintjens, 2015:133). It is divided into two camps, one that questions the government’s strict control of society, sees them as instilling fear and insecurity in the society and manipulates the narrative to assert blame to the Hutu will caring for their ‘own’. The other camp instead points to the miraculous recovery from the nation, pointing to efficient reforms and a prosperous economy and a government that has a genuine interest in improving the lives of all Rwandans (Hintjens, 2015:134). This research used a wide range of sources, from different journals and from different authors, often with the aim of getting several sources on the different subject in an attempt to get the different views on the governments and their polices during the reconciliation process.
4 Results – The Rwandan Reconciliation Process

This chapter will present the results of the research and answer the first research question, *What have been the government’s main policies towards reconciliation?* Additionally, the findings in this chapter will also illuminate and facilitate the aspects of the reconciliation process that correlates with the second and third research questions, which however will be analysed in the next chapter.

4.1 Background

First there will be a brief summary of the Rwandan history and its importance, then a discussion about the concept of ethnicity and the terms Hutu and Tutsi and lastly an explanation of the context in which the genocide transpired in.

4.1.1 History

Throughout their modern history, there has been animosity in-between the different groups in the Rwandan society, mainly Hutu and Tutsi, and a pattern of re-occurring violence has existed (Gubin et al, 2005:299, Prunier, 2009a:xxx, Sarkin, 1999:772-773). Some of the roots of the genocide can be traced back to pre-colonial Rwanda, but the colonizers and more specifically the Belgians made the situation worse during their administration (Prunier, 2009a:xxx, Sarkin, 1999:772-773). With colonization new borders, new social structures and a new culture was created while ignoring previously existing ones (Prunier, 2009:xxix). When Germany first colonized Rwanda, they used the pre-existing Tutsi political control and re-affirmed it, authorizing the Tutsi to administer the country for them. After the loss in World War I, Germany was forced to give up their Rwandan colony to Belgium, and once the Belgians was in control they formalized this Tutsi supremacy further (Amstutz, 2006:543, Moneti, 2011:81, Sarkin, 1999:772-773). The big issues here is that beforehand, the differentiation between the two social groups was based on the culture, their power and wealth, but the Belgians used ethnicity and race to differentiate between the inhabitants. This will be discussed more thoroughly below under the sub-heading ethnicity. The Belgian colonizers classified people into three groups, Tutsi, Hutu and Twa, and even went so far as creating identity cards which differentiated between the race of people (Amstutz, 2006:543).
But with decolonization, requests for changes started to appear from the population, which is logical as Hutu accounted for a majority of the populous, 85% and the Tutsi who dominated the country only accounted for 15% (Amstutz, 2006:544-545). When Rwanda became an independent nation in 1962 and democratic procedures were initiated, the Hutu got in power. But not long after they gained control of the state, the Hutu administration imposed similar discriminations as they themselves had been subjected to by previous Tutsi governments. Ethnic violence against the Tutsi was instigated and tens of thousands fled to neighbouring countries (Ibid, 2006:544-545). It was amongst these Tutsi refugees that had fled from the Hutu governments oppression that the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) was established in Uganda. In 1990 a civil war broke out, as the RPF started to lunge attacks into Rwanda along its northern border (Sarkin, 1999:768). The UN tried to intervene to stop the conflict, creating a power sharing agreement between the Rwandan government and the RPF, which resulted in the Arusha Accords in 1993 (Amstutz, 2006:544). The Arusha Accords however, did not lead to any significant change and the Rwandan genocide would commence in April of 1994 and continue until the majority Tutsi rebel army RPF invaded the country and stopped the Hutu extremists (Ibid, 2006:541, Conway, 2014:954). Since then the RPF and Kagame has been in power in Rwanda (Haynes et al, 2011:123, Kinzer, 2014:93).

4.1.2 Ethnicity

It is vital to briefly discuss the ‘ethnic’ terms Hutu and Tutsi and their origin. The separation in the Rwandan society is commonly thought to be an ethnic divide and the genocide is often referred to as an ethnic conflict. However, the separation between the Rwandan populations is something that is socially constructed rather than any separation based on race. First of it is important to mention that there exists a third ethnic group in Rwanda, the Twa. It is a small ethnic group and will not be a focus for this research, but just to be clear that there is not only Hutu and Tutsi that the Rwandan society consists of.

The terms existed before colonization and was referred more to social roles than race. ‘Tutsi’ – “meaning a person rich in cattle”, were pastorals and cultivators, they had more economic and political influence. ‘Hutu’ – “meaning subordinate to persons with power” were cultivators (Amstutz, 2006:543). Beforehand, the differentiation between the two
social groups was based on their role in the society, their power and wealth, but the Belgians used ethnicity and race to differentiate between the inhabitants. Tutsi were seen as ‘better’ and became the privileged, worked as the administrative group for the colonizers and controlling the majority Hutu population (Applegate, 2012:80). Before the colonization, these groups were basically the same, using the same language, culture, faith and living within the same communities. But through time, social constructed differences were created and reinforced (Ibid, 2012:80). The Belgian colonizers even went so far as creating identity cards to categories these ethnic groups after (Ibid, 2012:80).

