




Journal of Humanity, Peace and Justice

Research Article

 Open Access

The Rwandan Genocide: A Humanitarian Catastrophe in the Pages of History



Yaşar Onay¹  

¹ Istanbul Kent University, Department of International Relations, Istanbul, Türkiye.

Abstract


The 1994 Rwandan Genocide remains one of the most shocking humanitarian catastrophes in modern history. In just 100 days, nearly one million Tutsis and moderate Hutus were brutally murdered in a systematic campaign of violence. This study explores the historical background, causes, and execution of the genocide as well as the international community's response, legal processes, and national reconciliation efforts. By applying theoretical frameworks from social psychology, international relations, and transitional justice, the article hypothesises that the genocide was a modern, state-engineered political project, enabled by elite orchestration, dehumanising propaganda, and a profound failure of international responsibility. The study adopts a comparative case methodology with discourse analysis and aims to contribute to the understanding of the mechanisms behind mass atrocities and strategies for their prevention.

Keywords

Rwandan Genocide · Ethnic Violence · Dehumanisation · International Failure · Transitional Justice · Group Psychology



“ Citation: Onay, Y. (2025). The Rwandan Genocide: A humanitarian catastrophe in the pages of history. *Journal of Humanity, Peace and Justice*, 2(1), 13-28. <https://doi.org/10.26650/hupej.2025.2.1.1718146>

© This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. 

© 2025. Onay, Y.

✉ Corresponding author: Yaşar Onay yasaronay@istanbul.edu.tr

The Rwandan Genocide: A Humanitarian Catastrophe in the Pages of History

Genocide represents one of the most devastating breakdowns of human societies—a violent rupture in the moral and ethical codes that sustain civilisation. When people are persecuted solely for their ethnic, national, racial, or religious identity, it not only signifies a violation of rights but also a collapse of collective humanity. The 20th century, while marked by scientific and political progress, also witnessed horrifying genocides such as the Holocaust, the Cambodian genocide, and the Bosnian massacre.

Among these, the 1994 Rwandan Genocide stands out for its rapidity, brutality, and the inaction of the global community. This article hypothesises that **the genocide was not the result of ancient ethnic hatred but a modern political project carefully orchestrated by the Hutu elite, facilitated through mass propaganda, bureaucratic organisation, and the deliberate paralysis of international mechanisms.**

To test this hypothesis, the study applies theories from social psychology (Milgram, Staub, Arendt), transitional justice, and conflict resolution, using a qualitative comparative method.

Methodology and Theoretical Framework

This research employs a **qualitative comparative case study methodology**, supported by a **discourse analysis** of both primary and secondary sources. This study incorporates theoretical models from social psychology (obedience to authority, dehumanisation), genocide studies, and transitional justice literature.

The theoretical frameworks include:

- **Stanley Milgram's obedience theory**
- **Hannah Arendt's "banality of evil" concept**
- **Herbert Kelman's dehumanisation model**
- **Social Identity Theory (Tajfel and Turner)**

Data are drawn from

- UN reports and resolutions,
- First-hand accounts (e.g., General Dallaire's memoirs),
- ICTR documents,
- Media transcripts from RTLM radio
- Secondary analyses from leading genocide scholars

This triangulated approach allows for a layered understanding of how individual psychology, state institutions, and international actors intersected during the genocide.

Summary

1994 Ruanda Soykırımı, modern tarihin en trajik ve dehşet verici olaylarından biri olarak kabul edilmektedir. Sadece 100 gün içinde yaklaşık 800.000 Tutsi ve ılımlı Hutu, sistematik bir şiddet kampanyasında vahşice katledilmiştir. Bu makale, soykırımın tarihsel arka planını, nedenlerini ve uygulanış biçimini, ayrıca uluslararası toplumun tepkisini incelemektedir. Ayrıca bu suçlara karşı alınan hukuki önlemleri ve ulusal



uzlaşya yönelik çabaları da ele almaktadır. Tarihsel, politik, sosyolojik ve ekonomik açılardan yapılan analizlerle, gelecekte benzer vahşetlerin önlenmesine yardımcı olabilecek hayati dersler ortaya konulmaktadır.

Introduction

Genocide represents one of the most devastating breakdowns of human societies—a violent rupture in the moral and ethical codes that sustain civilisation. When people are persecuted and targeted solely because of their ethnic, national, racial, or religious identity, it signifies not only a violation of rights but also a collapse of collective humanity. Although the 20th century is often associated with advancements in science, politics, and international cooperation, it also bore witness to atrocities that revealed the fragility of the modern order. The Holocaust stands as a terrifying example of how state structures can be turned into instruments of extermination. Similarly, the killing of Bosnians during the final phase of the Yugoslavia reflected how political instability, fear, and ethnonationalism can lead societies towards collective violence. In Cambodia, the Khmer Rouge’s revolutionary agenda culminated in a mass purge that eradicated roughly a quarter of the population, illustrating the destructive consequences of ideological extremism.

Among these catastrophic episodes, the 1994 Rwandan Genocide stands out due to both its ferocity and the global community’s failure to intervene. Within just 100 days, approximately 800,000 Tutsis and moderate Hutus were brutally murdered—many by people they had once known personally. This mass violence unfolded with alarming speed and was often carried out with rudimentary weapons, such as machetes and clubs. Local media, especially radio broadcasts, played a central role in inciting hatred and organising attacks, while state actors coordinated much of the violence. Peacekeeping forces on the ground lacked both the authority and the capacity to prevent the slaughter, rendering the United Nations ineffective during one of the century’s worst humanitarian crises (Melvern, 2006).

