

Written evidence submitted by Professor Linda Melvern, Investigative Journalist

In the recent extensive news coverage of Rwanda there has been little reference to a continuing campaign to destabilise and try to eventually destroy by force the current Rwandan government. This campaign, orchestrated by an international network of Hutu Power ideologues, includes fugitive génocidaires and their supporters. This group sustains an armed militia group in the DRC which continues to kill and terrify the civilian population; it attempts through propaganda to project a benign image of its organisation. It is portrayed as a legitimate political opposition to the current regime.

There is detailed research work on this movement by a former member of the UN Group of Experts on the DRC; he is a world expert on the activities of the armed Hutu Power militia movement in the DRC, the *Force Démocratique pour la Liberation du Rwanda* (FDLR), and its splinter groups. His investigation was prepared for but has not yet been published by the UN. It shows how the FDLR operates through “regional committees” in Europe, in the Nordic countries, the US and Canada. These committees conduct propaganda against the Rwandan government, they help to protect genocide fugitives from international justice and actively promote genocide denial. Their use for propaganda purposes of unnamed informers to spread disinformation is widespread. Experience has shown that when it comes to Rwandan political affairs the utmost caution is needed when anonymous informers come forward offering information.

There have also been accusations in France that former French military officers and mercenaries have tried to destabilise the Rwandan government with claims that the current President Paul Kagame is responsible for the assassination of his predecessor.

The Rwandan government has been subjected to a diplomatic and political war by these elements.

1. News stories in the Western media about wrong-doing in African countries sometimes seem to require a lower level of proof than those concerning events closer to home. There is certainly less investigative effort than is the case in Western news production and in the past

few years there has developed a reliance by journalists on the work of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) whose reports -- certainly on the Great Lakes region -- have increasingly relied on anonymous informants.

2. I would refer the committee to the pre-genocide standard of reporting and detailed information provided by a consortium of human rights workers and international lawyers in a landmark report prepared by the International Federation of Human Rights of August 1993 (FIDH), Africa Watch, Inter-African Union of Human Rights, and International Centre of Rights of the Person and of Democratic Development: report of the International Commission of Investigation of Human Rights Violations in Rwanda since October 1, 1990 (7–21 January 1993).
3. To try to report the current political reality of Rwanda without mentioning the activities of the Hutu Power movement and its continued presence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), in Europe and in North America, is simply biased reporting.
4. The highly organised Hutu Power movement which purports to be a genuine Rwandan opposition group includes political and military operatives who took part in the 1994 Tutsi genocide. It is currently operating through a world-wide lobbying network and in Norway in particular it has obtained valuable influence at political level.
5. The Hutu Power ideology which underpinned the 1994 genocide of the Tutsi never went away: to this day its supporters remain organised and well-financed. They live among us. Inspired by racism they are determined to oust the current government by violent means if necessary in order to claim power in the name of the “majority Hutu people”.
6. Whilst this opposition advocates a violent overthrow of the current government, it has offered no programme for the advancement of the Rwandan people who continue to be cursed by rumour, lies and racist propaganda.
7. These dangerous elements continue to destabilise the Great Lakes region and successfully exploit political mistakes and human rights abuses committed by the Kigali government.
8. The forces of the former Rwandan army and the Interahamwe militia which fled Rwanda with the help of French armed forces in July 1994 have over the past 18 years undergone several mutations. They are now involved in the creation of a revitalized political opposition,

coordinated from Europe and the USA and involving hundreds of genocide fugitives who hope to escape international justice.

9. A major splinter group of the FDLR, known as the *Ralliement pour l'Unité et la Démocratie – Urunana* (RUD-Urunana), is currently under investigation by a US law enforcement agency and a criminal case against them is being prepared.
10. There is detailed evidence on the RUD-Urunana recently provided to US investigators including documents on the group's communication networks and money transfers. The leadership of this group, which is more efficient than that of the FDLR, resides in North America and it has considerable skills a lobbying operations.
11. Some information on the RUD-Urunana has recently been provided to US law enforcement by a Belgium FDLR specialist, Raymond Debelle. Debelle, a foreign armed group field researcher, is a former special operative from the Belgian Army. He is an arms expert and was in charge of field security of the Africa Desk for the Council of the European Union. He was subsequently an International Criminal Court Investigator (ICC) investigator in The Hague and in January 2009 joined the UN Group of Experts on the DRC until November 2010. He stayed in the Great Lakes region until mid-2011 to conduct intensive research on the FDLR and RUD-Urunana. Debelle is willing to testify to the committee and his report "Leadership et idéologie des FDLR-FOCA Dossier pour appréhender les enjeux cachés" can be made available to the committee.
12. This report shows how the FDLR 15-member Executive Committee is comprised entirely of those involved in the Tutsi genocide of 1994; while this group publically supports justice and reconciliation it continues to destabilise and try to destroy the current government by promoting disorder and uncertainty in Rwanda. This group is suspected of being behind deadly grenade attacks in Kigali which have targeted the civilian population.
13. The Hutu Power adherents actively promote genocide denial and as in 1994 the movement is skilled in the use of effective propaganda - their weapon of mass deception - and they use unnamed informers to spread disinformation. The recent coverage of Rwandan political affairs is notable for excluding any mention of this group, its network of supporters and its fundraisers in Europe who are responsible for some of the more recent anti-Tutsi hate-filled and racist postings in social media.
14. To seek to return Rwanda to the ethnic politics of the past, with political parties created along ethnic lines, is surely unadvisable. To question the motives of the Hutu Power movement attracts personal attack and in some cases threats of violence. I have experience of this. The group accuses detractors of "whitewashing" the regime of President Paul

Kagame. These propagandists are skilled at weaving a proportion of truth together with their own falsehoods in efforts to make their stories believable.

15. The Hutu Power movement makes effective use of the Western press to promote its aims: a Rwandan civil war is now being effectively waged in the western media. This includes the political activity of several former defence lawyers from the ICTR most notably the US lawyer Peter Erlinder. His continuing efforts to minimise, distort, obfuscate and deny the genocide of the minority Tutsis in Rwanda in 1994 includes the promotion of a theory that the RPF was a front used by US and UK governments whose intention was to oust the French from the region in order to facilitate the plunder of minerals of the wealth of the DRC.
16. Genocide does not end when the killing is over. Genocide denial is recognised by scholars as the final part of a genocidal process, a part of the crime itself. There is some research work on the circumstances of the 1994 genocide which does represent legitimate historical revision. Other research, however, departs from the academic standards of historical analysis and moves clearly in the direction of politically and ideologically motivated historical denial. One overarching characteristic of all deniers, the one characteristic which binds them together, is racism and upon this the deniers ultimately come to rely. At the ICTR the defence has produced a complex denial narrative that has been very effective: it aims to prove that the massacres in Rwanda were a spontaneous reaction to the assassination of the President and that no planning of the killing had taken place.
17. It is to be expected that Rwandans living abroad, who are not fans of the current President Paul Kagame, would steer clear of genocide deniers who continue to advocate that the genocide of the Tutsi in 1994 never happened. Yet Rwanda's political opposition has recently given a central role to a Canadian lawyer, Christopher Black, who is a former defence lawyer at the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR). Black recently represented Rwandan groups who submitted a request to the International Criminal Court (ICC) for President Paul Kagame to stand trial for human rights abuses. This Canadian lawyer widely promotes the idea that the 1994 genocide is a "myth".
18. One of the most important claims of the deniers is that the victims of the 1994 Tutsi genocide were responsible for what happened. This view has been actively promoted in France where a part of the judiciary has tried to prove that President Paul Kagame, when the military leader of the RPF, had ordered the assassination of his predecessor, Juvenal Habyarimana, with a missile attack on his personal jet on April 6, 1994. This event is widely believed to have triggered the genocide.
19. A French judge, Jean-Louis Bruguière, issued a report in 2006 which purported to prove that Kagame had been responsible for the assassination and more than twelve years after the event nine senior Rwandan government officials serving in the Rwandan government became the subject of international arrest warrants; only the immunity accorded by French law to serving heads of state prevented the authorities from issuing a warrant for Kagame.

20. The claim that Kagame was to blame for the assassination was widely reported as fact and was believed credible by human rights groups, including Human Rights Watch, and by journalists and academics. The claim, however, was entirely based on the word of informants who claimed to be former RPF soldiers and on information given to the judge by alleged génocidaires on trial at the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR). One of the informants told Judge Bruguière the names of those who had purportedly fired the missiles and further testified that there had been a secret RPF death squad called Network Zero -- a group of killers that was responsible for the murder of politicians.
21. The Bruguière case eventually collapsed. His key witness retracted his testimony claiming to have had links with operatives in the French secret service who had promised him asylum in Europe. He said he had fabricated the entire story.
22. The investigation into the assassination of President Juvenal Habyarimana continues and is now in the hands of Bruguière's successor, Judge Marc Trévidic who for the first time conducted forensic and scientific work in Kigali on the crash site. In an interim report in January 2012 he reported that the missiles were most likely fired from the then Rwandan army's strong hold, the Kanombe military camp.
23. One other story is illustrative of a failure to adequately verify and challenge information when it comes to Rwandan political affairs. In early May 2011 a 43 year-old Rwandan man, travelling on a Belgium passport, was stopped in Folkestone by UK border patrol: intelligence had been received from French sources that he posed an immediate threat to two Rwandans living in London. He was travelling on a Belgian passport, carried no weapons and very little money. He was denied entry to the UK and returned to Belgium.
24. A few days later, on May 12, the two Rwandans were visited by officers from the Metropolitan Police who presented them with a Threat to Life Warning Notice which informed them that the Rwandan Government posed a threat to their lives. A news story soon developed that an armed "hit squad" had been sent to London to wipe out Rwandan dissidents opposed to the Kagame regime.
25. The Metropolitan Police had conducted no enquiries, no investigation, and no interviews. The information on the so-called assassin in Folkestone provided by the French authorities contained no supporting evidence. No one could assure the reliability or otherwise of the information provided - only that the police said they had no reason to doubt the source.
26. A Threat to Life Notice is signed by a superintendent as authorising officer, a senior investigating officer determines the seriousness of the warning and a detective inspector is briefed on all the circumstances. An investigating officer is responsible for making an initial assessment. It appears that in this case because the warning came from a foreign service no investigation took place. In 2010 there had been 352 warnings issued by the Metropolitan Police.

27. No one seemed able to explain what the Rwandan government hoped to achieve in jeopardising its relations with the UK -- one of its closest allies and biggest donors. The two who were apparently threatened were seemingly low-profile dissidents.
28. It is interesting to note that a month before the threat notice was issued a newly created opposition group calling itself the Rwandan National Congress (RNC) was formed in London. The RNC was said to represent opposition activism in Europe, and was given a great deal of publicity as a result of the widely circulated "hit squad" story.
29. The 1994 genocide of the Tutsi contributed to the destabilization of an entire region in Africa and it has been followed by years of war, human deprivation, rape and misery, with untold and unimaginable brutality, and an incalculable number of victims. The withholding of aid to the Rwandan people will do little to address the problems of the continuing activities of Hutu Power and the lawlessness in neighbouring Congo where the repercussions of events in 1994 continue to be felt; the withholding of aid will serve to embolden the adherents of the FDLR and its various off-shoots. It will serve to increase the influence of those who wish to pull the Rwanda back to the politics of the past.

November 2012

Written evidence submitted by Rutembesa Didier, Pretoria, South Africa

1. UK took the decision of withholding Rwanda's budget support on the basis of a leaked report, not the final report which is expected to be published in November 2012. The recent leaked report didn't even have annexes mentioned in the report. The report was leaked two days before Rwanda's election at the United Nations Security Council, hiding an intended conspiracy from some NGOs.
2. Allegations raised by UN experts were not raised with Government of Rwanda in order to get their views on allegations, flouting a basic principle of research. UN experts only raised issues that were not part of the allegations against Rwanda. Instead, UN experts have been meeting dissidents/ opposition members of the Government of Rwanda. One case is a meeting held in the afternoon of 29 June 2012, in Brussels, in which Steve Hege and Marie Plamadiala, two UN experts, met with Jean Marie Micombero, a Belgium-based activist and a leader of Rwandan opposition group.
3. A lot of elements presented by UN experts were faulty. This concerns for example an ID purportedly of a Rwandan soldier (it was found that the ID was a fake one and the mentioned soldier is currently serving in RDC), the bullets purportedly of Rwandan forces (it was noted that FARDC also use same weapons) and many other allegations.
4. UN report of experts didn't consider the dynamics of ethnic groups in eastern DRC. Rwandophones from eastern DRC do have relatives in Rwanda. In Eastern DRC, one finds the same ethnic group like in Rwanda. Hutu, Tutsi and Twa of Rwanda are also present in eastern DRC. A trip of a Tutsi from DRC in Rwanda or any meeting of Tutsi from DRC in Rwanda have been interpreted by UN experts as a meeting meant to support rebel groups in Eastern DRC. The UN group of experts didn't provide audio recordings of these meetings but have only relied on biased sources that have been after money.
5. In DRC, there are multiple armed groups that have been killing the location of population and causing displacement for a decade (e.g. LRA, ADF-NALU, FDLR, More than 10 Mai Mai groups). Forces Democratiques pour la Liberation du Rwanda (FDLR) has links with genocidal forces which perpetrated genocide of Tutsi in Rwanda.
6. Steven Hege, coordinator of UN report of experts, has intentionally neglected killings and displacements caused by FDLR, a group that is at the helm of the genocide of Tutsi in Rwanda and this is explained by his sympathy to them in a document published in February 2009 in which Steve Hege expressed his sympathy to the cause of FDLR. This document was called "Understanding FDLR". With his sympathy to FDLR, Steven Hege cannot have a balanced view on Rwanda.
7. UK aid to Rwanda serves the Rwandan population and not any military support yet to be proved on Rwanda. Suspending aid to Rwanda will be another sign that the international community doesn't care about Rwanda's population like in 1994.

November 2012

Written evidence submitted by Population Matters

1. Population Matters has no view on the wider political and human rights case.
2. Rwanda is, however, a beacon of excellence in Africa in respect for its keen awareness of the importance of restraining population growth, and the need for intelligently designed and well resources family planning and reproductive health services to tackle the problem. Whatever other programme aid may be cut, we very much hope that support for this programme will remain in place.
3. The reason for the Rwandan Government to give such priority to family planning is best summed up in the following quote from James Gasana, Rwanda's Minister of Agriculture and Environment in 1990-92: "In the report I wrote for the IUCN's Task Force on Environment and Security, I suggested that four lessons be learned from this tragic chapter in Africa's history [the Rwanda genocide]: First, rapid population growth is the major driving force behind the vicious circle of environmental scarcities and rural poverty. In Rwanda it induced the use of marginal lands on steep hillsides, shortening of fallow, deforestation, and soil degradation - and resulted in severe shortages of food".
4. Elsewhere in Africa too, notably in the Sahel, competition by rapidly growing numbers of people for rapidly diminishing quantities of soil, water, vegetation and hence food is turning increasingly violent, and will probably continue to do so until populations can be stabilised. Human rights and political stability are among the first casualties of such conflicts, where the best-armed win the prizes. It is important for the wider continent that it remains able to learn from Rwanda's example.