After the genocide in 1994, the new government has made ethnic categorization forbidden and also ban on the terms ‘Hutu’ and ‘Tutsi’ in an attempt to prevent future ethnic differences and trying to get people to instead see themselves as primary Rwandans (Applegate, 2012:71, Hodgkin, 2006:203). Within the reconciliation field, some intellectuals endorse precisely this approach, to redefine oneself, to move towards a feeling of ‘we’ rather than ‘us/Them’ (Miall et al, 2011:248).

4.1.3 The context for Rwandan reconciliation

When studying Rwanda, it is important to realise the abnormal circumstances in which the genocide occurred. Clearly all conflicts and violence of such a magnitude as a genocide has severe effects on the society and its population. However, there are several aspects that makes the Rwandan case stand out. According to Purnier (2009b:1-6), the Rwandan genocide cannot be compared with other similar atrocities. Not only did the killings affect the majority of the inhabitants because of the magnitude of the violence, but additionally the participation in the genocide was wide-spread as hundreds of thousands ordinary citizens participated in it. Furthermore, Rwanda is a very densely populated country in a small geographical location, which meant that it often was not strangers or people of other nationalities that committed the crimes, but people within one’s neighbourhood or community (Clark, 2014:312, Ibid, 2009:1-6).

So after the genocide was stopped, former enemies, survivors and perpetrators, were often forced to live side by side in close knit communities. It was understandably a lot of suspicions in–between people in the society and distrust amongst people (Clark, 2014:312, Prunier, 2009:1-6). But it was not only in-between Hutu and Tutsi that this
suspicion existed, but also amongst themselves. Animosity and suspicion between Hutu and Tutsi sub-groups, depending on if they had stayed or fled, depending on which country they had been refugees in etc. existed as well (Prunier, 2009:1-6). Besides all the traumatic experiences and psychological aspects, the genocide also created massive material destruction. When trying to recover from the genocide, the nation’s infrastructure was ruined, cars were scarce and roads destroyed, shortage of doctors, layers, teachers, and the list can be made long. Additionally, the fleeing Hutu government had taken all the money from the central bank, which made rebuilding the nation even harder (Ibid, 2009:1-6). Prunier emphasises that the Rwandan genocide and situation needs to be viewed from a bigger perspective, that it is important to realise its regional causes and effects also. That the Rwandan genocide has was a product of regional issues and that it also caused more conflict in its aftermath (Prunier, 2009:xxxi). And the former Hutu government has established themselves in the many refugee camps along the Congolese border to Rwanda and established The Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda (FDLR) and continuously posses a threat to Rwanda with occasional raids into the country and something that the RPF government most take into consideration (Prunier, 2009:17).

4.2 Reconciliation approach and policies

To move towards reconciliation, the Rwandan transitional government, Government of National Unity (GNU) established The National Unity and Reconciliation Commission (NURC) (Haynes et al, 2011:123). NURC has two main departments, Civic Education (CE) and Peace Building and Conflict Management (PBCM) (Ibid, 2011:123). Although the RPF did not get elected until 2003, they have de-facto been in control ever since the end of the genocide and was part of the GNU (Ibid, 2011:123). The state has had near-total control over the reconciliation process (Haynes et al, 2011:123, Thomson, 2011:373), and they introduced the National Unity and Reconciliation Policy which has been their main and official policy which together with the NURC directs all reconciliation action in Rwanda (Conway, 2014:954, Melvin, 2010:933, Zobras, 2009:128). The RPF have three key structures in their policy aimed at reconciliation that is, strict legislation, education and justice (Melvin, 2010:932). To achieve this, they have
implemented two main instruments, for dialogue with *gacaca* and for civic education *ingando* (Clark, 2014:310).

With vast numbers of perpetrators involved in the genocide, over one million perpetrators (Clark, 2014:312), just the judicial process would have taken too long considering all the crimes, would have taken “*hundred years to try them all*” (Kinzer, 2014:98). The judicial system was in ruins, few judges or lawyers were alive or still present in Rwanda. Furthermore, there were not enough prisons to keep all the detainees in. According to the Red Cross, only 16 out of the 183 places where they kept detainees was actual prisons and the conditions in these prisons were horrible, to crowded, not sanitary etc. (Prunier, 2009:9-11). With these aspects in mind, the Rwandan government had no capacity to take care of the immense task of prosecuting all potential crimes committed during the genocide, they were forced to come up with an alternative to ensure some form of justice for the actions during the genocide.

When deciding which way they should seek justice for the victims and how the perpetrators should be punished, the government had two main approaches to choose from, retributive justice and restorative justice. Retributive focuses on individual rights and to prosecute lawbreakers through trials and in that way seek punishment, this is the common form of justice for most societies today (Amstutz, 2006:554). In the case of Rwanda, the government sought assistance from the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) to prosecute certain offenders and also implemented a genocide law in 1996 to start the process of prosecuting all the perpetrators (Ibid, 2006:551). Restorative justice, instead focuses on the subjective factors that effects our understanding and relationship amongst each other rather than mainly focusing on punishment. It seeks to combat anger, resentment, animosity and vengeance among adversaries to improve trust and social solidarity (Ibid, 2006:554). As the issue with all the genocide perpetrators was too big to handle through the common justice system, the government sought to heal the relationships among survivors and offenders and restoring communal relationships through the gacaca court system.