The roots of the Rwandan tragedy can be traced back to the colonial era, during which the European powers imposed rigid ethnic classifications that institutionalised inequality. Under the Belgian administration, Tutsis were favoured over Hutus, deepening social cleavages and fuelling resentment. After independence in 1962, these divisions became embedded in national politics, giving rise to cycles of discrimination, retaliation, and political exclusion (Des Forges, 1999). By the early 1990s, escalating tensions had left the country on the brink of collapse, and the assassination of President Habyarimana in April 1994 became the trigger for widespread violence.

The legacy of the Rwandan Genocide serves as a grim reminder that the collapse of social and moral order can occur with alarming rapidity. It also emphasises the need for the international community to respond not only with diplomatic rhetoric but also with timely and decisive action rooted in the protection of human dignity.

Between April and July 1994, in only 100 days, nearly 800,000 to 1 million Tutsis and moderate Hutus were killed during the Rwandan Genocide (Gourevitch, 1998). What made this genocide different from others was the way it was carried out. Unlike other genocides that often relied on military operations or industrial methods, most of the killings in Rwanda were done using simple tools such as machetes and clubs. The violence was not only between strangers—neighbours, friends, and even family members turned against one another. This was not a sudden outbreak of hate, but the result of years of political manipulation, ethnic propaganda, and deep historical tensions (Straus, 2006; Mamdani, 2001).

One of the most tragic aspects of the Rwandan Genocide was the failure of the international community to stop it. Even though intelligence agencies, NGOs, and diplomats warned about the risk of mass violence,



world leaders hesitated to take action. Many governments avoided using the term “genocide” so they would not be legally required to intervene under the 1948 Genocide Convention (Power, 2002). The UN peacekeeping mission in Rwanda (UNAMIR), led by General Roméo Dallaire, was unable to respond effectively due to limited resources and political restrictions (Dallaire, 2004).

This lack of international response allowed the killings to continue. It also raised serious questions about global responsibility and the effectiveness of international law. Beyond the loss of lives, the genocide caused deep social, political, and economic damage in Rwanda. Entire communities were wiped out, and millions of people were displaced (Prunier, 1995). After the genocide, Rwanda had to rebuild its society, deal with widespread trauma, and work towards justice and reconciliation (Clark, 2010).

The Rwandan experience has forced not only the country itself, but the whole world, to think again about human rights, international intervention, and justice after the conflict (Melvern, 2006). This study aims to examine the genocide from historical, political, sociological, and legal perspectives. It will look at how colonial rule contributed to ethnic division, how political messaging encouraged violence, and how international institutions failed to act. It will also evaluate Rwanda’s post-genocide justice efforts, especially the work of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) and the community-based Gacaca courts. By understanding the causes of this tragedy, we may help prevent similar events in the future.

Historical Background: Colonial Legacy and Ethnic Division

The roots of the Rwandan Genocide go back to long-standing ethnic tensions that were made worse and formalised during the colonial period. Before European colonisation, Rwandan society was not sharply divided by ethnicity. Instead, it was shaped more by economic roles and social status. Most Hutus worked as farmers, while Tutsis, who often owned cattle, held more wealth and political influence (Mamdani, 2001). These identities were flexible: a successful Hutu could be considered a Tutsi, while a Tutsi who lost wealth might be seen as a Hutu (Newbury, 1988).

This flexible system changed drastically when the Germans arrived in the late 19th century, and later when Belgium took control. Both colonial powers believed that Tutsis were superior to Hutus based on physical traits such as height and skin tone. They used the Tutsis as local rulers, creating a racial hierarchy that excluded the Hutus from power and opportunity (Des Forges, 1999; Gourevitch, 1998).

When Belgium officially took over Rwanda in 1916, they deepened this divide. In 1933, they introduced identity cards that labelled every person as Hutu, Tutsi, or Twa. This policy ended the fluid social mobility of earlier times (Prunier, 1995). Tutsis were given access to better education, government jobs, and land, while Hutus were excluded and marginalised (Chrétien, 2003).

However, things changed again in the mid-20th century, when many African countries began to seek independence. Belgium, sensing the political shift, switched its support from the Tutsi elites to the Hutu majority (Mamdani, 2001). This change led to the 1959 Hutu Revolution. Thousands of Tutsis were killed, and tens of thousands were forced to flee to neighbouring countries (Melvern, 2006). When Rwanda became independent in 1962, the Hutus took power and began to enforce discriminatory policies against the Tutsis (Straus, 2006).

In the years following independence, Rwanda’s Hutu-led governments continued to exclude the Tutsis from political power, public services, and economic life. This long-term marginalisation caused deep frustration among the Tutsi communities, especially those living in exile. Many of them had fled during earlier waves of violence, including the 1959 revolution. Over time, this group became increasingly organised and determined



to return to their homeland. Out of these exiled communities, the RPF was formed—a group that would later play a key role in the events leading up to the 1994 genocide (Prunier, 1995).

The foundations of this genocide were laid by two major historical forces. First, the colonial period created artificial ethnic divisions, turning flexible social categories into rigid, racial identities. Second, the post-independence policies of exclusion and discrimination deepened those divisions. For decades, Tutsis were labelled as enemies of the state, and their rights were systematically denied.

By the early 1990s, the tension had reached a breaking point. Years of unresolved grievances, social injustice, and ethnic propaganda erupted into widespread violence. The genocide that followed targeted not only the Tutsis but also the moderate Hutus who opposed the extremist government. Rwanda's experience shows how colonial manipulation and long-standing political exclusion can together lead to devastating consequences. This is a powerful reminder that identity-based politics and historical injustice, if left unaddressed, can fuel cycles of mass violence and instability.