November 2012

Written evidence submitted by Human Rights Watch

I. Summary

- i. Human Rights Watch welcomes the inquiry by the International Development Committee (IDC) into the decision by the Department for International Development (DFID) to withhold, and subsequently disburse, budget support to the Government of Rwanda following allegations about its involvement with the M23 rebel group in eastern Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC).
- ii. Human Rights Watch has documented serious human rights abuses by the M23 rebels in the DRC, including deliberate killings of civilians, summary executions, rapes, and forced recruitment, including of children. Some of these abuses amount to war crimes. Human Rights Watch has also documented extensive Rwandan military support for the M23, including the deployment of Rwandan troops in Congo to support M23 operations, the forced recruitment of Rwandans to fight with the M23, and the provision of weapons and ammunition to the M23. Through this support, Rwandan military officials may be complicit in war crimes. Independently from Human Rights Watch, the United Nations Group of Experts on the DRC has produced similar findings. During a visit to Kigali in October 2012, Human Rights Watch staff raised the issue of Rwandan military support for the M23 with major international donors, embassies and high commissions. None of them disputed that the Rwandan military has been backing the M23.
- iii. In late July 2012, DFID stated that the disbursement of £16 million of general budget support to Rwanda would be delayed while the Secretary of State considered whether the expectations outlined in DFID's partnership principles were still being met. In a written ministerial statement on 4 September, Andrew Mitchell, the then Secretary of State for International Development, announced that the UK would partially restore its general budget support to Rwanda by disbursing half the money which had been withheld and reprogramming the second half. He justified this decision on the basis that "Rwanda has engaged constructively with the peace process initiated through the International Conference on the Great Lakes region". Human Rights Watch sees no evidence to support this assessment of Rwanda's role in eastern DRC or of its constructive engagement at that time. On the contrary, Human Rights Watch's findings, based on extensive field research, show ongoing Rwandan military support to the M23 from late July to early September – that is throughout the period in which UK aid was withheld and after the decision to release half of it.
- iv. Andrew Mitchell's decision to resume half the delayed UK aid to Rwanda appears to have been taken hurriedly, with limited internal discussion across

Whitehall or with High Commission and DFID staff in Rwanda, and possibly against the advice of some UK officials. From recent discussions between Human Rights Watch and representatives of other major donor governments to Rwanda, including embassies in Kigali, it is also apparent that there was little or no consultation with other governments in advance of this decision.

- v. While the focus of this IDC inquiry is the decision on UK aid based on Rwanda's involvement in the DRC, Human Rights Watch is seriously concerned about wider aspects of DFID policy towards Rwanda and recommends that the IDC takes these into account, building on its inquiry into UK aid policy in the Great Lakes region in 2011. Specifically, DFID has given insufficient attention to human rights issues in its relationship with the government of Rwanda, contrary to DFID's own declared principles and the Memorandum of Understanding between the UK and Rwanda. Rwanda has repeatedly violated the terms of its agreement with the UK, and DFID has failed to honour its own principles too.
- vi. Human Rights Watch's research reveals continuing and severe restrictions on freedom of expression and association in Rwanda and an absence of political space. There is a longstanding pattern of government attacks on members of opposition parties and journalists, and harassment and intimidation of independent human rights organisations. Despite real and welcome progress on economic issues and against some important development indicators, the Rwandan government remains highly repressive and unwilling to tolerate criticism or peaceful opposition. In this context, DFID should reconsider the appropriateness of general budget support to Rwanda and whether assistance for Rwanda's poor may be better delivered through other mechanisms.

II. Human Rights Watch's work in Rwanda and DRC

- vii. Human Rights Watch is an independent, international human rights organisation. We document human rights abuses in some 90 countries around the world. We use our research to draw attention to rights abuses and call on governments to adopt policies to better respect, protect, and fulfill these rights. We press for those responsible for serious human rights abuses to be held accountable for their crimes.
- viii. HRW has been working on Rwanda and the DRC for nearly 20 years. With a permanent presence on the ground in both countries, HRW has closely monitored the human rights situation and has published numerous documents describing its research findings (available at www.hrw.org). HRW has closely followed UK government policy in the region and has regularly engaged with DFID and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office on these issues.

III. Abuses committed by the M23 in eastern DRC

- ix. The M23 armed group is largely made up of soldiers who participated in mutinies from the Congolese national army in late March and May 2012. Its senior commanders have a well-known history of serious abuses. They include General Bosco Ntaganda, who is wanted on two arrest warrants by the International Criminal Court for war crimes and crimes against humanity, and several other individuals involved in massacres and the recruitment of children in eastern DRC.
- x. Human Rights Watch has documented serious abuses by the M23 in areas under their control since April 2012, some of them amounting to war crimes. These include deliberate killings of civilians, summary executions – particularly of recruits who attempted to flee from their ranks – rapes of women and young girls, and forced recruitment, including of children. M23 fighters have also intimidated and threatened local journalists and human rights activists. Details are provided in the enclosed Human Rights Watch documents dated 11 September and 4 June 2012.

IV. Rwandan military support for the M23

- xi. Rwandan military officials have provided support to the M23 throughout the mutiny, including through the supply of weapons, ammunition and training, the recruitment of young men and boys in Rwanda, some under the age of 15, to augment the M23's ranks, and the deployment of several hundred Rwandan army soldiers to eastern DRC to support the M23's operations. On the basis of its research, Human Rights Watch estimates that between April and September, at least 600 people were recruited in Rwanda to join the M23 – some by force, others under false pretences – possibly outnumbering those recruited in the DRC. Details are provided in the enclosed Human Rights Watch documents dated 11 September and 4 June 2012. Rwandan military support to the M23 is consistent with its support to several other armed groups responsible for serious abuses in eastern Congo in previous years, in particular the National Congress for the Defence of the People (CNDP) which integrated into the Congolese army in 2009. Many senior M23 commanders and fighters were formerly in the CNDP.
- xii. The Rwandan government has vehemently denied any involvement by its troops or officials in backing the M23. Instead, it has repeatedly and publicly sought to discredit the work of the UN Group of Experts, Human Rights Watch and other organisations which have documented and denounced this support.

V. DFID's decision to delay, then resume aid to Rwanda

- xiii. In mid-July 2012, the then Secretary of State for International Development Andrew Mitchell visited Rwanda and eastern DRC. His visit took place more than

three months after the M23 had begun its mutiny and after Human Rights Watch and the UN Group of Experts first published information on Rwandan military support for the M23 (see enclosed Human Rights Watch press release of 4 June and link to the UN Group of Experts' interim report and addendum).

- xiv. In late July 2012, DFID delayed the disbursement of £16 million of UK aid to the government of Rwanda. This followed an announcement by the US government that it was suspending part of its military assistance to Rwanda in light of Rwandan support for armed groups in the DRC. In the following days and weeks, several other governments, including Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and the European Union, all announced the suspension or delay of part of their aid programmes to Rwanda for the same reason.
- xv. DFID did not widely publicise its decision to withhold this aid, but confirmed it in a short note circulated to journalists on 27 July. The note stated that the Secretary of State had decided that the disbursement of £16 million of UK aid to Rwanda should be delayed while he considered whether the expectations outlined in DFID's partnership principles were still being met. It stated:

“The UK only provides aid directly to governments who share our own commitment to the four partnership principles:

 - 1) poverty reduction and the Millennium Development Goals
 - 2) respecting human rights (from political freedoms, to the rights of minorities including Lesbian, Bisexual, Gay and Transgender and religious minorities) and other international obligations
 - 3) improving financial management, promoting good governance and transparency and fighting corruption
 - 4) being more accountable to their citizens.”
- xvi. On 3 September, in response to a ministerial question on how he was planning to leverage UK aid to Rwanda to end Rwandan support to militias in DRC, Andrew Mitchell said “the UK is able to be a ‘candid friend’ to Rwanda, engaging openly and frankly on sensitive issues at the highest levels [...] The UK will continue to maximise the leverage afforded by our development partnership with Rwanda [...] to ensure that this happens.”
- xvii. Yet just one day later, on 4 September, when the government announced a cabinet reshuffle in which Mitchell was moved from the Department for International Development to the Office of the Chief Whip, Mitchell stated in a written ministerial statement to Parliament that Britain would partially restore general budget support to Rwanda by disbursing half (£8 million) of the delayed tranche and re-programming the remaining half. He confirmed that the delay in disbursing aid in July had been based on “concerns about the impact of the

conflict on civilians in the region and reports of Rwandan involvement in the M23 mutiny.” He stated that he had “sought assurances from President Kagame that Rwanda was adhering to the strict partnership principles” but did not explain whether he had obtained such assurances or how they would be verified. He justified the decision to resume aid on the basis that “Rwanda has engaged constructively with the peace process initiated through International Conference on the Great Lakes Region and there is a continuing cease fire in the Kivus.” He also invoked the Rwandan government’s continued demonstration of “its strong commitment to reducing poverty and improving its financial management.”

- xviii. Throughout the period between the two DFID decisions, Human Rights Watch continued to document Rwandan military support to the M23 and serious abuses by the M23 against civilians in eastern DRC (see enclosed press release of 11 September 2012). Similar findings were presented in a version of the UN Group of Experts’ final report which was leaked to the media in October and is expected to be published before the end of the year. The Rwandan government repeatedly denied its army’s involvement in backing the M23, but to Human Rights Watch’s knowledge, neither the UK government nor any other foreign governments or donors to Rwanda had information contradicting the findings of Human Rights Watch or the Group of Experts. Indeed, most believed that the Rwandan military was involved in supporting the M23.
- xix. Therefore, on the basis of on-the-ground events in Rwanda and eastern DRC, there appears to have been no objective rationale for the decision to resume UK aid to Rwanda in the absence of progress on the very criterion which had triggered the decision to delay the aid in the first place.
- xx. Furthermore, the decision to resume UK aid at a time when pressure on Rwanda to cease military support to the M23 was mounting and an unprecedented number of donors (including several of the UK’s closest allies and the EU) had all suspended part of their aid to Rwanda within a few weeks had a negative impact on international efforts to resolve the situation. As several donor government officials confirmed privately to Human Rights Watch, the UK decision undermined these collective efforts and weakened their cumulative impact. It also gave an unfortunate signal to the Rwandan government that the UK was less concerned than other donors about its involvement in the DRC conflict.

VI. Human rights concerns in Rwanda

- xxi. Human Rights Watch is concerned about ongoing political repression and human rights violations inside Rwanda, which have received insufficient attention by DFID, despite the fact that these violations run contrary to DFID’s own declared principles and the Memorandum of Understanding signed by the UK and Rwanda in 2006, and revised in 2012. Human Rights Watch’s research reveals a pattern

of government attacks on members of opposition parties and journalists, including arrests, prosecutions, threats and other forms of intimidation. Freedom of expression and association remain severely restricted. Political space has not opened up since the 2010 presidential elections which President Paul Kagame won with 93% of the vote. If anything, state intimidation of opposition party members has intensified. Independent civil society organisations and activists have been harassed and intimidated. Despite its claims to openness and inclusivity, the government does not tolerate criticism or dissent.

- xxii. While the Rwandan justice system has undergone a number of positive reforms, the courts still lack independence, especially in politically sensitive cases, as illustrated by the recent judgment in the trial of opposition party leader Victoire Ingabire (see enclosed press release dated 30 October 2012).
- xxiii. Human Rights Watch has also documented cases of unlawful incommunicado detention in military custody – including of civilians – and unofficial detention centres, and several cases of detainees being forced to confess or incriminate others (particularly political opponents), sometimes under torture or under threat, sometimes through financial or material inducements.
- xxiv. In Human Rights Watch’s view, DFID has made insufficient efforts to raise these concerns with the Rwandan government, despite the fact that respect for human rights and international obligations is among the commitments cited in its MOU with Rwanda. Human Rights Watch’s concerns in this regard were outlined in evidence submitted by the organisation to the IDC for its 2011 inquiry.

VII. Revised Memorandum of Understanding between the UK and Rwanda

- xxv. On 5 September – one day after Andrew Mitchell announced the resumption of UK aid to Rwanda – the governments of the UK and Rwanda signed a revised Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), valid until February 2016. It contains some modifications to the 2006 MOU, lists DFID’s four partnership principles, and includes a new section on “strengthening domestic accountability”. Commitments on human rights and conflict prevention are similar to those in the 2006 MOU. The revised MOU contains a section on “annual reviews” in which the two governments would annually assess their commitments and review their performance, in line with DFID’s partnership principles. The revised MOU contains an annex listing “indicative sources” for informing these reviews. Human Rights Watch questions the independence or reliability of some of these sources.

VIII. Recommendations

This submission makes a number of recommendations:

- xxvi. Before releasing the remaining £8 million of budget support to Rwanda in December 2012, the Secretary of State for International Development should conduct a thorough assessment of the human rights situation in Rwanda and eastern DRC, based on a range of independent sources. The assessment should cover:
- abuses committed by the M23 in eastern DRC
 - Rwandan military support to the M23 or other armed groups
 - action taken by the Rwandan government to investigate allegations of support by its army officials to the M23 and appropriate measures to hold to account the individuals responsible
 - human rights conditions inside Rwanda, in particular restrictions on freedom of expression and association and on political space.
- xxvii. DFID should work closely with other donors to Rwanda and international partners to maximise the impact of collective pressure on Rwanda to halt all military support to the M23. Diplomatic efforts by the UK and its international partners to help find a solution to the ongoing conflict in the Great Lakes region should include a firm commitment to hold the worst human rights abusers to account, in line with international obligations to investigate and prosecute serious human rights crimes.
- xxviii. In the context of DFID's development work in Rwanda, much greater priority should be given to human rights, the rule of law, and transparent and responsive governance. The UK remains one of the most important donors to Rwanda, both bilaterally and as a significant player in the EU, and can exert considerable influence in encouraging human rights reforms.
- xxix. DFID and the Rwandan government should make **public statements** on their annual assessment of their respective commitments under the revised MOU. DFID should ensure that the "indicative sources" for informing reviews and assessments under the MOU include a range of independent, non-governmental sources and information from Rwandan and international human rights organisations.
- xxx. DFID should also publish its human rights assessment on Rwanda, which it was to undertake as part of the annual review of its operational plans in all its country programmes.
- xxxi. DFID should make clear to the Rwandan government, at regular intervals and publicly, that it expects it to fulfill its commitments under the revised MOU and to respect all of DFID's partnership principles.

- xxxii. In light of Rwandan military backing for abusive armed groups in the DRC, and continuing violations of civil and political rights inside Rwanda, DFID should review the appropriateness of general budget support to the Rwandan government and consider whether assistance for Rwanda's poor may be better delivered through other mechanisms.

November 2012

Written evidence submitted by Christian Aid

Summary

1. This submission relates to the UK's aid relationship with Rwanda in the context of recent allegations of Rwandan support to the M23 and other armed groups in Eastern DRC. Following a report by the United Nations Group of Experts (GoE) implicating support by the Rwandan Government for armed groups in DRC, the UK delayed disbursement of £16 million in budget support. This money was subsequently reinstated 6 weeks later.
2. Christian Aid welcomes UK efforts to promote transparency to ensure aid goes to those who need it most and to promote open societies and open economies. In this light we welcome the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) underpinning the principles of Rwanda-UK aid partnership and long term support for the Government of Rwanda (GoR), which has been essential in helping Rwanda rebuild after the genocide.
3. However, Christian Aid is concerned about the recent decision by DFID to disburse previously withheld budgetary support to the Government of Rwanda (GoR). This concern stems from ongoing allegations of the GoR's support for M23 and insufficient assurances from the GoR that violations of the MoU and UN Arms Embargo on DRC have ceased. Additionally Christian Aid would like to have seen a more exhaustive use of UK diplomatic leverage in the region and the exploration of alternate modalities of aid delivery.
4. This submission makes a number of recommendations for the UK Government:
 - Withholding aid to Rwanda has an immediate impact on the poorest and risks destabilising Rwanda, therefore we encourage DFID to reallocate their upcoming disbursements to Rwanda to be channelled through (local) NGO's and civil society, as well as the earmarking of funds disbursed to the Rwandan Government to reach those in need. This will give a clear signal to the Rwandan Government that violations of international commitments and the MoU are unacceptable.
 - The MoU between the UK and Rwanda should be revitalised and strongly monitored, with both sides living up to principles included in the MoU. The UK Government has an obligation to publicly condemn any violation of the MoU, step up its diplomatic and monitoring efforts over allegations of violations, and to take appropriate and strong steps in case of violations.
 - Beyond immediate funding decisions, taking into account Rwanda's role and influence in peace and stability in the region, the UK should use its leverage and influence as a major donor, in the UN and in the EU to take a more active stand on the search for solutions to the current crisis, that takes into account a country specific and regional approach.
 - This should include a redefined relationship with Rwanda that not only focuses on dealing with Rwanda's involvement in the current crisis in eastern DRC but also examines the internal political situation in Rwanda where democratic space and respect for human rights are increasingly under pressure.