Elizabeth Kiss finds that restorative justice is better matched with reconciliation than retributive justice, as it restores dignity to the survivors, the perpetrators will be held accountable and that it also creates an environment in the society where human rights are protected. Retributive justice however she associates with vengeance and can be contra-
productive to reconciliation (Melvin, 2010:936). Drake et al (2011:85) also argues in their paper that restorative justice is more suitable, as those initiatives has gotten Rwanda nearer reconciliation than retributive initiatives.

When Zobras did research on people’s perception in Rwanda of what reconciliation is and should include, most respondents seem to primarily value punishment. The respondents also stated that forgiveness did not need to be necessary and also that going back to ways that things were before the genocide was their hope (Zobras, 2009:127). Furthermore, respondents seem to value security. Of the two communities interviewed, 70% in Sovu and 83% in Bunzazi valued security as the most important pre-condition for reconciliation (Ibid, 2009:131).

Rwanda has recovered successfully against all odds, considering the huge amounts of obstacles facing the nation after the genocide, the nation has reached good levels in many aspects such as security, economy and are held as one of the most stable nations in Africa (Kinzer, 2014:94, Montei, 2011:82, Thomson, 2011b:442-443). However, there are some negative aspects of the development in Rwanda. The government has authoritarian tendencies, keeping a strict control of the society with amongst other things limits on freedom of speech and expression and there have also been repeated accusations of human right abuses. (Kinzer, 2014:94).

4.2.1 Gacaca

One of the main policies were the use of ‘gacaca’ courts, a traditional communal tribunal, where people that confess their crimes are granted leniency (Amstutz, 2006:544-545). The gacaca courts have been valuable in processing the many perpetrators and been hailed for its bottom-up approach, but according to Thomson it has also lead to “institutionalized a state-imposed narrative” (Thomson, 2006:374).

There has been criticism against the Gacaca system, specifically regarding legal aspects that has been inadequate, as participation in gacaca is required and the accused does not have legal representation (Kinzer, 2014:98-99). According to Kinzer, there is evidence that there is political control over the process (Ibid, 2014:98-99). But others questions if
perhaps one is setting the standard too high for them, comparing the system to the judicial process in western nations, what could have been their other option considering their situation and capabilities (Hintjens, 2015:135). Another issue with the gacaca courts has also been that only cases regarding Hutu crimes against Tutsi is being tried in these trials and not the other way around as well, that is Tutsi violence against Hutu (Kinzer, 2014:98-99). This is understandable as most violence was done by Hutu, but it differentiates between the two groups, although the main goal of the reconciliation process is to create a “oneness”. The two groups are essentially categorized even before the trials, Tutsi as survivors and Hutu as génocidaires (which is word used for the perpetrators of the genocide). Hutu cannot think of themselves as survivors and participate as victims in the gacaca proceedings even if they have been subjected to violence and Tutsi on the other hand have to forgive the perpetrators, as that is part of the process (Prunier, 2009:1-6, Thomson, 2006:377, 385). The inability for Hutu to seek justice create tension in the communities according to people being interviewed. Individuals who tried to bring up deaths of Hutu relatives during gacaca were dismissed and was told it was not relevant as it was not a genocide crime against Tutsi (Clark, 2014:307). According to Melvin (2010:947), trials should prosecute crimes of human rights abuses committed from both sides if one wants to effectively promote reconciliation.

Gacaca has been positive in most respondent’s communities, but it has not altered the relationships in the communities deeply (Clark, 2014:308). There is no more violence but not reconciliation either, communities are still separated and distrust amongst each other still exists, as an example one respondent tells how Hutu and Tutsi families sit on separate sides in the church (Ibid, 2014:307-308). Some genocide perpetrators told how they after the gacaca hearings expected to be able to return to their community and be reintegrated as they had been forgiven and done their time. But has been excluded and harassed since they got back (Ibid, 2014:315).

Several international organizations also question some aspects of the gacaca courts. Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch for example, has criticised gacaca, as it is mainly a ‘victor’s justice’, only Hutu’s are being prosecuted and the Tutsi war crimes are being excluded from the gacaca courts (Amstutz, 2006:553-554). Amongst scholars as well there are some well-founded critic. While Clark argues that there is space for open dialogue during the gacaca court and RPF violence can be discussed, Waldorf on the other
hand believes that is not the case and that discussion is limited (Melvin, 2010:941). According to Thomson, several of the Rwandans she has interviewed sees the gacaca system as oppressive power from the state, that it forces people to partake in the process and additionally that they are forced to fill the role that the government has intended for them to have in the process (Thomson, 2006:380). There has been an issue with there being incentives for people to confess to crimes, people that have confessed are the only ones that was eligible for releases and they might risk higher prison sentence if they instead plead innocent (Zobras, 2009:139). Thomson (2006:384) further found during her research that, it was common belief amongst Hutu adults that the gacaca was a way for the government to prosecute all Hutu for the genocide against Tutsi. And Thomson herself views gacaca as “an mechanism of state power”, in which the government uses the process to consolidate their power (Ibid, 2006:386). Miall et al brings up this point as well, that in some circles it is seen as the RPF has tried to assigned collective guilt onto all Hutu (Miall et al, 2011:254).