The Road to Genocide: Political Turmoil and the Spark of Conflict

In the early 1990s, Rwanda was on the verge of collapse. The country was struggling with an economic crisis, deep-rooted ethnic tensions, and growing political instability. For decades, repeated violence, ethnic discrimination, and state-led killings had created strong feelings of fear and hatred between the Hutu-led government and the excluded Tutsi minority (Mamdani, 2001). The situation worsened during the 1980s when coffee prices—the country's main source of income—fell sharply. This economic downturn caused high unemployment, growing poverty, and rising frustration among the population (Uvin, 1998; Prunier, 1995).

Amid this climate of uncertainty, the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF)—a group formed by Tutsi exiles who had fled earlier violence—launched a military attack against the Rwandan government in October 1990 (Des Forges, 1999). Their goal was to remove President Juvénal Habyarimana's regime and to secure the right of return for Tutsi refugees who had been living abroad for decades (Melvern, 2006). The government, however, resisted this challenge with support from France and Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of the Congo). This led to a prolonged civil war that lasted until the genocide erupted in 1994 (Gourevitch, 1998).

The growing instability, mixed with years of social division and economic collapse, laid the groundwork for radical ideologies to gain power. What followed was not simply the result of ancient ethnic hatred, but a carefully constructed political process that used fear and historical wounds to justify mass violence.

The Arusha Accords: A Fragile Peace

To end the ongoing civil war, peace talks were held between the Rwandan government and the RPF. These negotiations led to the signing of the Arusha Accords in August 1993 (Straus, 2006). The agreement aimed to create a power-sharing government between the Hutus and Tutsis, declare a ceasefire, and integrate RPF fighters into the national army (Dallaire, 2004). The international community welcomed the deal as a step towards peace. However, extremist Hutu groups saw it as a threat to their political dominance (Melvern, 2006).

Members of President Juvénal Habyarimana's ruling party, the MRND (National Republican Movement for Democracy and Development), along with ultra-nationalist groups like the Coalition for the Defence of the Republic (CDR), strongly opposed the Accords (Des Forges, 1999). They believed the agreement would give the Tutsis back political and military power. These hardliners had been preparing for years to launch mass violence, and they viewed the peace process as the perfect cover for their final plan (Chrétien, 2003).



Even before the genocide began, radical elements within the government were developing detailed plans to eliminate the Tutsi population. These plans were supported by years of anti-Tutsi propaganda. The ideology known as “Hutu Power” portrayed Tutsis as enemies of the state and called for their destruction. Hate speech was widely spread through Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines (RTLM), a government-backed broadcaster. On RTLM, Tutsis were regularly called “inyenzi” (cockroaches) and listeners were encouraged to kill them (Gourevitch, 1998).

During this time, death lists were created, militias were trained, and hundreds of thousands of machetes were imported and distributed to government-aligned groups (Melvern, 2006). In this way, preparations for genocide were made under the false promise of peace.

The Assassination of Habyarimana and the Start of the Genocide

On April 6, 1994, a plane carrying Rwandan President Juvénal Habyarimana was shot down as it approached the Kigali airport. The crash killed both Habyarimana and the President of Burundi, Cyprien Ntaryamira. To this day, it is unclear who was responsible for the attack, but the consequences were immediate and devastating (Des Forges, 1999).

Within hours of the crash, roadblocks were set up across Kigali, and the killings began. Tutsi civilians, as well as moderate Hutus who supported peace or opposed the ruling party, were targeted. The president’s assassination gave radical Hutu leaders the excuse they had been waiting for to launch a planned campaign of mass murder (Melvern, 2006).

Although the crash was officially framed as a national tragedy, extremist elements in the government and military used it to justify their pre-arranged plans. The Interahamwe militias—closely tied to the ruling MRND party—were activated. With lists of names in hand, they went door to door, killing Tutsis and political opponents (Gourevitch, 1998). These militias, supported by members of the national army and local officials, were brutal and efficient. The killings spread quickly from Kigali to the countryside.

What happened was not a spontaneous outbreak of violence. It was a well-organised effort, prepared over many months. Weapons had already been distributed, death lists were written, and hate propaganda had prepared the public to accept the killings. The downing of the plane simply triggered the execution of a carefully designed plan for genocide (Straus, 2006).

In just a few weeks, the international community realised that mass violence was unfolding—but by then, tens of thousands had already been killed.

The Mobilisation of Genocide: The Role of Extremist Hutu Leaders

Just hours after the assassination of President Habyarimana, extremist Hutu leaders, military officers, and members of the presidential guard activated a pre-existing plan to eliminate the Tutsi population (Dallaire, 2004). Factions loyal to the “Hutu Power” ideology quickly took control of the interim government and launched a nationwide campaign of organised killings (Gourevitch, 1998). Roadblocks were set up across Rwanda, where armed militias and government forces checked identity cards and executed Tutsis and moderate Hutus on the spot (Des Forges, 1999).

The primary actors behind the massacres were the youth militias of the ruling MRND party and the extremist CDR: the Interahamwe and Impuzamugambi. These groups were trained, armed, and directed by state officials and military commanders (Straus, 2006). The violence was not random—it was systematic,



coordinated, and brutally efficient. Massacres occurred in homes, schools, hospitals, and even churches, where many Tutsis had sought refuge (Melvern, 2006).