I. Introduction

1. Christian Aid is a Christian organization that insists the world can and must be swiftly changed to one where everyone can live a full life, free from poverty. We work globally in over 40 countries for profound change that eradicates the causes of poverty, striving to achieve equality, dignity and freedom for all, regardless of faith or nationality. We are part of a wider movement for social justice. We provide urgent, practical and effective assistance where need is great, tackling the effects of poverty as well as its root causes.
2. Christian Aid has programmes in Rwanda, as well as in the DRC and Burundi, adopting a regional approach to addressing the difficulties in the shared difficulties in the Great Lakes. Our work in the 'Great Lakes region' began in the 1960s, by supporting churches in Rwanda to meet the needs of rural communities. Today we work in the region supporting our local partners' efforts to tackle the underlying causes of poverty and instability.
3. Christian Aid's report *It's Time to Open Up* published in 2004, described the human rights, governance and accountability situation in Rwanda 10 years after the genocide. The report recognised the important progress made in post-genocide reconstruction in Rwanda, but also the need to start opening political and civil space in Rwanda and for the Rwandan government to promote peace and stability in eastern DRC. Our subsequent experience has convinced us that this remains the case.
4. We welcome this opportunity to provide written evidence on 'UK aid to Rwanda'. We have included specific recommendations for UK Government (HMG) action in their bilateral and multilateral aid programmes, and in their diplomatic efforts in Rwanda, as well as in the Great Lakes Region. We are happy to provide further evidence via Barry Johnston, UK Political Advisor, bjohnston@christian-aid.org or 020 7523 2175.

II. Brief overview of the current situation

1. The interim report of the United Nations Group of Experts (GoE) published in June 2012 (and its addendum) found that Rwanda is providing extensive support to armed groups in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), in particular to the March 23 rebellion (M23)¹. The report also includes allegations of support to six other armed groups. The Rwandan government has denied these allegations and provided an official response to the allegations made in the Addendum at the end of July 2012².
2. Following the publishing of the interim report of the UN GoE, the UK government expressed concerns about the situation in the Kivu provinces of eastern Congo directly with the Rwandan Foreign Minister as well as with the Rwandan President Kagame. In July 2012 the UK decided to delay a payment of £16 million of budgetary support to the GoR. In addition, after Rwanda's response to the UN GoE report, the Minister of State for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office said that the UK government did not have any evidence provided by Ministers and others in the Government of Rwanda that convinced them that the allegations were unfounded. However, only six weeks later, budgetary support was reinstated, this time pointing to Rwanda's internal success story and its constructive engagement with regional peace processes³.
3. Christian Aid is concerned at the reversal of this decision without citing any appreciable change in the circumstance that led to the suspension. Specifically, there has been no evidence of the GoR ceasing

¹ S/2012/348 and S/2012/348/Add.1

² Rwanda's response to the allegations contained in the addendum to the UN Group of Experts Interim Report, 27 July 2012

³ Written Ministerial Statement by the Secretary of State, International Development, Andrew Mitchell, September 4th 2012, <http://www.theyworkforyou.com/wms/?id=2012-09-04a.22WS.1&s=mitchell+rwanda#g22WS.2>

support to M23 and other armed groups; regional discussions at the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region have failed to provide tangible results; and local reports indicate increasing concerns about the protection of civilians in conflict affected regions.

4. ***Taking into account that concerns remain over Rwandan involvement with the M23 rebellion and taking into account that the final UN GoE report will inform the next UK disbursement of GBS scheduled for December 2012, Christian Aid recommends a revision of current the UK-Rwanda aid funding. Such a revision needs to take into account that simply withholding aid will have an immediate impact on the poorest and risks destabilising Rwanda. Therefore we encourage DFID to reprogram aid through different (local) NGO's and civil society channels and earmarking funds to the GoR to reach those most in need. This is an essential step in giving a clear signal to the Rwandan Government that any violations of international commitments and the non-fulfilment of the MoU will not be accepted.***
5. ***We further recommend that that while deciding over upcoming disbursements of aid to Rwanda, it is of the utmost importance the UK government takes into account Rwanda's role and influence in peace and stability in the region. Aid should come along with the UK using its leverage and influence as a major donor, in the UN and in the EU to take a more active stand on the search for solutions to the current crisis, which takes into account a country specific and regional approach.***

III. The Rwanda-UK Memorandum of Understanding and other agreements

6. The development partnership between the UK and Rwanda is framed by a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed in 1999 and updated in 2006, and underpins the aid partnership for Direct Budgetary Support between the two countries. While the MoU is not a legally-binding document, the MoU can be seen as a public expression of the intentions, goals and principles of the aid partnership. The MoU sets out that the Government of Rwanda commits to elements of conflict prevention, includes promoting peace and security in the Great Lakes Region and compliance with relevant international obligations, as well as supporting conflict prevention activities.
7. Rwanda has also signed various international commitments relating to peace in the region. These include the 2006 *"Pact on Security, Stability and Development in the Great Lakes Region"*, a legally binding document that obliges states *"to abstain from sending or supporting armed opposition forces or armed groups or insurgents onto the territory of other Member States"*, as well as the 2007 *Nairobi Joint Communiqué* committing the Government of Rwanda to: *"Take all necessary measures to seal its border to prevent the entry into or exit from its territory of members of any armed group, renegade militia leaders and prevent any form of support – military, material or human - being provided to any armed group in the DRC"*.
8. In 2003, with the adoption of Resolution 1493, the United Nations Security Council imposed an arms embargo on all foreign and Congolese armed groups operating in North Kivu, South Kivu and Ituri. The Resolution demanded *"that all States and in particular those in the region, including the Democratic Republic of the Congo, ensure that no direct or indirect assistance, especially military or financial assistance, is given to the movements and armed groups present in the Democratic Republic of the Congo"*. Taking into account that the arms embargo was modified over the years, the embargo on non-governmental forces remains in place and has been extended until 30 November 2012.
9. The MoU also sets out terms with regard to steps the UK Government can take following the non-fulfilment of commitments. Assistance can be interrupted or reduced when, among other things, *"the*

Government of Rwanda is in significant violation of human rights or other international obligations, especially those relating to regional peace and security”⁴.

10. ***The allegations in the interim UN GoE report suggest a violation of both international commitments and the MoU between Rwanda and the UK. These allegations are of such strength that the UK should take a more proactive stance on publicly condemning any non-fulfilment of the MoU, should step up its diplomatic and monitoring efforts over these allegations, and should develop follow-up steps in case of violations.***

IV. The UK’s wider relationship with Rwanda

11. Since the Rwandan genocide, the UK has become Rwanda’s largest bilateral aid donor, spending an average total budget of £83 million per year. The UK government also plays a key role in the European Union (also a major donor to Rwanda) and invests significant amounts of aid in the DRC and neighbouring Burundi, either bilaterally or multilaterally. This places the UK government in a position to influence policies in Rwanda bilaterally, via the European Union and regionally.
12. Rwanda has made remarkable progress towards reconstruction and consolidating internal security after the devastation of the civil war and 1994 genocide, especially with regard to economic growth and the Millennium Development Goals. Laudable efforts were made to promote national reconciliation. However, these efforts have not comprehensively addressed realities of Rwandan society and politics which contributed to the genocide in the first place; tensions around ethnic identity and power, coupled with the tendency for top-down authoritarian rule. These realities perpetuate the disempowerment of citizens who do not dare question authority.
13. The UK government has continuously referred to Rwanda as a success story, speaking about the country *‘being a role model for development and lifting people out of poverty in Africa’⁵*. Despite the fact that in its Operational Plan for Rwanda (2011-2015) DFID mentions that *‘Rwanda’s development progress is impressive, but it is also fragile’* in terms of state-building, concerns about state-building elements have rarely been revealed or referred to in public. While the FCO has sometimes been more critical of Rwanda’s role in the region and its internal developments, the UK government has sometimes appeared less responsive to these challenges.
14. ***In the context of UK aid to Rwanda, the UK government needs to redefine its relation with Rwanda by prioritizing increased attention to the countries internal political situation. A more proactive stance on the fragility of development in Rwanda by addressing democratic space, human rights and strengthening civil society in Rwanda is key to long term stability, development and accountable governance.***

November 2012

⁴ Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Republic of Rwanda (2006)

⁵David Cameron, response in All Commons Debate, 17 October 2012

Evidence of Rwandan involvement with the M23 rebel group in eastern DRC

1. The report published on June 21st and its Addendum on June 27th by the UN Group of Experts shaded a new light on Rwandan involvement through its support of the M23 rebel group in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of Congo.
2. Before this recent interference, there have been many other reports by UN experts which in 2000, 2001, 2003 and 2006 continuously reported on Rwandan persistent and destabilising presence in particularly the Eastern part of DRC.
3. The evidence that this note highlights focuses specifically on operations inside Rwanda that government security forces have undertaken which are aimed among other things at silencing witnesses inside Rwanda who have been relaying with the outside informing their contacts on these actions of the Rwandan government which are intended to support the M23 rebel group.
4. In an note released on Sunday 26/08/12 and intended to the general public, Boniface Twagirimana, one of the leading members of the unregistered Rwandan political party FDU-Inkingi of imprisoned Ms Victoire Ingabire, indicated that his colleague official of the same party, Silvain Sibomana, had been severely injured the night before by Rwandan Local Defence Forces [LDF], when he went to the rescue of a neighbor, Dominique Shyirambere, from another political party of the opposition, PS-Imberakuri.
5. Dominique Shyirambere, who that night had been besieged in his house from 10.00 pm by Local Defence Forces' individuals, was initially asked to open the door and let that group of people in, but refused. They decided then to spend the whole night outside waiting for him.
6. It is important here to highlight that Shyirambere had been previously arrested on 27/07/10 because of being a leader from an opposition party and having participated in a protest which had not been authorized. Only public and political demonstrations supportive of the regime are authorized. Having at several occasions suffered torture from his jailers, he was released a year later without any charge or compensation.
7. With regard the incident, when the police was called and found that it was members of the political opposition being victimised, instead of asking to LDF members why they were beating Silvain Sibomana, they took the latter who was injured to the police station of Remera. [This has become a general pattern of Kagame's security forces of adding misery to victims of his oppressive system].

8. The same note explains that once Alice Muhirwa, FDU-Inkingi treasurer, and Gratién Nsabiyaemye, responsible of youth, heard of the attack on and incarceration of their colleague, they went straight to the police station of Remera, for at least to get him looked after by a health specialist. Instead, they were also themselves taken into custody.
9. Above points are explained to highlight the fact that, inside Rwanda, though all the leaders of opposition parties were imprisoned, including Victoire Ingabire Umuhiza, who was sentenced on Tuesday October 30th, 2012 to 8 years of imprisonment, their colleagues named here are the only eyes for the outside that are still there to inform on issues such as the involvement of Rwanda for example recruiting forcibly young Rwandans for the M23 rebel group.
10. The ongoing practice of intense intimidation and violent harassment of Rwandans inside the country is not aimed only at the political opposition, which is officially absent. In August and September 2012 we received many accounts of young people being rounded up in the hundreds across Rwanda [apparently to seek forced recruits for M23, say informed sources]. Other people were knifed or injured by machetes to increase fear in regions where the regime suspects possibilities of popular uprising, like Gitarama].

Young people without official employment across Rwanda are being round up. On 23/08/12, this group was taken into police custody in Rusizi area. A similar exercise was performed this week in Kimicanga area of Kigali – the Rwandan capital. Sources in the country confirm that some of these young people end up forcibly given accelerated military training with the ultimate purpose of sending them in DRC to reinforce M23 contingent of fighters. And this appears unfortunate knowing that recent cuts or delays of aid from donor countries were a consequence to Rwandan support to that Congolese rebel movement.

11. And all this attitude of Paul Kagame regime towards its citizens comes as a reaction to an increased isolation of his government consequent to his involvement with the Congolese rebel movement M23. As this erratic behaviour persists from the Rwandan leader, the international community needs to monitor closely the excesses of oppression towards the Rwandan population which is becoming more and more victim of his political frustrations.
12. On September 11th, 2012 Human Rights Watch confirmed in a 14 pages report about the continuous drive of recruiting for M23 by Rwandan authorities despite previous allegations by UN experts on similar issue.
13. Following the decision by donor countries to cut or delay aid to Rwanda which came after the UN report showing its involvement with the M23 rebel group, the

Rwandan president has set up the Agaciro Development Fund which officially is aimed at filling partially the financial gap caused by the reduction of external assistance.

14. But the structure and administration of that fund is intentionally kept unclear by the RPF regime while at the same its enforcement tools meaning security forces are deployed nationwide to forcibly get contributions from a population which already suffers a range of different forms of poverty, namely not being able to send their children to school, get medicine when they are ill because they cannot afford the medical insurance, etc.
15. And because of the intentional lack of clarity in the management of the Fund, many voices particularly from those being forced to contribute are fearing that their money might end up going to support the M23 rebel group, since there is no transparency in what collected funds will be allocated at, or mechanisms of accountability.

November 2012

Written evidence from the Department for International Development

Introduction

1. The International Development Committee is to examine the decision by the Department for International Development (DFID) to withhold, and subsequently partially disburse, general budget support to the Government of Rwanda following allegations about its involvement with the M23 rebel group in eastern Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC).
2. On 5 January 2012, the Committee published a report entitled, 'Working effectively in fragile and conflict-affected states: DRC and Rwanda.' This included thirteen clear recommendations on building improved resilience through aid and humanitarian programmes, ensuring the most vulnerable and hard to reach benefit and working with a broad range of partners to deliver as effectively as possible. DFID appreciates this report and is continuing to follow up on these recommendations, including in Rwanda.
3. The current reports on Rwanda's involvement in eastern DRC are deeply concerning and the UK Government is looking carefully at the evidence whilst holding regular and frank conversations with the Government of Rwanda.
4. The UK Government remains committed to helping the people of Rwanda to lift themselves out of poverty. Rwanda is home to five million poor people and we know that delaying or suspending aid often only hurts the poorest. Through the DFID programme, it is planned that between 2011 and 2015 the UK Government will provide direct support for 135,200 of Rwanda's poorest people each year, help register the land of 4 million men and women to give their families and businesses greater stability, distribute a million bed-nets, and help 45,000 children to complete basic education. For further information on what DFID is doing in Rwanda please see Annex B, which provides an excerpt from the DFID Rwanda Operational Plan.
5. The Government of Rwanda has a strong track record of using aid money effectively to lift its citizens out of poverty. The economic growth and development results that Rwanda has delivered over the last five years have been remarkable. For example, between 2005 and 2010 the proportion of the Rwandan population identified as poor reduced by 12 percentage points to 45%. On education, Rwanda is now recording net enrolment rates into primary education at 92% (compared with 76% across Sub-Saharan Africa) and on health under 5 mortality levels decreased to 54 deaths per 1000 live births¹ from 152 in 2005.

Decisions on budget support disbursement

6. Two disbursements of general budget support were planned to the Government of Rwanda for 2012/13. The first disbursement, originally planned for July, was cut in half in early September (from £16 million to £8 million) to reflect the UK Government's concerns regarding the situation in the eastern DRC. The remaining £8 million was reallocated to programmes

¹Committing to Child Survival: A Promise Renewed – UNICEF 2012

which seek to improve service delivery in the education and agriculture sectors. The Secretary of State will consider the matter of budget support very carefully ahead of the next decision point (on a further £21m) in December.