The gacaca court system is often and for many is perceived as a bottom-up approach towards reconciliation, a grass roots process in which the communities and its inhabitants play a big role. However, as explained above the government has a strict control of the reconciliation process in general and specifically how the gacaca courts are shaped. So in many ways the gacaca courts could be viewed as top-down approach, as the government determines how the process is carried out, what crimes and which individuals that can be prosecuted as well as what subjects that can be discussed during these proceedings. This is extra important to point out as the general perception is the opposite and the process is presented as a bottom-up approach. Although some aspects might be perceived as bottom-up, some aspects are more in line with a top-down approach and the gacaca courts should not be viewed only as a bottom-up policy towards reconciliation.

4.2.2 Ingando and Education

Ingando, one of the two main pillars of the governments National Unity and Reconciliation policy, is an instrument for civic education (Clark, 2014:310). The policy aims to re-educate the population, teach them about the genocide and facilitate reconciliation. The main part of ingando are the re-education camps that the government
has implemented, where people are studying Rwandan history, government policies and unity and reconciliation (Thomson, 2011b:447). Released prisoners have to go through this process of ingando re-education camps for weeks or months and graduate from these camps before they are allowed to re-integrate into society (Ibid, 2011b:447, Turner, 2014:417). It is not however only ex-prisoners that participate in these igando re-education camps but also government officials, church leaders, judges, university students, basically people from all walks of life in Rwanda (Mgbako, 2005:202). People are thought a state-sanctioned version of the past and the Rwandan history (Turner, 2014:417). When Susan Thomson did research in Rwanda she was ordered to attend one of these camps for a week as her research permit got revoked, to learn the truth rather than what she had been told when interviewing peasants (Thomson, 2011b: 447). These ingando camps serve as attempts at reconciliation but also according to Mgbako as “to disseminate pro-RPF ideology through political indoctrination” (Mgbako, 2005:202).

The Rwandan history, and specifically the genocide, has been a contested topic and as a solution the government has removed history from the school curriculum, as they perceive the modern history to potentially be dangerous, inciting differences and ethnic hate. Instead they want the school curriculum to focus on one Rwandan identity (Hodgkin, 2006:199). The general consensus amongst Rwandans and the international community is that the educational reform has been positive (Ibid, 2006:200). It is important however to keep in mind that education can be a powerful tool to control and promote certain opinions, and education has been used as manipulation in Rwanda previously by political elites (Ibid, 2006:202, 207). When there has been a violent and deeply traumatic conflict, where the animosity is high in-between adversaries, there is a need to deal with the past and to recover from trauma to be able to build a future together (Miall et al, 2011:249). According to Hodgkin (2006:200), reconciliation with history is necessary if they want to achieve “Long-lasting, deep and meaningful reconciliation”.

The limits and even repression of discussion might create more social exclusion. Not only within education and history, but in general (Hodgkin, 2006:200). The historical discourse in Rwanda has a top-down approach, filled with political incentives towards groups and individual in how they should act (Melvin, 2010:940). According to Hodgkin (2006:202), Kagame is evidently trying to change the historical pattern in Rwanda where the governing is giving privileges to their own ethnic group. There is not much research
or information about ingando, but of those available, many questions the narrative within these re-education camps (Ibid, 2006, Mgbako, 2005, Thomson, 2011 b).

According to Miall et al, the ‘fourth stage’ of reconciliation which is the final stage, is when one is celebrating differences, not just tolerance but rather even appreciate the differences (Miall et al, 2011:260-261). For this to happen, pluralization of information is necessary, with the education schoolbooks, in the media narrative and the official accounts as examples (Ibid, 2011:260). Mgbako concludes that the ingando camps could prove to be a very efficient tool for reconciliation if open discussion and critic was possible but now it does not serve its purpose and rather works as a tool of indoctrination (Mgbako, 2005).

4.2.2.1 RPF violence

Another subject of the Rwandan history and the official story of the genocide that has been contested and also particularly sensitive, is the violence by the mainly Tutsi RPF army, against primarily Hutu. Both during and after the genocide there seems to have been wide-spread violence by the RPF, with some even going so far to claiming that it was a ‘double genocide’, but this is something that has been dismissed by several scholars and according to Prunier, “it is nothing that stands up to serious inquiry” (Prunier, 2009:13). However, there seems to be no doubt that the RPF and Tutsi violence is not treated in the same way as Hutu crimes, which is partly evident from the gacaca proceedings. Respondents during Zobras research were wondering and questioned why the RPF killings/violence is not talked about and also questioned the perception that the majority of Hutu’s participated in the genocide. The masses were manipulated and many participated, but not all Hutus participated or are guilty (Zobras, 2009:138-139). Paul Kagame has apparently stated that “upward to one million Hutu actively participated in the genocide against Tutsi” and he further also asserted that the rest of the Hutu population were guilty as they as by standers did nothing to stop the violence (Melvin, 2010:932). This official view that the majority of Hutu’s participated and the denial of much of the Tutsi violence seems to have created some frustration amongst the population, mainly Hutu, who themselves perhaps were survivors from the genocide but are being views upon as génodicaries.
Towards the end of the genocide, UNHCR started to get reports from refugees about massacres that the RPF committed as they were advancing into Rwanda. Later on this was confirmed by a Human Rights Watch report on the genocide (Prunier, 2009:15). But the accusations of the RPF violence was a sensitive subject, for understandable reasons as they had stopped the genocide so it was something people was hesitant to investigate and accuse the RPF of. One huge breakthrough on this subject was the Gersony Report. Robert Gersony was conducting a refugee survey for UNHCR when discovering the reoccurring evidence of RPF violence, not just random acts of violence that happens during a conflict, but rather organized and systematic violence (Ibid, 2009:15-16, 21). Gersony stated that, “the RPF was carrying out a massive campaign of killings, which could not be considered simply as uncontrolled revenge killings even if some of the murders belonged to that category” (Ibid, 2009:15-16). An horrendous example of these acts where when the RPF gathered people for ‘peace and reconciliation meetings’, oblivious to what would happened, people joined these meetings but where then slaughtered when they arrived (Ibid, 2009:16). Similar situations and killings has been observed in other situations as well (Prunier, 2009:15-17). Kagame however, has denied any wide-spread violence by the RPF (Melvin, 2010:945).