Women and girls were subjected to widespread sexual violence. Many were gang-raped by militias and soldiers, with some deliberately infected with HIV/AIDS—a method described by human rights experts as a form of biological warfare (Nowrojee, 2005).

Despite clear evidence of the scale of the killings, the international community remained largely silent. World leaders refused to intervene, even as reports from Rwanda showed the extent of the violence (Power, 2002). Rather than strengthening peacekeeping operations, the United Nations, the United States, and European countries withdrew most of their personnel, leaving civilians unprotected (Dallaire, 2004).

By July 1994, when the RPF captured Kigali and brought the genocide to an end, an estimated 800,000 to one million people had been killed (Prunier, 1995). This genocide remains one of the darkest chapters in human history and represents a profound failure of international diplomacy and humanitarian responsibility.

Psychological and Sociological Factors in Genocide

Genocide is not only a mass killing—it is also a socially constructed process that enables ordinary individuals to participate in extreme acts of violence. The psychological and sociological mechanisms behind this transformation include deep-seated prejudices, state-sponsored propaganda, group conformity, obedience to authority, and the systematic dehumanisation of the targeted group (Staub, 1989). These elements create an environment where violence becomes normalised and even justified in the minds of the perpetrators.

The 1994 Rwandan Genocide is a chilling example of how individual psychology, collective identity, and ideological indoctrination can combine to turn neighbours, friends, and even family members into executioners. Many Rwandans were influenced by years of anti-Tutsi propaganda, which portrayed the Tutsi minority as subhuman and dangerous enemies of the state. Constant exposure to this narrative made it easier for individuals to rationalise or even embrace violence (Mamdani, 2001).

Social pressures also played a powerful role. Participation in violence was often driven by fear of punishment, a desire for social acceptance, or opportunistic motivations such as looting and land seizure. In tightly knit communities, refusing to join in the killings could result in accusations of betrayal or even death. These dynamics highlight how genocide is not simply the result of hatred, but a complex interaction of psychological conditioning, political manipulation, and communal coercion.

Understanding these factors is crucial for preventing future atrocities. It reveals how vulnerable societies can be to ideologies of exclusion and violence, and underscores the importance of education, social resilience, and early intervention in times of rising ethnic or political tension.

Dehumanisation and the Role of Propaganda

One of the most powerful psychological tools that enabled the Rwandan Genocide was the systematic dehumanisation of the Tutsi population. In the years leading up to 1994, extremist Hutu leaders promoted a false narrative portraying Tutsis as foreigners and threats to the nation's survival (Des Forges, 1999). State-controlled media, particularly *Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines* (RTLM), played a central role in spreading this message. Tutsis were routinely referred to as "cockroaches" (*inyenzi*) or "snakes"—terms that framed their extermination as not only justified but also necessary (Gourevitch, 1998).



Research in social psychology confirms that dehumanisation is a critical step in enabling genocide. When a group is described using animalistic or disease-related language, moral boundaries are weakened. Perpetrators can commit horrific acts without guilt or empathy because they no longer see their victims as humans (Kelman & Hamilton, 1989; Staub, 2011).

In a small Rwandan village, people were at first unsure about hurting their Tutsi neighbours. However, as local militia leaders (Interahamwe) kept saying that “Tutsis are dangerous traitors,” the community slowly began to accept this idea. After several meetings and conversations, the group’s thinking became more extreme. What started as “maybe we should report them” turned into “we must kill them all.” This is an example of *group polarisation*, where people in a group start with moderate opinions but move to extreme positions after group discussions (Myers & Lamm, 1976).

A young man didn’t want to join the killings. But all of his friends had already joined the militia and told him he would be punished if he did not help. Feeling scared and pressured, he decided to help them find people hiding in the village, even though he knew it was wrong. Later, he said, “Everyone was doing it. I had no choice.”

This shows *conformity*, where a person changes their behaviour to match the group, even if they disagree inside. This idea comes from the classic studies by Solomon Asch (1956).

A Hutu farmer hid his childhood friend, a Tutsi, in his home. One day, the militia came and said anyone who hid the Tutsis would be killed along with their whole family. The man was afraid for his wife and children. In the end, he told the militia about the hidden friend. Many years later, he said, “I still feel guilty, but I had to protect my children.”

This is a *moral dilemma*—a very difficult choice between doing what is right and protecting loved ones. According to Kohlberg (1981), this kind of situation shows how people struggle between different levels of moral reasoning.

This pattern was not unique to Rwanda. During the Holocaust, Jews were described as rats and vermin; in Cambodia, enemies of the Khmer Rouge were labelled as parasites (Hinton, 2005). These examples show how language and imagery can be weaponized to destroy empathy and justify mass killing.

Understanding the role of propaganda and dehumanisation helps explain how ordinary citizens can become involved in systematic violence. It also highlights the need to challenge hate speech and ideological manipulation before they translate into real-world atrocities.

Social Identity Theory and Group Polarisation

Another key psychological factor in the context of genocide is the social identity theory, which explains how people define themselves based on group membership (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). In Rwanda, the ethnic divisions imposed during the colonial period gradually became rigid social categories, increasing hostility between the Hutu and Tutsi communities (Mamdani, 2001).

Psychologists suggest that when one group (such as the Hutu majority) perceives another group (such as the Tutsi minority) as a threat to its existence, aggressive actions can become justified or even encouraged (Staub, 2011). In Rwanda, decades of political propaganda reinforced the belief that the Tutsis were plotting to regain control of the country. This fear was used to portray their elimination as an act of “self-defence” (Melvern, 2006).