7. The previous Secretary of State delayed the disbursement of the first tranche of General Budget Support in early July because, following the release of the draft Group of Experts report, the UK Government wanted assurances that Rwanda was adhering to our partnership principles. He visited the Kivus region of DRC and Rwanda in mid-July and underscored the need for dialogue - including between Presidents Kabila and Kagame - to resolve this crisis.
8. Over the remainder of July and August, the UK Government assessed that the Government of Rwanda had engaged constructively in the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region (ICGLR) peace talks chaired by President Museveni of Uganda. An informal ceasefire resulted in a significant lull in fighting for the four weeks prior to the decision to disburse at the beginning of September.
9. As a result of this progress, combined with the ongoing strong economic development and poverty reduction focus and results in Rwanda, the UK Government judged that the Government of Rwanda had partially met the DFID partnership principles. In particular, it had continued to demonstrate strong commitment to reducing poverty and improving its financial management.
10. The previous Secretary of State provided a written statement to Parliament on the 4th September to explain the decision to disburse half of the delayed general budget support and redirect the other £8m to programmes in the education and agriculture sectors (see Box 1 for the results that will be delivered through the £8m redirected to these sectors). The statement explained that 'this decision reflects our responsibility to protect the poor, but also caution as concerns remain over Rwanda's involvement with the M23 rebels.'
11. The UK remains concerned about the reports of Rwanda's involvement with the M23 rebels. The UK Government has had several very frank conversations with the Rwandan Government underlining that Rwanda must do more to meet our joint partnership principles in full and play a constructive role in bringing about a peaceful resolution to the crisis in eastern DRC. It should work with others to seek long term resolution of the issues affecting the region.

Box 1: The additional money redirected to the education and agriculture sectors will deliver clear results for the people of Rwanda.

The Education Service Delivery Grant (£5m) will deliver:

- The construction of about 800 classrooms which will support about 60,480 pupils in primary and lower secondary school
- The procurement of 400,000 textbooks for use in primary and lower secondary school

The Agriculture Service Delivery Grant (£3m) will deliver:

- Provision of fertilizers to increase the production of key food security crops by about 250,000 metric tonnes
- Protection of approximately 2,400 families from the destruction of crops and livestock through a land management programme

Comment on the UN Group of Experts final report

12. The summary of UN Group of Experts' annual report on the situation in eastern DRC has been leaked. The next step is for the Group of Experts to brief the UN Sanctions Committee (expected 12 November). The report could remain confidential or be formally made public at a point thereafter. The full report will, however, form an important part of the evidence that the Secretary of State will consider in advance of her December decision on budget support to Rwanda.

November 2012

Annex B: Excerpt from DFID Rwanda operational plan

Overview

The Government of Rwanda is pushing for, and achieving, exceptionally fast development. A post-genocide emphasis on reconstruction, state-building and basic services is now shifting to one of economic transformation and growth, requiring a vigorous private sector attracting strong investment and generating revenues to replace high levels of aid. DFID sees the need for four fundamental transformations: i) from an agricultural economy to private sector-led growth; ii) significantly improved education and health services that deliver the Millennium Development Goals; iii) increased accountability of the state to citizens and empowerment of women, girls and the extreme poor; and iv) transition to more open and inclusive politics and enhanced human rights. The UK development programme in Rwanda is designed to catalyse these transformations.

Rwanda's development progress is impressive, but it is also fragile. The tightly-controlled political system, coupled with fast-paced improvement of services and creation of wealth, are fundamental aspects of Rwanda's state-building strategy. The UK's political discussions with the Rwandan Government focus on ensuring this process becomes increasingly inclusive, so that Rwanda's development success can be sustained through the political transitions of 2017.

Alignment to DFID and wider UK Government priorities

In close partnership with the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) in Rwanda, DFID is:

- Scaling up UK support in Rwanda in recognition of Rwanda's excellent development performance. DFID will continue to provide a significant proportion of the UK's support through budget support (an average of 65% over the four years – [although this is now under review – see main text]) because this is spent well and accountably; delivers measurable results; and maintains the UK's influence over development expenditure and results and ability to engage in debate on governance/political issues;
- Increasing governance analysis and dialogue working with the FCO and other partners to ensure a more robust, constructive, evidence-based dialogue with the government which helps open political and economic space.
- Increasing citizens' ability to hold government to account, spending an amount equivalent to 6.5% of the UK's budget support on increasing accountability.
- Stepping up UK support to the private sector, including boosting regional trade, reflecting the need to harness the private sector for growth and address constraints to private-sector led growth, consistent with the UK's Africa Free Trade Initiative, and working cooperatively with the FCO on commercial diplomacy.
- Supporting the Government of Rwanda to protect the poorest people and the economy from the effects of a changing climate, given Rwanda's particular vulnerability to its effects, and work with FCO to increase Rwanda's global voice on climate change.
- Targeting the poor, through sector budget support in health, education and agriculture, and social protection for the most vulnerable.
- Contributing to all four areas of DFID's strategic vision in support of girls and women: delay first pregnancy; direct assets for girls and women; get girls through secondary school and prevent violence against girls and women.

- Supporting the Government of Rwanda further to cement its commitment to poverty reduction in the next Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (2013-17), drawing on lessons from the DFID programme in Rwanda, and DFID's technical skills in social, political and economic analysis.
- Clearly describing the results DFID aims to achieve, and progress in doing so, emphasising value for money and transparency;
- Continuing to work in closely with development partners in Rwanda to achieve greater aid effectiveness.

November 2012



Department
for International
Development



Rt. Hon. Andrew Mitchell MP,
Secretary of State

Rt. Hon. David Cameron MP
Prime Minister
No 10 Downing Street

31 August 2012

Dear Prime Minister,

As you know in July I visited the Kivus region in eastern DRC to witness and discuss the impact of the conflict on civilians and MONUSCO. Based on reports of Rwandan involvement in the M23 mutiny I decided to delay the first £16m disbursement of General Budget Support (GBS) for the financial year 2012/13. I delivered tough messaging to the Rwandans, including the President, Defence and Finance Ministers, that any support to the mutiny must end. I also sought assurances that Rwanda was adhering to its strict partnership principles on GBS, which I strengthened in summer 2011.

You recently set three conditions against which any decision on disbursing GBS should be based. I judge that Rwanda has moved significantly against two of these: the Rwandan Government has engaged constructively in the ICGLR peace talks chaired by President Museveni of Uganda (condition one). There has been a continuing ceasefire in the Kivus and reporting shows that practical support to the M23 has now ended (condition three). However, there has been no public condemnation by Rwanda of the M23 group (condition two).

Given this reasonable progress, and recognising that the Government of Rwanda has continued to demonstrate its strong commitment to reducing poverty and improving its financial management, I have now decided to disburse half (£8m) of the delayed £16m as GBS and to re-allocate the other half to targeted DFID programmes in education and food security. The re-programmed money will put over 60,000 more Rwandan

children into primary school, half of whom would be girls, and increase production of key food security crops by an estimated 5,130 metric tonnes.

As we have discussed, this balanced approach reflects my continued concern about the crisis in eastern DRC and Rwanda's part in that. At the same time it ensures that our response does not undermine Rwanda's progress in reducing poverty and delivering essential services. After all, cutting GBS entirely would only hurt ordinary Rwandans, denying children an education and damaging our efforts to bolster food security.

Looking ahead it is important that the UK, in concert with others, maintains pressure on the governments in both Rwanda and the DRC to fully resolve the chronic instability in the Kivus. In December I will take a further decision on whether or not to disburse the second GBS payment for 2012/13, including an additional performance payment. I will ensure that both you and the Foreign Secretary are closely consulted in that decision.

I am copying this letter to the Foreign Secretary with whom I have discussed and agreed this approach.

*with her unity
your and
Andrew*

ANDREW MITCHELL

Written evidence submitted by Rene C Mugenzu

1 brief introduction about you

Rene C Mugenzi, I am a British citizen of Rwandan origin. UK resident since 1997. I am current CEO of London Centre for Social Impact, a social exclusion and community development think tank. I am a winner of various community development awards and recognition for my work with disadvantaged communities within underprivileged neighbourhood in UK. I am also the creator of British Grassroot Action Awards. I was Liberal Democrat candidate in 2010 local election in London Borough of Greenwich.

On my spare time a human right activist in relation to African Great Lakes region and coordinator of Global Campaign of Rwandans Human Rights.

In May 2011, the Metropolitan Police gave me a "Threats to life Warning Notice" that they had reliable intelligence which states that the Rwandan Government posed imminent threat to my life. They added that the threat could come in any form.

Fact about the Rwandan support to M23 support

1. UN group of experts has found credible evidence that Rwandan government directly support the M23 rebel group in Rwanda.
2. Congolese government has reported that it has always knew.
3. Rwandan Government has always denied those allegations, saying that they were baseless.
4. Reasons behind RPF support to M23 rebels
5. Despite that the Rwandan Patriotic Army (which was an armed group of Rwandan Patriot Front) has become Rwandan Defence Force after armed struggle in 1994, it has continued to be used in serving the interest of the Rwandan Patriotic Front instead of the Rwandan state.
6. Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) as a political party has a lot of economic interest in mines of DRC.
7. Rwandan Patriotic Front has taken advantage of DRC weak governance, unfinished grievances in East DRC to fuel conflicts that would facilitate them to access various mineral resources.
8. This has enabled RPF to build a strong business empire and became according to the Financial Times investigation "One of the best endowed political movement in the world, relative to the size of the country"
9. To grow that wealth the RPF has closed the private sector to only RPF owned companies or companies on which RPF has invested in.

10. This issue of private sector space that is dominated by RPF owned companies has been known by DFID for some time. It came up in a meeting which was held in December 2010 in Rwanda between DFID secretary of state Andrew Mitchel and Rwandan president Paul Kagame (FOI from DFID). This issue was also raised in a meeting which was held on Tuesday 2nd November 2010 between Parliamentary Under Secretary of States O'Brian and DFID Rwanda.

Impact of DFID budget support to Rwanda

11. The DFID budget support to Rwanda Government is unrestricted fund, therefore is spent in anything that is part of the general budget.
12. The specific impact of DFID support to Rwanda Government cannot be singled out identified within the general Rwandan government achievements
13. But the DFID budget support can be attributed in making Rwandan government (RFP) financially comfortable so that they can afford in spending DFID money or any other tax revenue generated income into military and intelligence activities that lead to conflicts in DRC in order to generate wealth for the RPF.
14. DFID has not contributed in reducing the poverty level in Rwanda. In fact according to UNDP poverty rate in Rwanda is worse than pre-genocide era.
15. More than half of the population was poor, and poverty reduction remain slow (FOI - Minutes of Parliamentary Under Secretary of States O'Brian and DFID Rwanda to discuss DFID Rwanda's Bilateral Aid Review offer – Tuesday 2nd November 2010 at 11:30)
16. The widely known truth versus facts about Rwandan government achievements and image
17. Why these facts about the Rwandan government are not widely known despite that their consequences reach wider population?
18. Rwandan government PR has been effective in painting an image of a successful story. The story based on fact that 1994 when RPF took over the power it counted as the year 0 of Rwanda growth and development. Forgetting that facts that previous governments have had more than 10 years of growth and built considerable infrastructures (UNDP).
19. Rwandan government has invested some of its generated income into British and USA PR companies to help them to embellish its international image.
20. This has been reported by Guardian in UK and the Global The Globe and Mail in USA in which it was reported that " For a monthly fee of \$50,000 plus expenses, the U.S. agency offered a tantalizing prospect to the Rwandan government: a burnished image, a sophisticated media campaign - and a chance at "drowning out" those pesky opposition voices on the Web"
21. It is clear that this amount did not come from targeted development budget, but from the unrestricted budget which is much composed by DFID money.
22. All independent media in Rwanda are closed. Journalists criticising the government have either been assassinated, exiled or imprisoned.
23. Freedom of speech is oppressed in the name of control of speech that can fuel genocide.
24. Political space closed; no criticism and control about the Government actions.

Rwandan governance decision making environment that manage to fuel conflicts

25. Rwanda political space is limited to RPF and political parties that are in alliance of them.
26. Really opposition partly have not been allowed to work in the country.
27. The main 3 opposition leaders have been imprisoned for political motivated charges.
28. This gives open political and military space for RPF to operate in without any challenge and control on its actions.
29. Last presidential elections were dominated only by RPF and allied parties. Opposition parties were not allowed to participate, they were harassed and others assassinated prior to election.
30. Rwandan government produced reports on achievements gained as result of support received from DFID cannot be reliable as they are produced by a non-reliable government which has not counter checking independent systems.

Recommendation

31. Rwanda political space should be opened in order to allow non RPF Politian's to participate in political arena
 32. Strong political decision making which does not include RPF only be important to reduce RPF dominance.
 33. Rwandan government should restructure the army in order to make it a mainstream state army instead of RFP serving army.
 34. Decision about the Rwandan should consider based on humanitarian and ethical values and based , considering number of people who have been extremely suffering and been uprooted (lives destroyed) in DRC as result of RPF support to M23 rebels in contrast of supposed number of people in Rwanda whose lives have been changes as result of budget support to Rwanda.
 35. DFID should stop the whole budget support to Rwanda until it has opened political and economic space and allow Rwanda to become a democracy that follow rule of law and justice. This system is the only one that will guarantee:
 - a. Rwanda achievement its development potentiality as result of free participation (political, economic and media) of different contributors
 - b. Peaceful relationship with its neighbour as the Rwandan government will not be able to fuel conflict as result of a different decision making system.
 36. Lastly
-

Normally Rwanda which has known genocide and unbearable suffering of its people as result of various conflicts, it should be in front line promoting peace, justice and reconciliation not fuelling conflicts in .other countries and not oppressing opponents

November 2012

CONGO QUESTION: BEYOND THE 'M23'

- Dr Mukwege and Mr David Hague, MP, statement

By this time, we would like just to remind you the latest negative development of the Congo War: the attempt of assassination of Dr Mukwege, the only witness and assistance to the millions Congolese raped women. His interviews and especially his request of dealing deeply with any peace solution need to be taken in account. In his statement, our Foreign Office Secretary, William Hague, has condemned this attempt and asked for any light from the Congolese government. We believe to the weakness or the complicity of the Congolese regime and it is an illusion to expect any light from that side. Some famous affairs known internationally are strong evidences to avoid dreaming for having any cooperation or collaboration from them.

- Fears from Congolese to give evidence: British running for Rwanda!

Another very important point to take in account is that, most of Congolese believe strongly that the British and American establishments has many ties with Rwanda; they even send every times their young and volunteer in Rwanda making positive contribution that they seem to become blind for any opinion opposite to what they believe or know about Rwanda. We know that it is not easy for Congolese to reverse this situation. And, opposite to Rwandese regime that seems to develop a very strong international lobbying relationship, the Congolese side seems very weak and unprofessional. The fact that the decision for Andrew Mitchell to resume Rwandese assistance the day after the Congo Foreign Office minister visited London is a strong message that the Congolese diplomacy is not working.

There is another fear from Congolese thinking that any contribution will be leaked to the Rwandese side and, as most of times, as explained below, they have strong impact and involvement in Congo matters, it is not impossible for some Congolese to feel uncomfortable to give any evidence, fear for the security of their relatives back home. The last story of the Rwandese refugee in London to be warning by the MI5 that she should be assassinated by people sent from Kigali is also another clear evidence of that fear.

Congolese opinion abroad and back home believes strongly that what happened in East of the Congo, the war and everything else is the involvement of the British and Americans in their search and will of exploiting the Congo natural resources, using their allies on the region: the Rwandese. As a Congolese proverb says: *"A chick, even very big, could never fill a pot. If a chick fills a pot; it means that a big chicken is below"*. Only any positive involvement of the British could stop this opinion.