There is no question that the Hutu government and extremists bear a bigger responsibility for the genocide and conducted far more killings then the Tutsi or the RPF, but it is important still to acknowledge the violence from the RPF nonetheless. Necessity for it being based on same conditions, even if more Hutu committed crimes, the Tutsi crimes needs to be brought before justice as well if possible. How could it otherwise be reconciliation and an attempt to end the cycle of ethnic separation, and not seen as Tutsi using their power for revenge, as earlier in history has been the case by the different iterations of governments.

4.2.3 Suppression of opinions

One issue with the Rwandan reconciliation process and the policies discussed above, is the tight control of the society and political landscape the RPF has, controlling political opponents and opinions through fear and intimidation (Melvin, 2010:941, Thomson, 2006:377-378). There is no possibility for people to question the RPF story, contesting the government’s official story or their policies can often lead to harassment, intimidation,
imprisonment and in rare cases even disappearances and deaths (Thomson, 2006:374). The RPF have used the genocide laws to accuse political opponents of being genocide deniers when they have questioned the RPF official story (Melvin, 2010:941). And in instances where people have been trying to free innocent people from being convicted, they get accused of being génocidaires (Prunier, 2009:11). When conducting her research, many people Thomson spoke with, thought that the RPF was using the genocide, manipulating it to maintain their role and power (Thomson, 2006:379).

As the RPF has almost total control of the reconciliation process (Haynes et al, 2011:123, Thomson, 2011:373) and furthermore suppresses anyone questioning them as explained above, there is no room for discussion about the approaches and policies aimed at reconciliation. The RPF has tight control over the media, journalist that goes against them and speaks out against their policies often get accused of “preaching genocide ideology” and the state uses the law against divisionism for this. Therefore many media outlets self-censor themselves (Thomson, 2013:113). According to Montei the suppression of discussion and opinions have created a culture of silence (Montei, 2011:81). When talking about the reconciliation process in Rwanda, Miall et al states, “Here reconciliation is highly politicized, since the government side is perceived to insist on reconciliation on its own terms, and the unequal status between Rwanda’s ethnic and social groups remains” (Miall et al, 2011:260).

Values, views, beliefs and understandings are not static, but rather something that can change through dialogue (Mohan & Thomson, 2007:64-65). For people that has been in actual conflict or that might be in danger of potential conflict, working together can facilitate a better understanding of each other, changing the views one has of one another (Ibid, 2007:64-65). But when discussion and debate is suppressed, one could assume the chances of transformation of people’s perception of one another in Rwanda is decreased as the literature on reconciliation seem to indicate that an open discussion amongst former adversaries are necessary for reconciliation as enlightened previously in this study by different sources.
5 Analysis

This chapter will use the analytical framework of the research to analyse the results presented in the previous chapter, to try and answer the second research question concerning the power dimensions and if aspects of three-dimensional power can be observed. Furthermore, in line with the third research question, there will also be a discussion about potential indications that the government of Rwanda has exercised power through the reconciliation process and if any misuse of power can be observed.

5.1 Gacaca

Since Rwanda is such a small country and people live in close knit communities, the application of a local based reconciliation approach as the method, gacaca courts, is in many ways positive. Both Kiss and Drake also had the opinion that restorative justice is best suited for a reconciliation process (Drake et al, 2011:85, Melvin, 2010:936). Furthermore, with the vast amount of perpetrators there was a need to find an alternative and quicker way to bring certain offenders to justice. However, there are several issues with the proceedings that might be counter-productive to the aim of reconciliation. First off, the lack of certain legal aspects such as no legal representation is worrying if one wants to ensure a fair process (Kinzer, 2014:98-99). Moreover, the perhaps most troubling aspect is the exclusion of crimes committed by Tutsi or RPF forces and the crimes committed against Hutu from the gacaca courts (Ibid, 2014:98-99). There are more Hutu perpetrators and the main focus of the gacaca courts are the time frame of the genocide, but if not both sides are treated equally then it is hard for the proceedings to serve as an instrument for dealing with the past, discussion and eventually moving beyond past issues. The process differentiates between the two groups although one of main aims with the government’s National Unity and Reconciliation policies is to create a ‘oneness’ with an Rwandan identity, but the gacaca proceedings categorizes them and separates them, treating them differently depending on their ethnicity (Prunier, 2009:1-6, Thomson, 2006:377, 385). If gacaca is supposed to work as a truth commission – then all truths needs to be able to be brought up and discussed (Miall et al, 2011:253-254). And as Melvin states, that criminal trials and justice within reconciliation are much more likely
to be effective and encourage reconciliation if they are unbiased and prosecuting individuals on both sides of the conflict (Melvin, 2010:936, 947).