In addition, the psychological phenomenon known as group polarisation also played a major role. This occurs when people adopt more extreme positions when they are part of a group than they would on their own (Myers & Lamm, 1976). As the killings began, growing social pressure to participate in the genocide pushed many individuals into violence. Even those who were initially hesitant joined in—whether due to fear, coercion, or a desire to gain social approval (Fujii, 2009).

Understanding how social identity and group dynamics contribute to collective violence is essential for designing early-warning systems and interventions that address not only political tensions but also the psychological vulnerabilities that can lead to mass atrocities.

Obedience to Authority and the Banality of Evil

Stanley Milgram's (1963) famous experiments showed how ordinary people can follow orders from authority figures, even when those orders cause harm to others. In Rwanda, local leaders, government officials, and military officers gave direct orders to citizens to kill their neighbours, coworkers, and even family members (Dallaire, 2004). In a culture where obeying political and military leaders was strongly expected and where people feared punishment, thousands joined the genocide—even if they felt it was wrong (Straus, 2006).

Hannah Arendt's idea of the *banality of evil*, based on her analysis of Adolf Eichmann, shows that mass killings can be committed not only by fanatics or sadists but also by ordinary people who do not think critically about their actions. These people follow orders, obey rules, and avoid personal responsibility (Arendt, 1963).

In the case of the **1994 Rwandan Genocide**, Arendt's concept can be applied to different local actors:

- **Village Chiefs:** Many village leaders helped organise lists of Tutsi families and shared them with the militias. They were not ideological leaders, but local officials who saw themselves simply as following the government's orders (Dallaire, 2004).
- **Militia Leaders (Interahamwe):** Some militia leaders were motivated by ethnic hatred, but many acted because of peer pressure, fear, or for personal benefit such as land, status, or protection. They became part of the violence not by deep belief, but by following what became "normal" in their environment (Straus, 2006).
- **Radio Broadcasters (RTLM):** This radio station encouraged violence with hate speech. But after the genocide, many broadcasters said they were just doing their jobs—just like Eichmann said during his trial (Des Forges, 1999).

These people were not monsters. They were ordinary individuals who played their roles in a violent system without thinking deeply about what they were doing. Their actions—writing lists, speaking on the radio, organising local meetings—show how terrible things can happen when normal people stop thinking critically and blindly obey a system.

Fear and the Need for Self-Protection

While ideology and propaganda motivated many, fear was also a major reason why ordinary Hutus joined the killings. In many cases, those who refused to join the violence were called traitors and were themselves attacked or killed by extremist militias (Fujii, 2009). Some people did not hate Tutsis, but they feared for their lives and the safety of their families (Straus, 2006).



There were also economic reasons. The Hutu civilians were promised the property, land, and money of the Tutsis they killed. This made the violence even more attractive for people struggling with poverty (Uvin, 1998).

Psychological trauma and post-genocide guilt

For many who took part in the genocide, the emotional impact was deep. Those forced or pressured to kill lived with strong feelings of guilt, shame, and emotional breakdown (Hinton, 2005). Some had to kill friends or relatives and suffered serious mental conflicts afterward.

For survivors, the trauma was just as severe. Many experienced post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression, and deep sadness. Families and communities were torn apart by grief, fear, and mistrust (Staub, 2011).

After the genocide, Rwanda tried to rebuild through reconciliation efforts. The local courts known as Gacaca helped people share the truth, accept responsibility, and return to society. However, these processes were emotionally difficult. Survivors had to face the people who had killed their loved ones, and this made forgiveness and healing much harder (Clark, 2010).

Understanding Genocide Psychology to Prevent Future Crimes

Understanding the psychology and social forces behind genocide is essential for preventing future mass killings. Rwanda shows how propaganda, group identity, obedience to authority, and fear can push ordinary people to commit shocking violence.

To prevent similar events, societies must take the following key steps:

- Promote education that supports critical thinking and tolerance,
- respond early to signs of extremist ideas, and
- Strengthen global legal systems that hold people accountable for crimes.

Unless we clearly understand how genocide happens, the world risks facing these horrors again (Staub, 2011).

Economic Consequences of the Genocide

The 1994 Rwandan Genocide caused not only deep human suffering but also a massive economic collapse. Mass killings, forced displacement, and the destruction of infrastructure led to the shutdown of key industries and nearly stopped the country's economic activity (Uvin, 1998). With many workers killed, roads and utilities destroyed, and farming disrupted, poverty increased and food became scarce (Prunier, 1995).

Despite these severe problems, Rwanda later made a remarkable economic recovery. Through reconciliation-based development plans, structural reforms, and new governance strategies, the country began to rebuild. Today, Rwanda is seen as one of Africa's fastest-growing economies. This success is often linked to the determination and cooperation of its people (World Bank, 2022).

Immediate Economic Impact: Collapse of Key Sectors

During the genocide, the economy almost stopped. Factories were closed, farms were abandoned, and transportation systems no longer worked. Agriculture, which supported over 90% of the population, was hit hardest. Many farmers were killed or fled, and the land was left unused (Uvin, 1998). Roads, bridges, power



lines, and water systems were damaged or destroyed, making it hard to continue any economic activity (World Bank, 2000).

The financial sector also collapsed. Most banks shut down, and foreign investors left due to political chaos. The national currency lost value, inflation increased, and the government could no longer pay salaries or support public services. International donors also paused or reduced their aid while waiting to see how the situation would unfold (Holtzman et al., 1996; Ansoms, 2011).