When we commemorated the centenary of the Royal Albert Hall rally by the Congo Reform Association, the invited lady and chair of the raped women project at Bukavu came only with one message from the Congolese voiceless: *"Please, is it possible to make this request to the British Prime Minister and his government: could they take their telephone and speak to President Obama asking him also to take his telephone and to tell to president Paul Kagame only one message: leave the Congo! Stop killing in Congo!"*

Now, one of us who just came back from the region came with another message: *“Please, is it possible for us to know how many people they need to be died, so that we could offer them those people to kill and then we could live in peace, farming peacefully and schooling our children? Please, what is the number of the women they want to be rapped so that we could agree for them to rap them straight and then they could leave us living in peace? We know the truth that they are exploiting minerals for their mobile phones and computers, what do we need to do for them to exploit and buy fairly those minerals, by installing their headquarters at Kinshasa, instead of been the witness of aeroplanes taking minerals to Rwanda?”*

Another incredible truth is why Congolese populations need to suffer and to be killed for what they have not been involved: the Rwandese genocide! And shy the international community who forced Congolese to open their doors to their neighbours, seems weak to stop for Congolese for be killing for nothing?

- Only British could work for peace in the region like in Sierra Leone

Our motto by making this contribution is not to add any other evidence for the reason you will read below, *but is an appeal for Their Right Honourable Members of Parliament to take this opportunity to look beyond the now problem of the M23: the need of a real innovative peace approach for the end of the Congo wars.* As Latin proverb said: *“Causa sublata, tollitur effectus”*, when the cause if removed, the effect will cease. And the cause of everything that happen in Congo is the war.

We are very proud to live here and we are very proud of our parliament involvement in Congo question. We believe also strongly that the solution for the peace in Congo could come only from British side. Not only because British have not any colonial ties with the Congo, but they are the only who could have an innovative approach and because the now Rwanda regime have strong links with British establishment. British could then influence positively any peace solution for the Congo.

The example of the British involvement in peace process in Sierra Leone could be taken in account. The Congolese population are requested the same British involvement as any other has not bring peace.

- History of the positive British involvement in Congo question

In the project we run *“Bamonimambo (The Witnesses): Congo and Wales Roots and Routes”* and in the book published *“Rediscovering Congo and Wales Common heritage”* we learned the lessons of the positive involvement of British to end the King Leopold II atrocities in Congo, atrocities reported for example by Joseph Conrad in his novel *“Heart of the Darkness”*. It was a British journalist, Morel, who created the Congo Reform Association and who started reporting about the King atrocities in Congo. It was then that British parliament commissioned a special Consul for the Congo, Roger Casement, who published his report and that the “Congo Question” was backed by the British parliament with specific recommendations to end the bloody inhuman Congo rubber business. It was also that association that organised on 19th November 1909 the big rally and meeting in London Royal Albert Hall and it was then that the King stopped the atrocities and sold Congo to Belgium before died. History lesson could be learned.

- The illusion of the now Congolese and Rwandese regimes to work for peace

One needs to learn about the Congo war, as it started by the Rwandese regime in power then at Kigali who wanted to avoid themselves to be attacked from the Congo borders by the Interamwe, living in Congolese refugee camps. When they successfully destroyed those camps, they created the

so called AFDL rebellions and, as the then Mobutu regime was also corrupted and weak, they started pushing the war till the withdrawal of Mobutu on May 1997. Since then, any Congolese government even army have strong link with Rwandese regime and army. They all were trained by Rwandese and even when new rebellions were created, they all were backed by Rwanda.

It is not possible for any Congolese after government or regime to stay away from that shadow. They are all beholden to the Rwanda.

The first consequence of this situation is that the Congolese voice will never been listened and Congolese regime will have every times an inferiority complex when dealing with the Rwandese; the now regime if the fruit of the Rwandese involvement in Congo. And also, when for any reason, Congolese side want to build any peace process, they would like to prove to the Rwandese that they are also strong and independents; so the ongoing war between then.

The reality is that any militia, force, war solution could not solve the Congo and Rwandese problem. Only peace makers, peace approaches, peace talks and peace innovative strategies could bring peace in that region and between Congolese and Rwandese. There is nothing wrong between poor Rwandese population and the Congolese side. They were dealing and networking and exchanging and trading and marrying since century. They were helping each others during calamities and assisting each others with their cows and goats crossing one border to another. The now antagonism is only created by War Lords who are taking the advantage of exploiting fraudulently the Congo. They are businessmen and they have nothing to do with Rwandese and Congolese poor population interests. Congolese understand it and Rwandese also.

The ongoing war would become very dangerous in the future as sons and daughters born from that rapped situation are now becoming teenagers. The frustration of that situation could create an incredible situation that no one could be able to control in the future. If peace solution is not been found for the Congo war now, we could probably became guilty tomorrow if it uprising, as the international community now about the Rwandese genocide.

- The myth of the ICC warrants fears: Charles Taylor example

Rwandese and Congolese regimes are using the high bid when anyone call for the warrants against Bosco Ntangana and any other war lord of the East of Congo. The implementation of those warrants will have a strong impact in the end of the war in Congo; everyone would then understand that they are not on the top of the international laws, as they are giving the impression now. And, nothing will happen in the region of Bosco Ntangana or whoever is arrested. Who believed that Charles Taylor could be arrested without any uprising of the Liberia? And it happened. The peace process is conditioned also by the strong message to the warlords of the regions.

British parliament and government could call for the arrest of those needed by the ICC. Those people have blood on their hands and stories in the regions are full of their involvement in the massacres and massive killing.

- Different war alibis used by Rwanda

One needs also to have a look on different war alibis using by the Rwanda. It started by the “genocidaires” to purchase; and then they supported any Congolese rebels groups for the purpose that the Congolese Tutsi of South Kivu, known as the Banyamulenge, need special support. But, when the Banyamulenge understood straight that they were using for other purposes than their security, as they live with their fellow other Congolese since century, Rwandese used another alibi: the protection of the rwandophones of the Nord-Kivu. They then created and supported the CNDP with Laurent Nkunda. And, when it became clear that everyone started understanding the business,

they moved now to create the M23 for the reason of the respect of the agreement between Kinshasa and the CNDP. Or, they are the one who took the advantage of any agreement as most of them became high profile in the army and they also never like to integrate fully the then army. In fact, it was known that they were not Congolese, but Rwandese till when the Kinshasa government, surprisingly, tasted that Rwandese were still in east of Congo.

About this presence of Rwandese in East of the Congo, one needs only to remember what President Kabila said in a famous interview: "*C'est un secret de polichinelle*" (Open secret). Unless if he misused those phrases... if not, there is not any other evidence that his own statement.

- The lack of good will from Congolese side: using sometimes of the Interamwe

But, there is also another concern, a very dangerous one in need to be taking in account: the lack of good will from the Congolese regimes. It is known now, with many evidence that, not only they used or continue to use the Interamwe services when they wants to give an impression that they are also strongest than the Rwandese side; but they also use services of Rwandese based in Congo when needed. An interview carried with a Congolese refugee and former President Laurent Desire Kabila's body guard, showed that when Kabila father started his war against the Rwandese, he got supports from the former FDLR Interamwe based in East of Congo and those based in some Congo neighbour countries; but also when Joseph Kabila got the last after election war against Jean-Pierre Bemba at Kinshasa, he received a full supports from the CNDP and Laurent Nkunda and Bosco Ntangana soldiers brought to Kinshasa night times. And, they then tired the alliance that Joseph Kabila regime would not let then end on the ICC hands. This could explain why it is not possible for Congolese to arrest neither Nkunda nor Ntangana.

- Facts recording by the latest reports: nothing more

We know that the now International Development Committee is in search of facts and evidences about the Rwandese involvement and supports to M23 rebel group. We are really very surprising that, on top of the now full documented reports available, if the government and the parliament want another report or other evidences; that means there is not any will for them to act positively or differently.

We understood also that, amongst those who wrote those reports, there are many British, especially those who spent times and years in East of the Congo.

If the commission and the parliament need more evidence, why not taking in account the fact that other European Union countries have not resume their assistance; and even by the international solidarity, the fact for the British side to resume their assistance, without taking in account the position of the other allies could put them in a very weak situation. And, the most suspicious is also that the decision has been taken the last day of Mr Mitchell to be in charge of the DFID! And, as reported by the Medias, everyone knows now that the then Secretary of State has strong personal relationship with Rwanda where it is said that he got some volunteer involvement!

● RECOMMENDATIONS

- To maintain pressure on the Rwandese regime by avoid resuming the assistance, by solidarity to the International Community and to the other European Union partners who diced also to cut their assistance to Rwanda;
- To influence the Rwandese regime to enforce the ICC warrants for the ones needs to be arrested and to be sent to the Hague

- To organise, as soon as possible, in London, the Central African Peace Conference with specific talks from the most innovative approaches and avoiding the usual ongoing recommendations and with specific decisions to be implemented after.
- To question about the Rwanda-AFDL support agreements and also to state the wars bills to be paid by Congolese governments to its allies (Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi)
- To agree a cease fire between Rwanda and Congo and, officially and for the last time, to organise an open return of the last Rwandese soldiers from the Congo.
- To adopt a resolution for the MONUSCO soldiers to be placed on the border between Rwanda and Congo to avoid any using of the alibi of invading Rwanda from the Congo.
- To list the mining companies and business exploiting the Congo from Rwanda side or the one who have their headquarters in Rwanda for the transparency of their business in Congo.
- To force Congolese government to adopt good governance policies and transparency and to be able to organise, for the next elections, the free and fair ones and to secure foreign business and to deal fairly with its neighbours.
- To label the M23 as a terrorist group and to issue warrants for anyone involved with
- To avoid mixing the Rwandese genocide with the Congo war as Congolese were not involved in any way to the evil genocide and they only opened their door to their neighbours in search of sanctuary.
- In any Congo conference or matters, to start by giving voice to Congolese Diasporas; to identify them and even to train some of them to be ready for any positive involvement in any peace activity or actions on the ground.

November 2012

1. Summary of Main Points

1.1 A peace-building and internationally significant genocide memorial project in Rwanda has been placed at risk on account of uncertainty regarding the future of budget support from international donors to Rwanda.

1.2 The project relates to the development of the Kigali Genocide Memorial. It is planned that a campus will be developed there, to include a centre for peace-building education. The Government of Rwanda (GoR) asked British NGO Aegis Trust to develop the site and manage the programmes on the new campus. The master plan was developed, pro-bono, by British firm of architects John McAslan Partners.

1.3 Long-term stability and the prevention of genocide may be served by such a project and should be part of the equation that leads to a decision on UK Aid to Rwanda.

1.4 Regarding the timing of the decision on whether to resume UK Aid: It has been characterized by the media that the former Secretary of State Andrew Mitchell made the decision to resume aid, in haste, at the beginning of September following the cabinet reshuffle. However Aegis Trust was informed that the decision was always scheduled to be made by the end of the month of August.

2. Who are Aegis Trust?

2.1 Aegis Trust is a British NGO with a mission to prevent genocide. It grew out of the work of the UK's Holocaust Centre. Aegis Trust commemorates atrocities of the past, invests in peace-builders of the future and advocates for those at risk of genocide today.

2.2 The Government of Rwanda invited Aegis Trust to advise on the conservation of and activities at genocide memorial sites in 2002.

2.3 Aegis understands that:

- Giving dignity to survivors of genocide contributes to transitional justice.
- Knowledge about the genocide in Rwanda must be preserved as a warning for future generations and the wider world.
- Blame and animosity are often passed on to the next generation in a post-atrocity society. This can be highly corrosive to social cohesion. Therefore it is crucial for memory of and education about the genocide to take this into account in order to actively promote unity and understanding in the second and third generations.

For these three reasons Aegis Trust agreed to support development of the genocide memorials in Rwanda, the archive and an education programme aimed at promoting social cohesion.

2.4 Since 2004, Aegis Trust has managed and developed the Kigali Genocide Memorial on behalf of the GoR. It is a burial site of victims of the genocide against the Tutsi in 1994. 80,000 visitors attend the memorial each year, including State leaders from all over Africa and around the world. Visiting the centre provides a warning about what happens when leaders allow hatred to inform policy or when there is a collective failure to protect people at risk of being destroyed through genocide.

2.5 Aegis Trust is not paid by the GoR to undertake this work. While Aegis has managed projects for the Rwandan Minister of Sports and Culture, the Commission against Genocide and Kigali City Council, the majority of the funds for the projects that Aegis is involved in are raised independently from the Government of Rwanda. We therefore submit this evidence with separation and independence from the Government of Rwanda.

2.6 Despite the progress that Rwanda has made from a development perspective there is much evidence that ideas and attitudes that caused genocide in the first instance persist in Rwanda and the region. There is also evidence that the programme of peace-building education at the Kigali Genocide Memorial is having a positive impact on social cohesion through values-based and critical thinking education. It was therefore planned to expand the programme in order that it may have national impact. Later, it is planned that the peace-building education programme will be extended beyond the borders of Rwanda. This is all endorsed and supported by GoR.

3. The project placed at risk through suspension of UK Aid to Rwanda

3.1 It was planned that for the 20th commemoration of the genocide in April 2014 that the Kigali Genocide Memorial would be expanded. On the site would be a genocide archive of international significance. More importantly an education facility for peace-building would be established to house the proposed peace-building and genocide studies programme. *See Annex 1, the speech of the Minister of Sports and Culture in Kigali, 19th August 2012.*

3.2 By equipping young Rwandans to identify how they may prevent future atrocities, this project would be in line with what DFID and FCO refer to as 'up-stream prevention'. It should be pointed out that when compared to other memorials about mass atrocities elsewhere in the world, it is progressive and commendable to have a clear objective of prevention and peace-building at such a site.

3.3 Reflecting the international nature of the genocide in Rwanda and the significance of such a project, it is hoped that many international donors will contribute to the establishment of this centre for genocide prevention in Kigali, which will require in the region of \$10 million.

3.4 However the success and sustainability of the project relies on GoR having ownership and full backing of the project. In this regard, the Government's role should not be displaced by external agents, but rather partnerships fostered, in the spirit of a common purpose. To this end, while the responsibility for development is delegated to Aegis by GoR, to further emphasize this is a national project with GoR commitment and involvement it was agreed by cabinet that the first phase of the project would include financial contributions from GoR. The land was set aside by the Kigali City Council and the project plan approved by the cabinet of GoR.

3.4 The Rwandan Ministry of Finance was due to approve between \$1.5-\$2m million for the landscaping and infrastructure for the new campus in August 2012. These funds would have been allocated from the Rwandan Government **general budget**.

3.5 Following the suspension of general budget support by the UK and other donors, the Aegis Trust was informed that, while the Government of Rwanda is fully committed to the project, a decision on the future funding of phase 1 will be delayed. It was anticipated the decision was merely a brief delay and that once full aid resumes, the project will again be on track. At the point of submission to the International Development Committee, the Ministry of Finance in Rwanda remains supportive of the project in principle, but has been unable to proceed with approval of full funds given the current uncertainty. Alternative ways to structure the development of the project are being explored, but there is no secure funding at present.

3.5 At best the delay threatens to throw out the timeline, making it impossible to undertake the developments in time for the 20th Commemoration of the genocide in 2014. At worst, the project could be shelved indefinitely.

3.6 Aegis Trust does not have expert knowledge on the allegations and defence regarding M23, other than by reading the UN Group of Experts report and the Government of Rwanda's rebuttal, including the Akin Gump opinion. We understand the pressure HMG is under to suspend aid. However Aegis holds the view that long-term stability and the prevention of genocide may be served by the project described here that is supported via general budget and should be part of the equation that leads to a decision on UK Aid to Rwanda.

3.6 Aegis Trust CEO, James M. Smith wrote to the former Secretary of State for International Development, Andrew Mitchell, on the 30th July 2012 informing him of this situation and expressed the view is that this specific project supports HMG Foreign Affairs and Development strategy of upstream conflict prevention. See *Annex 2: email to Andrew Mitchell*.

In his written reply on 14th August 2012 Andrew Mitchell stated that a decision on future disbursements of General Budget Support would be made during August. Officials of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office at the same time in mid-August re-iterated this to Aegis Trust.