The gacaca courts are clearly in the control of the RPF government and some scholars claiming that it is ‘victor’s justice’ (Amstutz, 2006:553-554). The gacaca shows some clear aspects of two-dimensional power as the government are setting the agenda or constructing the rules of the game, of what issues that can be discussed at these courts and therefore ultimately also in the judicial part of the reconciliation. Furthermore, they are also creating barriers with the limits of discussion and prevents potential issues from being brought up. All these aspects are clear signs of the two-dimensional power as explained earlier in the operationalisation chapter and by Lukes (2005:21-23). Furthermore, considering the discrimination towards Hutu in the gacaca courts, it indicates that the process is a mobilization of bias in accordance with that Lukes describes (2005:21). Clark however claims that there is possibilities for open dialogue during gacaca proceedings and that even RPF violence can be discussed (Melvin, 2010:941).

Although the findings regarding the gacaca process indicates aspects of two-dimensional power, many of those aspects can be regarded in a bigger picture as three-dimensional power as explained in the operationalisation chapter of this study. As Thomson states, she views the gacaca courts as “institutionalized state-imposed narrative” by the government. The RPF are seemingly using the gacaca courts to assert their official story, what crimes that has been committed and no open dialogue about it is allowed. The RPF has political control over the process, and whether intentional or not, the approach does control the narrative and understanding of the genocide. And as it is a reoccurring pattern, it can be viewed as a systematic exercise of power onto certain groups in the society, in line with three-dimensional power (Lukes, 2005:26).

5.2 Ingando and Education

Education is one of the main instruments of power exercise of the three-dimensional power according to Lukes, as it distributes not only knowledge but also values, opinions and norms (Lukes, 2005:27). Furthermore, education can be a powerful tool to distribute out propaganda and even to manipulate the masses, something that has been used
previously by political elites as manipulation (Hodgkin, 2006:202, 207). These two aspects make education extra relevant to examine and analyse.

The policy and the re-education camp aspects of ingando aims to re-educate the population, but what they are being thought are state-sanctioned version and no discussion is allowed (Turner, 2014:417). They are intended to assist reconciliation and to some extent probably do, but according to Mgbako it is also political indoctrination of ideology that is pro-RPF (Mgbako, 2005:202). There are several scholars that questions the narrative within ingando (Hodkin, 2006, Ibid, 2005, Thomson, 2011 b). The government has done educational reforms and also removed history from the school curriculum, the general consensus according to Hodgkin is that the educational reform is positive (Hodgkin, 2006:199-200). But the top-down approach approach to the historical discourse has lots of political incentives (Melvin, 2010:940. And it is important to keep in mind that education can be a powerful tool to control and promote certain opinions and as it usually is with history it is the winner who writes it. For example the official story of the genocide, where the official story or understanding of the conflict shapes the reconciliation process, if the official story is insufficient it can affect the reconciliation process.

That the government is trying to move past previous problems is good, but perhaps an issue can arise when removing history from the curriculum, as no discussion about past atrocities or debate about what occurred can happen. Whether or not the policy is good or not for reconciliation, it is an exercise of power by the government in accordance with Lukes (2005) definitions. The government suppress certain issues from the agenda and prevents the potential issues with history, this in accordance with the two-dimensional view of power (Lukes, 2005:22-23. It is creating an official narrative, a story of what transpired and how things should be understood based on the RPF’s opinions and controlling the information, to some extent it can be viewed as indoctrination, both of these aspects indicate three-dimensional power (Lukes, 2005:27). All governments of course effects the education and thereby what is being thought to the population, but the ban of history and asserting an official story while at the same prohibiting certain topics indicates a strict control of the information being thought to the inhabitants. Hodgkin states that reconciliation with history is necessary if Rwanda wants to achieve deep, meaningful and long-lasting reconciliation (Hodgkin, 2006:200).
As people in general, not just in-between Hutu and Tutsi, have different opinions on what transpired it is important to come to terms with history. Otherwise there is the possibility that the official narrative creates a rift as certain groups and individuals will feel that it is just propaganda and no truth to the story, even if most aspects are true, as the suppression of opinions and prohibition of subject can indicate that. Perhaps if people feel the official story is propaganda as their views and opinions are being suppressed, they are more susceptible of conspiracies from extremist or radicals.

Values, views, beliefs and understandings are not static, but rather something that can change (Mohan & Thomson, 2007:64-65). The educational system affects and can change these aspects and shape how we perceive and treat each other. So this does not have to be an intentional motive for the government, although there are some indications of this, for it to be an exercise of power (Lukes, 2005:27). Even more importantly, the inhabitants might not be aware of the values and views that are being instilled in them. And for reconciliation to reach its deepest level there is the necessity of pluralization of information, this means variations in the schoolbooks and the narrative (Miall et al, 2011:260-261).