Loss of Human Capital and Long-Term Development

Beyond physical destruction, one of the most damaging effects was the loss of human capital. In just 100 days, Rwanda lost around 10% of its population. Many of those killed were teachers, doctors, engineers, business leaders, and public servants—people who played key roles in the economy (Straus, 2006; Verwimp, 2003).

It is also estimated that about 400,000 children were left orphaned. This had a strong negative effect on Rwanda's long-term development potential (Human Rights Watch, 1996). Many women who survived were victims of sexual violence, which caused physical and mental trauma, making it difficult for them to work or continue with a normal life (Nowrojee, 2005).

The refugee crisis also hurt the economy. Millions fled to neighbouring countries, creating one of Africa's biggest refugee movements (UNHCR, 1995). When they returned after the genocide, Rwanda faced serious problems with housing, employment, and access to basic services (Prunier, 1995).

Post-Genocide Economic Reforms: The Path to Recovery

Despite the deep economic destruction caused by the genocide, Rwanda managed to launch one of the most ambitious rebuilding efforts in recent history. Under the leadership of the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) and President Paul Kagame, the government introduced strong economic reforms focused on reconciliation, political stability, and sustainable growth (Ansoms, 2011).

One of the key parts of this recovery was investment in agriculture. Since most Rwandans depended on farming, the government prioritised land reform, rural development, and modern farming techniques (World Bank, 2022). Programmes aimed at increasing food production, improving irrigation, and boosting exports helped stabilise the economy and lifted millions out of extreme poverty (IMF, 2019).

Another major factor in the recovery was support for private sector investment. The government created business-friendly policies, reduced bureaucracy, and offered incentives to attract foreign investors. This helped revive industries such as tourism, manufacturing, and technology (Holtzman et al., 1996). Investment in roads, electricity, and the internet also made Rwanda more attractive for business (World Economic Forum, 2021).

Tourism and Economic Diversification: A Model for Africa

Rwanda used its natural beauty and biodiversity to build a strong tourism sector. Thanks to investments in ecotourism and wildlife conservation, the country has become a popular destination for international tourists (Spenceley et al., 2017). Volcanoes National Park, home to endangered mountain gorillas, has made Rwanda a world-famous travel destination. Tourism brought foreign income and created jobs for thousands of people (Munyaneza, 2019).



At the same time, Rwanda worked to diversify its economy beyond farming and tourism. The government invested in manufacturing, services, and financial technology (IMF, 2019). It also attracted international businesses, hosted global conferences, and built strong trade partnerships. Today, Rwanda is considered one of East Africa's emerging economies (World Economic Forum, 2021).

Lessons from Rwanda's Economic Transformation

Rwanda's recovery offers important lessons for other countries rebuilding after the conflict. Even though the genocide left the nation in ruins, good leadership and long-term planning helped rebuild the economy:

- **Political Stability and Reconciliation:** Peace and shared governance create the foundation for recovery (Clark, 2010).
- **Investment in Human Capital:** Rwanda focused on education, job skills, and youth empowerment to rebuild its workforce (Verwimp, 2003).
- **Infrastructure and Technology:** Modern roads, electricity, and digital services support long-term growth (Anyanwu & Erhijakpor, 2010).
- **Anti-Corruption Policies:** The government enforced strong measures to reduce corruption, improve trust, and attract investors (Transparency International, 2022).

Although Rwanda still faces challenges such as unemployment, inequality, and reliance on foreign aid, its progress shows that post-conflict recovery is possible with smart and committed leadership (IMF, 2019).

International Response: Silence and Inaction

The 1994 Rwandan Genocide is seen as one of the biggest failures of the international community. Political interests, bureaucracy, and hesitation stopped world leaders from taking action, even when clear warnings were given. Despite intelligence reports, diplomatic messages, and witness accounts, leaders from the United Nations, the United States, and European countries did not take steps to prevent the killing of nearly one million people (Dallaire, 2004).

Even when the genocide was reported by the global media and confirmed by satellite images, international leaders delayed and debated. In the end, they chose not to intervene. The failure of the UN Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR), the reluctance of Western powers, and the overall lack of political will showed that the problem was not a lack of resources but a lack of commitment (Melvern, 2006).

Early Warnings Ignored

The UN and other global actors were warned about the coming genocide months in advance. In January 1994, UNAMIR Commander General Roméo Dallaire sent a secret telegram, later known as the "Genocide Fax," to the UN Headquarters in New York. He clearly stated that the extremist Hutus were planning mass killings, collecting weapons, and training militias (Dallaire, 2004; Des Forges, 1999).

Dallaire asked for permission to stop the weapons and prevent the violence. However, the UN refused, saying it must respect Rwanda's national sovereignty and stay within its limited peacekeeping mandate (Barnett, 2002). This delay gave extremists time to act without any serious opposition (Melvern, 2006).



UNAMIR's Weak Mandate

UNAMIR was created by the UN Security Council in October 1993 through Resolution 872. Its job was to observe the peace agreement between the Rwandan government and the RPF (Jones, 2007). However, it had no real authority or capacity to stop violence.

When the genocide began in April 1994, UNAMIR had only about 2,500 lightly armed peacekeepers—far too few to stop the mass killings (Dallaire, 2004). As the violence increased, the UN actually reduced the force to just 270 soldiers. This left Rwanda at the mercy of the killers (Power, 2002).

Although General Dallaire and his team tried hard to protect civilians, their efforts were limited by the lack of equipment, troops, and legal authority (Des Forges, 1999). At the same time, NATO was willing to intervene in places such as Bosnia and Kosovo, which showed a painful double standard (Gourevitch, 1998).