3.7 The characterisation in the media that the former Secretary of State Andrew Mitchell made a hasty decision to resume full funding to the Government of Rwanda on account of the cabinet re-shuffle at the beginning of September, therefore appears to be inaccurate.

Annex 1.

Speech by the Rwandan Minister of Sports and Culture at the Aegis White Rose Society

Gala. (as delivered)

Kigali, 19 August 2012

On behalf of the Ministry of Sports and Culture I am grateful to my predecessors, former Ministers of Sports, Youth and Culture at that time, including Mr Robert Bayigamba, who is here with us tonight, for having invited Aegis Trust to Rwanda, and for forging the partnership that has contributed to our nation, to our national reconciliation.

This partnership has established a place of great importance, the Kigali Genocide Memorial, one of respect and dignity for victims of the genocide against the Tutsi. It is a place we can tell the story of our past for further generations and for those who visit our country, Rwanda.

Great strides have been made since point zero of 1994. In those 18 years, our nation has literally risen from the ashes of a destructive past to develop nationally, commercially, economically and, most importantly of all, develop the bonds and understanding that are vital for all our futures.

My thanks go to the organizations like the Aegis Trust for being partners in the effort and to all Rwandan political and business leaders who have made it happen.

Your Excellency, the First Lady; distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, the Government of Rwanda is working in partnership with the Aegis Trust on the next ambitious phase to expand the Kigali Genocide Memorial Centre as it has been presented to us this evening.

While maintaining the memorial as a place of dignified burial and remembrance, an ambitious expansion will emphasise genocide prevention through peace-building education, both in Rwanda and beyond our borders.

One of the pillars of this new institution will be an internationally significant archive to preserve the memory of our past and allow researchers to draw solutions for the future in preventing crimes against humanity. One of the largest archive challenges is that of Gacaca documents and we hope Aegis Trust will play an instrumental role in this.

Your Excellency, ladies and gentlemen, we have had no greater leadership than our honoured guest this evening, the First Lady of the Republic of Rwanda. Through her different initiatives and projects, like Imbutu Foundation, our First Lady has worked tirelessly for peace and reconciliation in Rwanda, empowering young women alongside much-needed improvement in the health of our nation and support for vulnerable survivors.

Ends.

Annex 2.

Email from Dr James Smith, CEO Aegis Trust, to former Secretary of State Andrew Mitchell

30th July 2012

Secretary of State for International Development
Rt Hon. Andrew Mitchell MP.

30th July 2012

Dear Andrew,

Following the decision of the British Government to suspend budgetary support to Rwanda I write to let you know that during the month of August, the Aegis Trust was expecting the Ministry of Finance in Rwanda to approve spending on phase one of the expansion of the Kigali Genocide Memorial, which would amount to £1.3M. Consequences of the suspension of budgetary aid to Rwanda will most likely include this project being placed on ice.

Altogether around £10M is required for both capital and programme support over the next three years for Aegis projects in Rwanda. Not all of this will come from the Government of Rwanda. Indeed, to be clear, the Aegis Trust has no programmatic support from the Government of Rwanda and raises all its programme funds independently. However, it is appropriate that the Government of Rwanda should contribute to the first phase of the capital aspect of the development of the Kigali Genocide Memorial in order to demonstrate this is a national project that has the full support and ownership of the Government of Rwanda, even though the management is delegated to the Aegis Trust.

The physical expansion will be overseen by London-based architects John MacAslan & Partners. A delay to the funding at this stage will make it impossible to complete the works by the proposed date of 2014, the 20th anniversary of the genocide.

Furthermore, a failure to fund this phase will have a knock-on effect on the programmes which are linked, in part, to the physical expansion. Recent events, including the withdrawal of support from the British, American, Dutch and German Governments will contribute to a wider lack of confidence among other non-government supporters. Already there is evidence of adverse impact on funding for Aegis programmes in Rwanda.

I wish to emphasize that the programme of expansion of the Kigali Genocide Memorial goes far beyond commemoration of the genocide. The whole project aims to re-position activities around genocide commemoration in Rwanda to those that HMG refers to as upstream prevention.

It has been agreed with the GoR that the developments of the memorial should serve as an African centre for the prevention of genocide, which would be led by a British NGO (Aegis Trust) working in partnership with state institutions and local and international partners.

The proposed new centre would focus on prevention of violence through peace-building education, establishing a world class genocide archive, higher education genocide studies course and regional training in relation to genocide prevention.

I would add that forward thinking prevention agendas like this are rare at such memorials. It is the key reason that the Aegis Trust, as a prevention organization, remains in Rwanda in order to help influence the next generation and encourage resilience against violence should there be political upheaval. It is apparent that political instability in the region remains a threat and the need for communities to learn how to resist the slide into horrific violence is as great now as it ever has been.

I have been encouraged by early external evaluation of the peace-building education programme, that it is having a positive impact on values and attitudes among young Rwandans. We had hoped to build on this to have national impact.

We have developed strong partnerships with higher education institutions in the US, UK and the Netherlands to develop the genocide archive and research and training in relation to genocide prevention.

I understand in regard to M23 and the UN report that DFID must examine the MOU between the UK and Rwanda. However I fear the withdrawal of budgetary support in relation to Aegis' activities may have a direct impact on peace-building programmes that aim to help stabilization in the long term.

It will be very helpful to find a way to resolve the shortfall we could imminently face, to avoid disrupting this important programme that contributes to peace in the region.

Yours sincerely

James Smith

Annex 3.

Reply from Secretary of State, Andrew Mitchell, to Dr James Smith, CEO of Aegis Trust, 14th August 2012:

Thank you for your e-mail of 30 July, regarding suspension of aid to Rwanda. Let me first clarify that the UK Government has not suspended aid to Rwanda but has delayed the disbursement of General Budget Support, which was due in July.

I recognize the importance of the work that the Aegis Trust does in Rwanda and appreciate your points regarding focusing on peace-building and prevention of violence. I also join you in recognizing the importance of financial contributions from the Government of Rwanda in order to ensure national ownership.

I have committed to taking a decision about future disbursements of General Budget Support in August. This decision will be informed by the UK Government's assessment of the situation in the east of the Democratic Republic of Congo, and the role being played by the Rwandan Government in securing a peaceful solution. I would like to reassure you, however, that in taking a decision, I will also consider the potential impact on poverty reduction in Rwanda and on important development initiatives.

ANDREW MITCHELL

November 2012

Written evidence submitted by Andrew Wallis

Summary

1. This submission takes into account a brief history and objectives of M-23 and its importance within wider security and social difficulties in DRC. It focuses on the need for an independent verification by the UK of any role Rwanda may have played in assisting M-23, given the context of the GoE report; and looks more widely at the relationship between the DRC government and other armed militia, specifically the FDLR.

Any short-term solution cannot be achieved by military means alone and the UK needs to play a part pressing for immediate meaningful talks between the combatants - the DRC government and the M-23, and for the possible restoration and implementation of the 2009 peace agreement. Further, if such a conflict is not to reoccur there has to be far reaching long term change within security forces and civil society.

The UK needs to play a positive part not by threatening development aid reduction but supporting constructive initiatives by the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region (ICGLR), and further political dialogue. In this role, with its strong relationship with Rwanda and several governments in the Great Lakes Region, it is in an excellent position to play a leading and beneficial part in pushing for a meaningful and lasting peace and the necessary reforms to address current long-standing antagonisms and resentments.

The loss of development aid to Rwanda will not solve the M-23 revolt, runs the risk of seemingly 'punishing' Rwanda - despite the UK not independently verifying allegations by making its own findings on the issue - and practically will hit hardest those targeted by the aid.

Author Introduction

2. Dr. Andrew Wallis is a research associate at the University of Cambridge Faculty of POLIS.¹ He has been involved in detailed research and travel in Rwanda and the Great Lakes for the past 15 years. Besides academic research projects he has written for various international media including the BBC, Al Jazeera, broadsheets in the UK, USA and Africa and is a regular contributor to *opendemocracy.net*. He is the author of *'Silent Accomplice: the untold story of the role of France in the Rwandan genocide,'* 2006, i.b.tauris.

Present and future aid to Rwanda

3. The M-23, [Congolese Revolutionary Army, CRA] is a militia of currently around 1,000 men, and without doubt a source of conflict the eastern DRC. However it is important to be aware of both the history of this movement and its wider impact and significance in the region and to escape from some western media portrays that have currently distorted the situation for their own political reasons.

4. M-23 claims to represent discontented former members of the CNDP and the Banyumulenge. It aims specifically to get the government of President Joseph Kabila to respect the peace agreement of 23rd March 2009, and to bring an end to both the FDLR and alleged security outrages by the national army, the FARDC. M-23 is

significant, not just because its relatively few fighters have so far managed to take control of a significant area of the Kivus, but because it focuses attention on long term intrinsic problems in the area.

Most notable is the issue to the place in DRC society of the Banyamulenge. This group which has lived in the eastern DRC for more than 100 years, has in the past fifty years been the subject of numerous attacks; physically from other tribal groups and militia such as FDLR and national states forces (FARDC); also the loss of land rights and citizenship and with it both a political voice and an ability to live off the land. Without a resolution to these issues that gives them security from attack and an end to political prejudice in Kinshasa it is likely any end to the M-23 situation will only be short term before another armed insurrection takes its place. In sum, M-23, is the direct successor of Laurent Nkunda's uprising, with a similar set of objectives.

International response

5. The response of the International Community – the UN and individual states including the UK – to the M-23 situation has been limited and has failed to encourage the political dialogue needed for a resolution. Moreover, the contribution of the UN has been partial and far from helpful. The report by the UN Group of Expert's has only encouraged regional antagonism, rather than providing an objective, methodologically secure and far reaching analysis that is needed. It has been used as a political tool with which to attack the Rwandan government, rather than to provide the necessary independent information and analysis that was its remit. The constant, almost monthly leaking of the report and its various amendments and appendices for obvious political reasons, and the staunchly anti-Rwandan government views of the GoE lead researcher, Steve Hege, should be a cause for concern in such a sensitive and much relied-upon document.

6. The UN and UK have attempted to press the leaders of Rwanda and DRC into talks. However, the major need is for pressure for meaningful talks to take place between M-23 and Kinshasa – something the DRC government has so far publicly refused to accept. A stand-alone military solution to the M-23 situation is unlikely.

7. The sudden influx of tens of thousands of genocidaire into the Kivus in 1994 seriously destabilized the area, and caused immense security issues, not just for the Banyamulenge, but for other indigenous tribal groups. The Rwandan state in the post genocide years has been threatened with periodic murderous incursions of Hutu extremist groups such as the ALiR and FDLR. In the years post 1994 these extremist groups have, at times, been used by the DRC government and its armed forces, the FARDC, for their own political reasons.

8. For the Rwandan government, restoring internal and external security has been the number one priority since 1994. It has made it clear it does not accept having armed groups on its border that have the freedom to put into practice their open intent to attack and destabilize Rwanda, its citizens and its current government. Besides having to deal with this threat, Rwanda is faced with having a large number of its historic former citizens, the Banyamulenge, and the wider Banyarwanda community, who have lived across the border in the Kivus, threatened with land eviction, violence, sexual molestation and political emasculation. Refugee camps already exist inside

Rwanda of those DRC citizens and non-citizens of original Rwandan extraction, who have fled ethnically-based violence directed against them in their DRC homeland.

9. The Rwandan government has publicly made it clear it does not support M-23 but that it remains supportive of efforts to obtain for the Banyamulenge and wider community the civil and human rights that should be the entitlement of all DRC citizens. It has been equally clear that the continued presence of the FDLR, which has continued its own murderous agenda during this summerⁱⁱ (see the report by UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Navi Pillar on 30 August) gives justification to the M-23 that they are defending their own community. Further it has played a leading role in the 11-member International Conference on the Great Lakes Region (ICGLR) talks, chaired by President Museveni, that seek a solution to the crisis.

10. The International Conference on the Great Lakes Region (ICGLR) has through the summer produced some meaningful responses to the crisis. This has included setting up a Joint Verification Group tasked with monitoring borders to stop the flow of weapons or recruits to the militias. It is also seeking to put into the field an international African force that would target all the militia groups in the Kivus – a vital part of restoring security to the region. The UK government should be fully supportive of the efforts by the ICGLR to allow this international force to move forward with its plans as it offers, at present, the only meaningful action.

Finding a solution

11. The UK government has focused on the alleged Rwandan government support for the M-23. However any solution to M-23 has to take account of FDLR, whose long-term destabilization and violent campaign in the Kivus has exacerbated the formation of militia such as M-23, Raïa Mutomboki and the CNDP.

In the view of this author simply taking M-23 out of the picture is not, in itself, a solution to the problems faced by the people of the Kivus or indeed the DRC. The UK government needs to press for long term solutions (see International Alert, Ending the deadlock: Towards a new vision of peace in eastern DRC).ⁱⁱⁱ

M-23 may be politically useful for a number of politicians in Kinshasa and media groups that have used it either as a smokescreen to cover the far deeper malaise that have seen DRC marked as 187 of 187 countries in the World Development Index, or to attack the Rwandan government. Ending the conflict in the Kivus must be a priority the International Community is concerned with, but to simplify the matter down to whether or not Rwanda is aiding one militia group would be a mistake.

12. The UK government needs to press for the 2008/9 peace agreement to be honoured by all sides, as pointed to recently by Nigeria's former President, Olusegun Obasanjo, a past envoy to the DRC. It needs to ensure vital internal security reforms take place that mean the state security forces alone have a military capability, and this is used solely for the advantages of the people they are there to protect, and not against them. It needs to press for land reform so that all inhabitants of the Kivus are treated equally before the law and in terms of political representation. And for judicial reform that will hold accountable all those who have committed violations of human rights and crimes against humanity and end a culture of impunity.

Rwanda and Aid

13. Rwanda has, quite significantly, confounded critics and even the best placed experts in its rise from the ashes of the 1994 genocide. Much of the credit for this should lie with the current government of President Paul Kagame and the incredible response of its people to extreme adversity. Within 18 years a country that had lost more than half its population, its total exchequer and infrastructure, has become one of impressive growth in all sections of society. Rwanda has won a number of prestigious international awards from the business community, anti corruption bodies, for environmental protection and restoration projects, for significant poverty and disease reduction and education and health reforms. In the past week alone Rwanda has won a seat on the UN General Assembly, and had its President awarded the African Peace Personality prize for 2012 after he won the votes of 812,000 young people on the continent.

14. Development aid, well targeted, managed and spent, has been an important element of Rwanda's success. Unlike several other countries where DFID's assistance has also been substantial, it can be argued Rwanda has used the funding on projects such as education and healthcare to the greatest benefit of the recipients. Development aid will always be associated with politics. However, to cut Rwanda's aid for political reasons and not developmental ones, given the exceptional way it has been used to help some of the poorest and most vulnerable in society.

15. It is difficult to conceive what the UK government - or the people of the affected region - will gain by the Development Aid being cut. It is clear it will gain support in elements of the media that have targeted Kagame's Rwanda as the major cause and concern for problems in the Kivus. As has been touched on, the insecurity in eastern Kivu goes far deeper than either the M-23 or any possible foreign involvement, whether justified or not. The UK risks putting in jeopardy vital education projects which will continue to help turn people's lives around in Rwanda.

16. The UK government would be better focused in pressing for immediate talks between the sides at the centre of the conflict – the M-23 and the DRC government. And in supporting very real regional efforts by the CGLR to procure an international force to target an end to all militia violence and patrol borders to stop arms and recruitment to them. Finally, the current crisis should throw into a new light UK aid to DRC and the need to press the government there into vital reforms to break out of the constant cycle of short-term crises that afflict the people of the region.