One part of the history that is contested and that has not been open for debate is the RPF violence. As the UNHCR’s Gersony report concludes there were much evidence that the RPF had conducted their own atrocities, not anywhere near the scale of the Hutu extremists, but nonetheless organized and systematic violence (Prunier, 2009:15-16, 21). Kagame however, has denied any wide-spread violence by the RPF and the government suppresses any such claims (Melvin, 2010:945). Regardless of the extent of the violence, it is clear that the government are using their control over the education system and to assert their narrative, which denies any RPF violence and therefore exercising power in accordance with the three-dimensional view of power to establish their official story.

5.3 Control of Information and Supression of Opinions

Just as with the discussion of education and its importance in shaping the values and norms in a society, the control of information has the same potential. Lukes mentions the
control of information as an instrument with which one can exercise three-dimensional power as it shapes what reality people identify (Lukes, 2005:27). The control of information and media was an important instrument of the Hutu extremists during the genocide to persuade the masses to participate in the killings.

The control of information is not just through the media, but other channels as well, for example the previously discussed ingando and gacaca processes. These aspects are two-dimensional power as they are controlling the agenda and those issues people are probably aware of, if they are limited to voice their opinion (Lukes, 2005:22-23). But additionally aspects of three-dimensional power can be observed in the exercise as it affects the values and perceptions that people have (Ibid, 2005:26-28), and that there are grass roots and mass involvement in some of these examples, such as gacaca, makes it even more powerful, as it becomes mass participation in the government approved rhetoric. It is crucial to emphasize here that it does not have to be any issue with the information being portrayed, but rather the problem is with having only one narrative and that this narrative goes unchallenged, becomes top-down rhetoric rather than an inclusive interpretation.

The government has authoritarian tendencies, keeping a strict control of the society with amongst other things limits on freedom of speech and expression and there have also been repeated accusations of human right abuses (Kinzer, 2014:94). A problem with the reconciliation process in Rwanda and the policies discussed, is the firm control of the society and political landscape the government has, and even more their way of controlling political opponents and opinions, through intimidation and fear (Melvin, 2010:941, Thomson, 2006:377-378). This has created a ‘culture of silence’ in the society (Montei, 2011:81).

The suppression of opinions is clear indications of two-dimensional power as they are controlling the agenda, creating barriers for discussion and in this sense preventing potential issues to be voiced (Lukes, 2005:22-23). However, the aspects that are indications of two-dimensional power are not necessarily through the decision-making process and therefore rather three-dimensional. Furthermore, since these aspects are a reoccurring pattern, they can be viewed as social structures and therefore not just two- but also three-dimensional power. The control of information and in some situations the
propaganda that are being spread are indications of three-dimensional power (Ibid, 2005:27).

Although the reasoning behind the laws banning ethnicity is understandable as it aims to prevent discrimination, it can be problematic that they are trying to create an oneness. As Clark claimed, that the government’s reconciliation process is flawed as it is based upon a negation of ethnicity, that they are attempting to create a false unity. That they should strive for equality is essential to prevent a rift between the different groups in society as they combat discrimination and have a successful reconciliation. But equality does not mean that everyone have to be the same. Everyone is different, and that should be celebrated, but everyone should be treated the same way. Miall et al states, “Here reconciliation is highly politicized, since the government side is perceived to insist on reconciliation on its own terms, and the unequal status between Rwanda’s ethnic and social groups remains” (Miall et al, 2011:260). The ban on the use of ethnic terms is in line with the one-dimensional power (Lukes, 2005:17-18).

When discussion and debate is suppressed, one could assume the chances of transformation of people’s perception of one another in Rwanda is decreased as the literature on reconciliation seem to indicate that an open discussion amongst former adversaries are necessary for reconciliation as enlightened previously in this study by different sources.

5.4 Evaluation

This chapter has indicated that there are several instances of power exercise by the government in accordance primarily with the two and three-dimensional power. In this evaluation section, the third research question of this study, Can any instances of misuse of power by the government during the reconciliation process in Rwanda be observed?, will be evaluated based on the discussion earlier in this chapter.

The RPF government evidently seems to have a tight and near-total control of the reconciliation process, which consequently means that their actions affect the reconciliation significantly (Haynes et al, 2011:123, Thomson, 2011:373). Thomson, who it is worth mentioning seems to be a very stong critic of the Rwandan government, even
went so far as to state that their policy of National Unity and Reconciliation is a means to control the population and consolidate their own power (Thomson, 2006:374). The gacaca courts seems in some sense to be a ‘victor’s justice’ as some scholars have claimed (Amstutz, 2006:553-554). The RPF are seemingly using the gacaca courts to assert their official story, what crimes that has been committed and no open dialogue about it is allowed. The RPF has political control over the process, and whether intentional or not, the approach does control the narrative and understanding of the genocide. Furthermore, their ingando policy and the education system is teaching a state-sanctioned version of the Rwandan situation and there is no room to question it (Turner, 2014:417). And according to Mgbako (2005:202) although the ingando is intended to promote reconciliation and it probably do to a certain extent, the policy also works as indoctrination of pro-RPF ideology.