The Role of the U.S. and Western Countries

During the genocide, the United States under President Bill Clinton remained largely passive (Power, 2002). The death of US soldiers in Somalia in 1993 made the Clinton administration very cautious about another mission in Africa (Barnett, 2002).

In press briefings, U.S. officials avoided using the word “genocide.” They used vague terms such as “acts of genocide” to avoid legal obligations under the 1948 Genocide Convention (Power, 2002; Kuperman, 2001).

Meanwhile, France continued to support the Hutu-led government. In June 1994, it launched “Operation Turquoise,” claiming it was a humanitarian mission. However, this also helped many genocide suspects escape to Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of Congo) (Prunier, 1995).

Moral Failure and Late Realisations

By July 1994, the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), led by Paul Kagame, had taken control of the capital, Kigali. The genocide had already claimed around 800,000 to 1 million lives (Straus, 2006).

After the genocide, the UN and Western governments faced harsh criticism. Kofi Annan, who later became the UN Secretary-General, admitted that the UN had failed in Rwanda (Annan, 1999). In 1998, President Bill Clinton visited Rwanda and admitted the U.S. inaction but did not offer a full apology (Power, 2002).

The Rwandan Genocide demonstrated the importance of early intervention in stopping mass killings. However, later tragedies in Sudan (Darfur), Myanmar (Rohingya), and Syria raise serious questions about whether the world truly learned from Rwanda (Straus, 2006).

Lessons from Rwanda: Strengthening Global Responses to Genocide

The failure to stop the 1994 Rwandan Genocide sparked major discussions about how the world can better prevent such mass killings. Some key lessons are as follows:

- **Early Warning Systems:** Intelligence agencies and international organisations must act quickly and firmly when signs of genocide appear (Jones, 2007).
- **Stronger Peacekeeping Mandates:** Future peace missions need enough troops, equipment, and the authority to intervene if violence breaks out (Dallaire, 2004).
- **Avoiding Political Delays:** Governments should not hesitate to use the word “*genocide*” when mass violence is occurring. Hiding behind legal language weakens action and delays help (Power, 2002).



- **Accountability:** Countries that fail to respond to genocide must take responsibility. Human rights should come before political interests (Melvern, 2006).

As Kofi Annan, the former UN Secretary-General, once said, what happened in Rwanda was “a unique failure” in UN history. The world cannot afford to repeat that mistake.

Conclusion: Preventing Future Genocides

The Rwandan Genocide was one of the most shocking events of modern history. It showed how ethnic hatred, political extremism, and global silence can combine to cause mass death. In just 100 days, about one million people were killed. The international community failed to act in time and was often stuck in debates and bureaucracy (Staub, 2011).

This genocide left deep scars on Rwandan society. It affected everything—economy, politics, society, and national identity. However, Rwanda began a long recovery process focused on justice and reconciliation. Through the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) and local *Gacaca* courts, many perpetrators were judged, and efforts towards national unity began (Clark, 2010).

At the global level, the genocide proved how important early action, strong legal systems, and political courage are (Barnett, 2002). However, recent tragedies in Sudan, Myanmar, and Syria suggest that the world has still not fully learned from Rwanda (Straus, 2006).

To prevent future genocides, the international community must:

- **Take Early Warnings Seriously:** Genocide is often the result of years of hate speech and division. These signs must not be ignored (Mamdani, 2001).
- **Improve Response Systems:** The UN and regional organisations should be reformed to act quickly, even when politics are complicated (Dallaire, 2004).
- **Fight Hate Speech:** As in Rwanda with the RTLM radio, hate speech often comes before violence. In today’s digital world, this threat is even greater (Melvern, 2006).
- **Balance Justice and Healing:** Punishment is not enough. There must also be truth-telling and efforts to bring communities back together (Clark, 2010).
- **Promote education and historical awareness:** The causes and effects of genocide should be taught to future generations to prevent denial and forgetting (Schabas, 2006).

Rwanda’s journey over the last 30 years offers hope. But real healing requires constant work, honesty, and building a shared national identity.

Table 1
Comparison of Genocide Prevention Mechanisms

Criteria/Genocide	Rwanda (1994)	Bosnia (1992–1995)	Cambodia (1975–1979)	Holocaust (1939–1945)
Early Warning Signs	UN peacekeepers warned the UN, but no action is taken.	Many reports of violence were ignored for years.	Refugees and mass graves were visible, but there was no strong response.	Anti-Jewish laws and violence were clear signs.
International Response	The UN and other countries were too late and too weak.	NATO only acted after years of killings.	No real international help; only Vietnam stopped it.	No action during the war; focus was on military victory.



Criteria/Genocide	Rwanda (1994)	Bosnia (1992–1995)	Cambodia (1975–1979)	Holocaust (1939–1945)
Legal Tools Available	The Genocide Convention existed, but was not used.	Convention ignored, no punishment at the time.	Convention was ignored due to Cold War politics.	No legal term for genocide existed during the war.
UN's Role	The UN had peacekeepers but gave them no power.	UN troops failed to protect civilians in safe zones.	The UN was not involved; the major powers stayed silent.	The UN did not exist yet; the League of Nations failed to act.
Regional Powers' Actions	Neighbouring countries stayed silent.	Serbia supported the attackers; others stayed quiet.	Only Vietnam acted by invading Cambodia.	Some local governments helped the Nazis or stayed silent.
Media and Civil Society	The media came late; the world saw the killings too late.	Some media reports existed, but they did not stop the genocide.	The government blocked all news; the world knew little.	Few knew or cared until after the war.
Political Context	Post-Cold War confusion delayed the global reaction.	The European war made action harder; politics blocked it.	The Cold War made the West avoid action against Cambodia.	The World War II focus was the military; Jews were not a priority.
Lessons Learned	Led to "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P) in 2005.	Showed the need for a stronger international justice system.	Led to later debates on humanitarian intervention.	Helped create human rights law and war crime tribunals.