17. Rwanda has become an important partner for the UK and a close relationship has been built up since 1994. This should mean the UK government is in a unique place with which to work with Kigali. Withdrawal of development aid as a means of relaying political pressure is surely not a response that is either positive for those who will suffer from the loss of funding or in terms of getting through the message it wants to give. It would also smack of being a knee-jerk reaction to media headlines that have failed to analyse in any meaningful way the relationship between Rwanda and the DRC, and the intrinsic problems within the Kivus that successive government in Kinshasa have backed away from – or even exacerbated.

ⁱ For two recent articles on Kivu and the current M-23 situation please see:

www.opendemocracy.net/andrew-wallis/dr-congo-politics-of-suffering
www.opendemocracy.net/andrew-wallis/dr-congo-beyond-crisis-cycle

ii

<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=42767&Cr=Democratic&Cr1=Congo#.UJLHyY7byvY>

iii <http://www.international->

[alert.org/sites/default/files/publications/201209EndingDeadlockDRC-EN.pdf](http://www.international-alert.org/sites/default/files/publications/201209EndingDeadlockDRC-EN.pdf)

November 2012

Executive Summary

This submission addresses the decision by the Department for International Development (DFID) to withhold, and subsequently to disburse, budget support to the Government of Rwanda following allegations about its involvement with the M23 rebel group in eastern Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). This paper puts forward two main arguments. First, decisions to withhold or withdraw aid to particular states should be based on more comprehensive and systematic evidence than that provided by the United Nations Group of Experts (GoE) for the DRC. There are substantial methodological and substantive shortcomings in the 2012 Group of Experts reports, on the basis of which several foreign donors reconsidered their development aid strategies toward Rwanda.

Second, while there are justified concerns over Rwanda's alleged military involvement in eastern DRC as well as domestic human rights issues in Rwanda, the withholding or withdrawal of aid to Rwanda will do little to address systemic causes of conflict in eastern DRC and may undermine important political, social and economic gains which Rwanda has made since the 1994 genocide. This risks destabilising a still fragile situation in Rwanda, with major repercussions for the entire Great Lakes region. On this basis, this paper advocates the continuation of UK aid to Rwanda at the same level as before the GoE findings, alongside the continued use of non-aid measures to address the question of Rwanda's alleged military involvement in the DRC and domestic human rights issues in Rwanda.

Submitter's Biography

Dr. Phil Clark is a lecturer in comparative and international politics (with reference to Africa) at SOAS, University of London, and a specialist on conflict-related issues in central Africa. He holds a DPhil in Politics from the University of Oxford, where he studied as a Rhodes Scholar. Dr. Clark has published extensively on political, social and legal responses to genocide and other mass crimes in the Great Lakes, principally on the gacaca community courts in Rwanda and the International Criminal Court (ICC). His research is based on more than 1000 individual interviews over the last ten years with conflict-related actors at the international, national and community levels throughout the region. Dr. Clark's most recent book is *The Gacaca Courts, Post-Genocide Justice and Reconciliation in Rwanda: Justice without Lawyers* (Cambridge University Press, 2010). In 2011, he gave oral evidence to the International Development Committee on UK aid policy in fragile states, focusing on central Africa. He has been an expert witness at the ICC (in the case of Callixte Mbarushimana in the situation of the DRC) and has provided expert briefings on central Africa to DFID, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the US State Department, the Swedish Foreign Ministry, the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the International Crisis Group. Dr. Clark is currently an expert for the Crown Prosecution Service on issues concerning Rwandan genocide suspects living in the UK.

Over-Reliance on UN Group of Experts Reports on the Democratic Republic of Congo

1. In 2012, the decision by the governments of the UK, the US, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden to withdraw or withhold parts of their donor assistance to

Rwanda was based primarily on the June 2012 addendum to the interim report of the UN Group of Experts (GoE) on the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), which accused the Rwandan government of supporting the M23 rebel group in eastern Congo. In considering the justifiability of this decision and effective policy directions for the future, the nature of GoE reporting warrants further scrutiny. That the donors in question cited the June 2012 GoE report as the principal reason for altering their aid programmes toward Rwanda highlights the immense influence of the GoE in shaping international policy. There are, however, significant methodological and substantive problems with this and other GoE reports, which call into question whether this single source should be relied upon so extensively in determining policy toward central Africa and elsewhere.

2. Evidence-gathering in volatile conflict and post-conflict societies such as those in the Great Lakes is an enormously complex undertaking. Investigators and analysts confront constant challenges, including gathering information during ongoing conflict, ensuring the security of informants and investigators alike, and corroborating evidence to ensure it is not tainted by misinformation, propaganda, rumour and other distorting elements that inevitably arise during times of war. Because of these enormous challenges and the risk that poorly gathered evidence can skew analysis and policy prescriptions, close scrutiny of the investigative methods used by organisations such as the GoE is imperative.
3. The June 2012 GoE report exhibits methodological shortcomings that are apparent in the majority of GoE reports. It is important to recognise these problems when considering GoE findings and their implications for international policymaking. First, most GoE reports in the context of the DRC involve interviews and other forms of information-gathering within confined regions of eastern Congo, with little engagement in neighbouring countries, including Rwanda. In the case of the June 2012 report, GoE analysts spent only several days in Rwanda interviewing government officials and conducting other forms of investigation¹, which constrained their ability to draw robust conclusions about the precise nature of Rwanda's alleged support for M23.
4. This geographical restriction limited the depth of analysis in the report and led to several erroneous claims. To take one example, the report states incorrectly that Rwanda trained some M23 fighters at the Kanombe army barracks in the Rwandan capital, Kigali² – a key claim in showing the extent of Rwandan involvement in the M23 rebellion – when those barracks comprise only a military hospital and a cemetery. It would be impossible for such training to take place in those barracks and even a cursory check of the premises would have convinced the GoE of this. This error suggests that the GoE conducted insufficient investigations within Rwanda and relied on highly questionable sources, a point that has major implications for the GoE's wider claims regarding Rwandan complicity in rebel activity in Congo.

¹ UN Group of Experts, 'Addendum to the Interim Report of the Group of Experts on the DRC Submitted in Accordance with Paragraph 4 of Security Council Resolution 2021 (2011)', S/2012/348/Add.1, 27 June 2012, p.26.

² Ibid., p.14.

5. Second, a general problem with many GoE analyses in eastern DRC, which is also apparent in the June 2012 report, is a tendency to ascribe criminal liability to armed groups in the Kivu provinces on the basis of scant evidence or without specific explanations of how the identity of the liable groups was deduced. The GoE tends to state either that violations were committed by particular groups without indicating how this information was gathered or that the organisation has ‘received reports’ containing this information, without further specification. For example, a GoE report on 29 November 2010 states:

The Group has received reports of five cases of summary executions of RUD combatants since January 2009.³

The Group has received numerous credible reports of contacts aiming to reunite FDLR-FOCA and RUD-Urunana initiated by Kanyamibwa, who is based in New Jersey. His brother, Emmanuel Munyaruguru, who is the RUD representative in Norway, was chosen to mediate between the parties.⁴

6. The lack of detailed evidence in GoE reports may result from the Group’s preference for analysis based on ‘authentic documents and, wherever possible, first-hand, on-site observations by the experts themselves’⁵ (the nature of such ‘observations’ being largely ill-defined) rather than more concrete evidence such as corroborated interviews with multiple, credible eyewitnesses.
7. In this vein, a key dimension of the June 2012 GoE report is the reliance on testimony by unidentified Congolese military commanders and intelligence officials and defectors from the Congolese army⁶, whose impartiality on the issues at hand must be seriously questioned. The report provides insufficient information regarding how evidence gathered in the field was tested and how the reliability of certain sources was established. Coupled with the geographical narrowness of the GoE’s investigations, as discussed above, questions should be raised regarding the robustness of the evidence which underpinned the GoE’s conclusions. Greater scrutiny of the GoE’s methodologies and the substance of their claims is required before policy decisions are made on the basis of the Group’s findings. In the case of the June 2012 report, apparent methodological and substantive problems suggest that international donors should have treated the GoE’s analysis with much greater caution.

Limitations and Pitfalls of Withholding or Withdrawing Aid to Rwanda

8. Not only should there be a closer assessment of the GoE’s findings, but the decision by the UK and other donors in 2012 to withhold or withdraw aid to Rwanda is

³ UN Group of Experts, ‘Final Report of the Group of Experts on the DRC Submitted in Accordance with Paragraph 6 of Security Council Resolution 1896 (2009)’, S/2010/596, 29 November 2010, p.29.

⁴ Ibid., p.30.

⁵ UN Group of Experts, ‘Interim Report of the Group of Experts on the DRC Submitted in Accordance with Paragraph 8 of the Security Council Resolution 1857 (2008)’, S/2009/253, 18 May 2009, p. 6.

⁶ UN Group of Experts, 27 June 2012, p.3.

problematic for two further practical reasons: first, such a policy will not address systemic political and military causes of violent conflict in eastern DRC; and, second, decreasing aid to Rwanda risks damaging a still fragile post-genocide socio-economic environment, with major consequences for Rwanda and the Great Lakes region as a whole.

9. One significant problem with the GoE report and much of the international reaction to it is the insistence that Rwanda is primarily responsible for current instability in eastern Congo. This view neglects the role played by Congolese President Joseph Kabila in generating the M23 mutiny. One key motivator for the rebellion was that President Kabila reneged on deals with these same rebels in 2009, before they were integrated into the Congolese army. These deals held that the integrated rebels would not be scattered away from their homelands in the provinces of North and South Kivu – which Kabila threatened to do in early 2012 – and that they would maintain their military ranks and be paid adequate salaries. President Kabila has displayed bad faith on each of these counts and undermined the 2009 peace agreement between the DRC, Rwanda and a range of Congolese rebel groups, which greatly improved the security situation in eastern Congo. Rwanda played a vital role in this peace process and the subsequent increase in regional security – a positive contribution that warrants greater recognition in current policy discussions.

10. More broadly, the singular focus on Rwandan military involvement in eastern DRC ignores President Kabila's failure to control his armed forces, which are responsible for regular attacks on Congolese civilians, as well as his tendency to use inflammatory ethnic rhetoric against supposed 'Rwandans' living in Congo, as seen during the 2006 and 2011 presidential campaigns. Simply diminishing Rwandan influence in eastern Congo will not address these fundamental causes of conflict and President Kabila's role in fomenting tensions for his own political gain. If the policy objective in altering aid strategies toward Rwanda is to guarantee security in eastern Congo and the region generally, more systemic remedies are required. Principal among these is substantial political and military reform within the DRC. Such reform does not appear forthcoming, particularly following Kabila's victory in the 2011 presidential election, which was greeted favourably by much of the international community.

11. Finally, withdrawing aid from Rwanda is likely to have dire consequences for a country still addressing the complex legacies of the 1994 genocide. International donor contributions represent around 48% of the Rwandan national budget, the vast majority of which is spent on education, health and poverty alleviation. As a landlocked, resource-poor country, Rwanda still relies heavily on foreign assistance. Most observers – even those highly critical of the Rwandan government⁷ – agree that Rwanda has recorded extraordinary successes in these domains since the genocide because of its effective use of international aid and its low levels of corruption. These

⁷ See, for example, S. Straus and L. Waldorf (eds.), *Remaking Rwanda: State Building and Human Rights after Mass Violence*, University of Wisconsin Press, 2011.

major socio-economic achievements have been the bedrock of the peace and stability that Rwanda has enjoyed over the last 18 years. The danger in using aid to alter Rwanda's perceived military policy in eastern DRC is that ultimately it will be the Rwandan population that suffers from any reduction in social and economic services. Withholding aid will do little to address systemic problems in the DRC and will undermine substantial gains in Rwanda. This risks causing major instability within Rwanda and the region as a whole and, in doing so, undermining the UK's wider policy objectives in central Africa.

Policy Recommendations

12. The points raised above lead to a series of concrete policy measures that should be adopted by the UK government. Above all, the UK should continue providing aid to the Rwandan government at the same level as before the allegations regarding M23. To date, donor assistance has contributed enormously to the stabilisation and prosperity of Rwandan society and to levels of social cohesion and economic development which were unimaginable in the aftermath of the genocide. While there may be justifiable reasons to question Rwanda's military actions in the Great Lakes region and its domestic human rights record, these questions should be addressed separately from issues of development aid which benefit everyday Rwandans in tangible ways. The withholding or withdrawal of aid, as a means to alter Rwandan government policy, may not achieve domestic political reforms but will certainly undermine vital social and economic services for the majority of Rwandan citizens. That is too high a price to pay and may reverse many of the immense socio-economic advances Rwanda has made since the genocide.

13. Second, the UK government should call for more robust field methodologies employed by the UN Group of Experts, to ensure a higher quality of empirical analysis. The Group should display greater transparency about the nature of its informants and its strategies to ensure impartiality and comprehensiveness in its reporting. More effective GoE analysis would provide more systematic insights into conflict-related issues in the DRC and elsewhere and a more informed basis for international policymaking.

November 2012

Written evidence submitted by the UK Rwanda Diaspora Community.

1. In spite of strong protest from Kigali, accusations that Rwanda is fuelling the conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) have been accepted as undeniable fact. Countries once well disposed towards Rwanda have been quick to withdraw their support, allowing Rwanda little or no chance for a right of reply. There is no reason to doubt that these countries genuinely believe that isolating Rwanda in this way will alleviate the DRC's suffering. However this is to misread, or completely misunderstand the causes of the conflict in the DRC. And it is only with dispassionate analysis of these causes that real solutions will be found. Yet rather than seek a real understanding of the underlying causes, almost all of Rwanda's critics have tended to satisfy themselves with holding Rwanda responsible for the DRC's ills. This not only does nothing to advance the cause of peace in the DRC, but, it may conceivably result in destabilising Rwanda, and rolling back, if not all, then at least some of the life and death achievements of the last decade or so.
2. Only with objective analysis of the real causes of conflict in the DRC, can there be any realistic hope of bringing respite to the long suffering people of that country, and peace to the region. Rwanda has vehemently denied supporting the so called M23 rebel group. However their response and evidential refutation of the report accusing them of supporting this group are covered elsewhere. Our concern is that for a proper understanding of how Rwanda comes to be involved in the DRC, a number of questions need to be considered:
 - Who or what is M23, and what is their connection to Rwanda?
 - Why would Rwanda be involved in the DRC at all, given the disapprobation heaped upon it?
 - Who beside the M23 group is party to conflict in the DRC and why?
3. For better or worse, few, if any of Rwanda's policies can be understood without considering them in the context of the 1994 genocide. And so it is with any real understanding of whom or what is M23. M23 is a rump of what was CNDP, which was led by Laurent Nkundabatware, better known as Laurent Nkunda. Many, although by no means all of the members of both groups, are Congolese of Rwandan origin, better known as Banyamurenge. They are so called, because they settled in the Murenge region of Congo, as long ago as the Seventeenth Century. Most of them were Batutsi, or as they have come to be known, Tutsis. It is important to note this because had they not been Batutsi, we would be having a different debate.
4. As well as this group there are other Congolese of Rwandan origin, later arrivals, from the 30s, 40s and 50s. Almost all of them settled in Eastern Congo. In late fifties and early sixties the Rwandan monarchy is overthrown, and the first massacres of Batutsi in Rwanda begin. Hundreds of thousands are murdered in what is a precursor to the genocide of 1994. There is an exodus of Batutsi to neighbouring countries to escape these pogroms, including what is now the DRC. In 1994 as RPF (Rwanda Patriotic Front) fighters advance against the Habyarimana regime to halt the genocide in progress, French troops create a safe corridor for regime members, army and Interahamwe militias to take refuge into Congo. With this

action a microcosm of Rwanda and its communal hatreds is imported ready made into what was then Zaire. With the benefit of hindsight it is now clear that this is the moment the involvement of the new RPF government into Congo becomes almost inevitable.