It is not unusual that the government has control over education, but its rather the strict control that they have and the limits on different versions, that is the issue. The suppression of opinions and even intimidation in some instances when people questions the government. According to Melvin (2010:941) the genocide laws that the government has legislated is also used against political opponents, accusing them of being genocide deniers when they have opposed or questions the official RPF story. If that is the case, then that is a clear misuse of power of the reconciliation process by the government. The governments control of information and education has made it possible for them to reinforce the official story, their narrative. And with this control they have created a version that does not include the RPF violence, although once again its worth mentioning comes nowhere close to the violence perpetrated by the génocidaires. Although Reyntjens believes there has been a ‘tutsification’ of the state and the RPF are trying to expanded their control, some of the critic is unfounded and the discrimination is not at all on the same level as during previous government (Amstutz, 2006:558).

There are several aspects within the Rwandan recovery that are remarkable and positive, but regarding the aspects examined in this research there seems to be several indications of questionable features of their policies. The governments intentions might be authentic and not an attempt to use the reconciliation process to consolidate more power, but these features can nonetheless be harmful to the reconciliation of the Rwandan society. However, there seems to be some indications that the government is using the policies
aimed at reconciliation to benefit their own power. Using genocide laws to prosecute certain opponents, the education system and ingando to spread their narrative and a strict control of information to prevent people from questioning them and their policies. These examples indicates that there has been a misuse of power by the Rwandan government during the reconciliation process at least to a certain extent.
6 Conclusion & Future Research

This concluding chapter will summarize the discoveries of this research and answer the research questions that were outlined in the beginning of this paper, and finalize with possibilities for future research.

6.1 Conclusion

The findings of this study indicates that although Rwanda has recovered quite successfully from the havoc of the genocide, there are some issues with their reconciliation process. In regards to the first research question, the government has mainly used its policy of National Unity and Reconciliation as an approach towards reconciliation, with their three key structures, strict legislation, education and justice and two main instruments, *ingando* and *gacaca*.

In regards to the second research question, there have been several examples of power dimensions present in the Rwandan reconciliation process. With the gacaca courts, one of the big issues where the differentiation the process does between the two groups, Hutu and Tutsi, although one of the main aims of the government's National Unity and Reconciliation Policy is to create oneness. The gacaca courts had several examples of primary two-dimensional power as they set the agenda and prevents potential issues from being voiced, but also indications of three-dimensional power as this was a reoccurring pattern. The government’s control over ingando and education has also shown signs of power exercise in accordance with Lukes’ definitions. Lukes states that education can be an instrument for three-dimensional power and there is indications that these two instruments for reconciliation has been used to re-affirm the official story and show clear signs of three-dimensional power. Furthermore, the government has had strict control over information and suppresses contradicting views and opinions. The suppression of opinions are signs of two-dimensional power whereas the way in which the government has used its control of information is indications of three-dimensional power. These aspects of education and control of information has been used to portray a RPF narrative to the population, something that possibly can be viewed as indoctrination.
In regards to the questions of potential misuse of power during the reconciliation process it is difficult to prove and claim that they have been abusing their power position to gain more power through the reconciliation process. But nonetheless there are several indications that this might be the case. There are positive aspects of the governments approach and policies, but there is no doubt that the strict control of the process and their control of the agenda, information and education has enabled them to teach an official story that they control, a narrative that puts them and their actions in a positive light. As some examples in this study as indicated there are aspects that could be seen as indoctrination of RPF ideology within the reconciliation process.

However, the findings of this research can perhaps also be influenced by the policies that was chosen as the focus for this study. As this study examined certain features within the reconciliation that focused on the judicial and educational aspects of the reconciliation process there might be more of the critical scholars investigating these policies. If the focus of this study for example had been on economic policies and reforms of the reconciliation process, a more positive view might have been presented.

The relevance of this study was the new analytical approach to examine the power aspects of the process, and this approach generated some new findings that is very relevant to consider when evaluating the reconciliation process in Rwanda. As this research has shown several instances of power exercise by the government and indicated some misuse of power during the reconciliation process, the governments approach in some of their policies needs to be questioned and further researched. The findings has shown the power the government has and some of the issues with their role in the reconciliation process. An effective and successful reconciliation process is essential for Rwanda to move forward, as survivors and perpetrators are living within the same communities and interaction amongst them are unavoidable. With the reoccurring pattern of violence and the animosity between groups in the society, it is important to break this pattern to prevent discrimination and avoid future conflict. It is also important to point out that just because there is evidence that there has been exercise of power within the reconciliation process, that it does not automatically concludes that the reconciliation process is flawed. The aim of this study was to illuminate certain power aspects that have occurred during the reconciliation process and potential issues rather than to come to a evaluation of the success of their reconciliation process.
6.2 Future Research

For future research, there is perhaps valuable to examine if there are similar patterns in other reconciliation process as this study has indicated several instances of power exercise and even misuse of power. And further also research if it possibility is better to refrain from having a reconciliation process that is under such strict control of the government and instead one should aim for a more inclusive process. As the point of the reconciliation is to come to terms with the past, forgive one another and prevent future conflict, it is necessary for both sides of the conflict to be included in this process and not just the winners of the conflict, otherwise it might not lead to reconciliation but rather more animosity.
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