Summary Points

- In **Rwanda**, the genocide could have been stopped early. A UN commander warned the world, but no one listened.
- In **Bosnia**, the UN and Europe did not protect civilians even when they promised to.
- In **Cambodia**, the world powers stayed quiet. Only **Vietnam** stopped the genocide by invading.
- During the **Holocaust**, there was no strong international system. The genocide happened while the world fought a big war.

The phrase "Never Again" should not just be a dream. It must be a call for action, policy, and responsibility. The world failed in Rwanda in 1994. To ensure that never happens again, every person, institution, and country must do their part.



Peer Review	Externally peer-reviewed.
Conflict of Interest	The author has no conflict of interest to declare.
Grant Support	The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

Author Details **Yaşar Onay (Prof. Dr)**

¹ Istanbul Kent University, Department of International Relations, Istanbul, Türkiye.

 0009-0009-0166-4128  yasaronay@istanbul.edu.tr

References

Annan, K. (1999). *Causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa* United Nations.



- Anyanwu, J. C. and Erhijakpor, A. E. (2010). Does human capital matter in the finance-growth nexus? *African Development Review*, 22(2), 334–363. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8268.2010.00237.x
- Arendt, H. (1963). *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the banality of evil*. Viking Press.
- Asch, S. E. (1956). Studies of independence and conformity: A minority of one against a unanimous majority *Psychological Monographs*, 70(9), 1–70. doi:10.1037/h0093718
- Barnett, M. (2002). *Eyewitnesses to a genocide: The United Nations and Rwanda* Cornell University Press.
- Chrétien, J.-P. (2003). *The Great Lakes of Africa: Two thousand years of history*. Zone Books.
- Clark, P. (2010). *The Gacaca courts, post-genocide justice and reconciliation in Rwanda: Justice without lawyers* Cambridge University Press.
- Dallaire, R. (2004). *Shake hands with the devil: The failure of humanity in Rwanda*. Carroll and Graf.
- Des Forges, A. (1999). *Leave none to tell the story: Genocide in Rwanda*. Human Rights Watch.
- Fujii, L. A. (2009). *Killing neighbours: Webs of violence in Rwanda* Cornell University Press.
- Gourevitch, P. (1998). *We wish to inform you that tomorrow we will be killed with our families: Stories from Rwanda*. Picador.
- Hinton, A. L. (2005). *Why did they kill? Cambodia in the shadow of genocide* University of California Press.
- Holtzman, S. B., et al. (1996). *Aftermath: Post-conflict recovery in Rwanda*. World Bank.
- Human Rights Watch. (1996). *Shattered lives: Sexual violence during the Rwandan genocide and its aftermath*
- International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2019). *Rwanda: Staff report for the 2019 Article IV consultation*. <https://www.imf.org>
- Jones, A. (2007). *Genocide: A comprehensive introduction*. Routledge.
- Kelman, H. C., & Hamilton, V. L. (1989). *Crimes of obedience: Towards a social psychology of authority and responsibility* Yale University Press.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *Essays on moral development: Vol. 1. The philosophy of moral development*. Harper and Row.
- Kuperman, A. J. (2001). *Limits of humanitarian intervention: Genocide in Rwanda* Brookings Institution Press.
- Mamdani, M. (2001). *When victims become killers: Colonialism, nativism, and the genocide in Rwanda*. Princeton University Press.
- Melvern, L. (2006). *Conspiracy to murder: The Rwandan genocide* Verso.
- Munyaneza, F. (2019). *Ecotourism and gorilla conservation in Rwanda* Rwanda Tourism Board Reports
- Myers, D. G., & Lamm, H. (1976). The group polarisation phenomenon. *Psychological Bulletin*, 83(4), 602–627. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.83.4.602
- Newbury, C. (1988). *The cohesion of oppression: Clientship and ethnicity in Rwanda, 1860–1960*. Columbia University Press.
- Nowrojee, B. (2005). *Your justice is too slow: Will the ICTR fail Rwanda's rape victims?* United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.
- Power, S. (2002). *"A problem from hell": America and the age of genocide*. Basic Books.
- Prunier, G. (1995). *The Rwanda crisis: History of a genocide* Columbia University Press.
- Schabas, W. (2006). *Genocide in international law: The crime of crimes* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Spenceley, A., et al. (2017). *Rwanda's tourism sector*. UNWTO Publications.
- Staub, E. (1989). *The roots of evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence* Cambridge University Press.
- Staub, E. (2011). *Overcoming evil: Genocide, violent conflict, and terrorism* Oxford University Press.
- Straus, S. (2006). *The order of genocide: Race, power, and war in Rwanda*. Cornell University Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Brooks/Cole.
- Transparency International. (2022). *Corruption perceptions index*. <https://www.transparency.org>
- UNHCR. 1995. *Rwanda: The refugee crisis*. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
- Uvin, P. (1998). *Aiding violence: The development enterprise in Rwanda*. Marian Press.
- World Bank. (2000). *Rwanda: Post-conflict reconstruction report*. <https://www.worldbank.org>
- World Bank. (2022). *Rwanda economic update*. <https://www.worldbank.org>
- World Economic Forum. (2021). *Rwanda: The path to recovery*. <https://www.weforum.org>