5. The earlier migrants who had settled peacefully, and become Congolese are soon to be dragged into the very problems they had left behind. Soon the new RPF government would also be obliged to get involved. The former Rwanda regime, complete with its army, and militias begin to plot return to power in Rwanda, and in their oft repeated declarations, finish off where had they left off. They are later to form a unified movement, the somewhat paradoxically named "Democratic Federation for the Liberation of Rwanda", FDLR. They begin by attacking the Banyamurenge, our first group of Congolese of Rwandan origin, and other Batutsi who had settled into Congo decades earlier. Crucially, they also begin to cross into Rwanda and murder genocide survivors in particular, because they would bear witness to the crimes of genocide. This is relatively easy for the attackers, since their camps were on the boarder of Rwanda and Congo.
6. The RPF, then still more of a movement with a military arm than a government, has more than it can cope with stabilising Rwanda to defend against this new threat. It calls for the International Community to help. It asks that the militias and the soldiers be separated from ordinary civilians, who were being virtually held hostage by their former rulers. Once the militias and soldiers had been separated from civilians and their families, the former be relocated away from the Rwanda boarder, at a distance stipulated under International law. These calls for help are almost entirely in vain, and the attacks continue. At some point, almost in frustrated desperation, a plan is hatched in Kigali, to go after the attackers. As we now know, the plan is centred on supporting the then President Mobutu's opponents in Congo to overthrow his regime. In return, it is envisaged, the new Congolese government will work with Rwanda to disarm the forces that would later call themselves the FDLR, and build friendly relations with the RPF government. In due course, with the help of Uganda, and Rwanda, Laurent Kabila finds himself in Kinshasa, as head of state, as the late Julius Nyerere was later to quip, a surprised man. However, there was to be no lasting friendship between the two governments, and Rwanda would soon find itself launching another war in Congo, this time against the very man it had helped install in power.
7. The falling out between the new government of Laurent Kabila and the RPF government leads to the second stage of Rwanda's involvement in the DRC. This is messier, and arguably more deadly, as it is less clear cut. Having been heavily dependent on Rwanda and Uganda for military power (the Congo army was trained by Rwanda, and many of its senior officers still maintain close relationships with their former trainers in Kigali), Laurent Kabila now looks around for new allies. Among those allies are members of the former Rwandan army, who together with the Interahamwe militia would form the nucleus of the FDLR. Now close to the Congolese government, these forces are allowed to do in Congo what they had done in Rwanda, massacre Batutsi. For a period, there is a virtual replay of a mini Rwanda genocide in Congo, complete with their version of Radio Mille Colline, the broadcasts which in Rwanda exhorted people to go out and murder their neighbours. The Banyamurenge were a particular target, but, so were many other Congolese of Rwandan origin. Burundi's own

extremist groups, including the FNL (National Forces for Liberation), make common cause with the FDLR.

8. This time although Rwanda does again call for help from the International Community, it does so expecting that no help will come. As Mobutu was replaced with Kabila, there are no shortages of Congolese who are deemed to be better qualified than Laurent Kabila to lead their nation, and most importantly from Rwanda's point of view, who will honour the original accords. Essentially Rwanda's objective is to achieve militarily what it had hoped the International Community would have done, through exerting pressure on successive regimes in Congo: separate the Rwanda civilians from the FDLR then push the latter away from the Rwanda boarder area. In effect Rwanda decides to change regime in the DRC. However Kabila, the eternal survivor, calls in other neighbouring countries, almost all of whom answer the call, motivated by Congolese riches. The result is what has been termed Africa's First World War.
9. By now the International Community had begun to respond to Rwanda's calls, but, not in the way that Rwanda had hoped, or expected. Rather than recognising its security concerns, Rwanda is pressured to end the conflict. Rwanda argues that of all the countries with armies in Congo, only it has a legitimate reason to be there, for its security. Kabila's government argues that all other armies, other than Rwanda, are there at his government's invitation. The International Community focuses pressure on Rwanda to withdraw from Congo. Rwanda argues that it will do so if either Congo or the International Community addresses its legitimate security concerns. By now these include a force estimated at 15,000 strong on Rwanda's boarder, a shadow government, with schools for civilians, all fed and sustained by the donor Community. The deadlock is eventually broken at the Pretoria, and Lusaka conferences, mediated by Thabo Mbeki. The conferences address a comprehensive list of concerns, which all parties agree to implement:
 - All foreign armies are to withdraw from the DRC.
 - The FDLR to be disarmed, all none Congolese Rwandans repatriated, allowing Rwanda to reintegrate them into their respective communities.
 - All persecution of Congolese of Rwandan origin to cease, allowing them to return to their homes and their lands, their rights as Congolese citizens fully recognised.
 - All Congolese combatants to be either voluntarily demobilised or integrated into the national army.
 - A transitional government of national unity to be set up in Congo, succeeded by a new government, following elections.
 - A UN force is to oversee the implementation of the agreement.
10. Rwanda signs up to this agreement, and even when Laurent Kabila is assassinated, and succeeded by his son, Rwanda hopes that the agreement still holds. Sadly it does not. First the Congolese combatants are not allocated the ranks in the national army as agreed. Congolese of Rwandan origin continue to be persecuted, dispossessed, and driven from their

lands, and the FDLR continue to become entrenched within Congo's administration, and army.

11. In response, CNDP (Congress for the Protection of The People) from which M23 is to emerge, is born. It is led by Laurent Nkundabatware. He is from the Banyamurenge community, and he has a single objective: to protect his community from the FDLR, and his own government and military. And so begins what became a major threat to the Kinshasa government. Again, the pressure is put on Rwanda, which is accused of supporting Nkunda. This pressure is intensified when there are allegations of human rights abuses by Nkunda's fighters. Rwanda argues that Nkunda is simply a symptom of a deeper problem, chiefly, the failure to implement accords. CNDP is achieving two objectives which arguably suit Rwanda: it is weakening the FDLR, and it is protecting Congolese of Rwandan origin. Rwanda argues that the only way of removing Nkunda and other armed groups, is to ensure implementation of the Pretoria/Lusaka agreements. All this falls on deaf ears. The narrative that Rwanda is fuelling the conflict in Congo is virtually indelibly established.
12. Nevertheless, there is some hope: when Nkunda's CNDP threatens Goma, Joseph Kabila appeals to Rwanda to mediate a negotiated settlement between Nkunda and his government. Rwanda sends its Minister of Defence, and former head of its army, James Kabarebe, and together with the head of Congo's army, they begin negotiations with Laurent Nkunda. The meetings take place both in Congo, and Rwanda. We do not know the details of these meetings, but, we do know that an agreement is proposed. The government of Congo would implement all the agreements it had failed to implement, CNDP would be integrated into the Congolese army, the persecution of Congolese of Rwandan origin would cease, and Congo would cooperate with Rwanda to move against the FDLR. However Nkunda's mistrust of his government is such that he does not believe that Joseph Kabila would honour any of the agreements, and it seems that his intransigence is deemed an obstacle to progress by the two governments.
13. At a meeting in Kigali, which included Joseph Kabila, Nkunda is detained by Rwanda security forces, and to this day remains under house arrest in Rwanda. The two governments then work with Bosco Ntaganda, then Nkunda's deputy in the leadership of CNDP. James Kabarebe continues to mediate in the negotiations. On 23rd of March, an agreement is reached. All agreements would be implemented, including the integration of CNDP into the Congolese army, with appropriate ranks. Among them is Bosco Ntaganda, who takes the rank of general. As part of the new agreement, a joint Rwanda/Congo force is deployed against the FDLR, dealing it a serious blow, and greatly weakening it. Sadly, Nkunda is soon to be proved right, as this agreement too begins to unravel, again, over none implementation of the accord.
14. CNDP personnel complain that they are routinely discriminated against. Most never received their ranks, no pay, and are barely recognised as members of the national army. To make matters worse, a decision is taken to redeploy them to different parts of the country, away from their families. They fear that attacks against their families will resume, while they are too scattered to defend them. They also argued that without any pay, they remain dependent on their families. How would they live if they are to be deployed so far away

from their families? And their fears seem justified. An estimated fifty of their number who had been deployed to the West of the country are all killed, reportedly by their colleagues from the national army. No one is held responsible, and no investigation is carried out. Inevitably, others refuse to be redeployed. Once again, Kabila turns to Rwanda requesting that Rwanda uses its leverage to bring the restive soldiers to heel. Once again, Rwanda dispatches James Kabarebe to work with his Congolese counterpart.

15. There have been suggestions that Bosco Ntaganda reported to Kabarebe, and that Ntaganda was in and out of Kigali at will. This is mostly likely confusing the nature of Kabarebe's relationship with many in the Congolese army. At the time of the overthrow of Mobutu, Kabarebe, then a young soldier was the de facto head of the Congolese military. Many of the senior officers in the Congolese army, including Joseph Kabila himself were trained by Rwanda, and they remained close to Kabarebe and his staff. It was therefore natural that Kabarebe would be sent to mediate between a section of the army, and the government. He knew them all well, as they did him. However, the suggestion that Ntaganda frequented Kigali is certainly incorrect. Ntaganda was wary of travelling to Kigali, and preferred to send his deputies. He well remembered what had happened to his boss, Laurent Nkunda when he went to Kigali for just such a meeting.
16. In any case, all Rwanda's efforts were to be nullified, when in the midst of negotiations, in a speech in Goma, Joseph Kabila announced that he was to arrest all the former CNDP soldiers who refused redeployment. Some were arrested, many escaped, including Ntaganda, who had apparently been tipped off. Ntaganda also believed that he was about to be arrested and handed over to the ICC. Within a couple of months, those who were at large, had found each other, and "M23" was born. By now their grievances had multiplied. And this is how things now stand, with Rwanda being held responsible for their attacks against their government.
17. We have tried to summarise the background to the current narrative which holds Rwanda responsible for the conflict in Congo. It is a tragedy that the International Community seems to blithely ignore the real causes of conflict, and chooses to condemn the one country in the region which is actually in a position to make a significant contribution to efforts to bring about peace in Congo. Today, a number of EU countries, including the World Bank, and the African Development Bank, have withdrawn financial support from Rwanda. None of these countries or institutions truly believes that aid to Rwanda is used for anything other than poverty reduction. The laudable use to which Rwanda puts aid money is widely acknowledged, and we shall not take up the committee's time outlining what it already knows. The Rwanda government has a policy of inviting third party auditors to verify that aid money is spent on education, agriculture, health, and similar policies. It has been said that for every pound given to Rwanda, one pound fifty of work is produced. None is allocated to M23, as is being claimed.
18. More importantly, impoverishing and stigmatising Rwanda will do nothing to bring peace to Congo. As the Rwanda government has consistently argued, the causes of the conflict emanate from within Congo, and so must the solutions. Rwanda does indeed bear a responsibility, not for "fuelling conflict in Congo", but, as an important regional player, which

must do its part to bring peace to its long suffering neighbour. However, rather than put undue pressure on Rwanda, the Congo government should be pushed to work with Rwanda to implement all accords up to which it has signed. It is the failure to do so that is prolonging the conflict. For instance, Rwanda has proposed a regional force to rid Congo of all armed groups, including M23. Only Congo has refused to even discuss it. Our concern is not just for Rwanda. It is for the region, it is for the Congolese children who dread walking to school for fear of being raped. It is for a country betrayed by its supposed leadership. Holding Rwanda responsible or all this is a red herring, and a tragic one at that.

November 2012

Written evidence submitted by Ann Garrison

RE: SUBMISSION OF EVIDENCE AGAINST UK BUDGET SUPPORT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF RWANDA

The Rwandan contingent became this angry when, after listening to them all day, I suggested that anyone evaluating the Rwanda Genocide and its aftermath in D.R. Congo, should also consider Radio Muhabura and sixteen years of UN human rights investigations beginning with the [Gersony Report on Rwanda, produced in 1994](#), and leading to what was still the most recent report at the time: [the UN Mapping Report on Human Rights Abuse in the Democratic Republic of the Congo 1993 - 2003](#). That report was leaked in August 2010 and made public in October 2010.

I'm sure that you have copies of these reports, and those produced between 1994 and 2010 and since, including those produced this year, which finally triggered this reconsideration of budget support to Rwanda.

EVIDENCE AGAINST UK BUDGET SUPPORT TO RWANDA (Longer written statement explaining attached Sacramento State Police reports.)

- 1) As a journalist, I report and produce for the Pacifica Network's KPFA Radio-Northern California and remotely report and produce for a weekly hour on Africa - AfrobeatRadio - on Pacifica's New York City station, WBAI. I am also a regular contributor to Global Research, the Black Star News, the San Francisco Bay View Newspaper, and other publications, and I maintain my own website, anngarrison.com.
- 2) For the past four years I have studied UN and other human rights investigations, histories, lawsuits, and news, and spoken to many African people and members of the African Diaspora to try to untangle the roots of the staggering bloodshed - millions of lives, maybe as many as 10 million or more - in Uganda, Rwanda, and most of all the Democratic Republic of Congo, as a consequence of armed conflicts of the past 20 to 30 years. I have put many African voices, who otherwise would not have been heard, on KPFA Radio in Northern California and WBAI Radio in New York City. Those voices included members of the Rwandan opposition parties who were not allowed to register their parties or stand for the presidency against Rwandan President Paul Kagame in 2010. They have also included Congolese in exile, many of whom don't dare return home.
- 3) In 2010, I spoke with all three Rwandan presidential candidates who appeared to be viable; others stood for the presidency as part of a charade in which Kagame won 93% of the vote. Two of those three viable presidential candidates, Bernard Ntaganda and Victoire Ingabire, are now in prison. Frank Habineza went into exile in Sweden for several years after the vice president of his party, the Democratic Green Party of Rwanda, was found by the banks of a river with his head cut off. Habineza has just returned to Rwanda, but he is being understandably circumspect in his public remarks.
- 4) During that 2010 election year, I reported that Rwandan President Paul Kagame's enemies were assassinated in Rwanda, in the Democratic Republic of Congo, and in Tanzania and that there was an unsuccessful assassination attempt on his former general, Kayumba Nyamwasa, who was then in exile in South Africa.
- 5) I have not been to Rwanda or the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and the consensus among my friends is that I had better not even try getting anywhere near the border, because Rwandan President Kagame and his friends have made it clear they'd like to kill me. In 2011, Charles Ingabire, a Rwandan journalist in exile in Uganda, was gunned down in public in Kampala, after which Kagame said, as he usually does, that he cannot not be held responsible for every violent assault or robbery in his part of the world. President Kagame's state newspaper, The New Times, has denounced me repeatedly, as has a similarly self-righteous and delirious cartoon publication called The Exposer. My name has been added to long published lists of "Friends of Evil," aka, enemies of Rwanda.

6) I would like to submit in evidence the assault complaint that I filed with the Sacramento State University Campus Police after the conclusion of the November 2011 pseudo academic "Third International Genocide Conference," which was above all a shameless PR event for Rwandan President Paul Kagame, even though he decided not to come after a group of faculty protested both his appearance and the university president's plan to present him with a medal.

7) I sat and listened quietly almost all day, on one day of this conference. Near the very end of that day, in a breakout session, I asked whether the existence of Radio Muhabura prior to and during the Rwanda Genocide, the one available section of the 1994 Gersony Report, a long suppressed UN human rights investigation in Rwanda, 1994, and 12 more years of human rights reports documenting the Rwandan and Ugandan regime's atrocities and resource plunder in the Democratic Republic of Congo, should not also be considered in any evaluation of the Rwanda Genocide and its aftermath.

8) In the discussion that ensued, the Rwandan contingent, including Rwandan Ambassador to the U.S. James Kimonyo grew angrier and angrier and more and more shrill, until they surrounded me shouting and two of them actually laid hands on me. Then someone from the university intervened, saying, "Hey hey hey, you can't do that here."

9) I was badly shaken but not injured. I made an assault complaint and obtained a copy of the Sacramento State University Police report, so as to have it to offer it in argument against any similar event ever being staged at a California University campus.

November 2012