

Question Period

Thierry Cruvellier: Merci. Mr Nsanzuwera, you now have the right to ask two questions.

Francois-Xavier Nsanzuwera: Well I'd like to ask three questions, because they're very complex questions. The first question is addressed to Mrs. Simone, and Mrs. Charity, who were the trial attorneys in the case. I will not ask them to repeat the trial here, but I would like to ask them if they were able to establish a link between the three people found guilty, the intellectual authors of the crime, and those who actually killed. My second question, which might seem to be provocative is to know when should a reporter stop being a reporter, and become a criminal responsible for crimes against humanity? This is provocative, because this morning I found myself being accused, if not charged, because between 1990 and 1994, I was a crown prosecutor of the Republic. I am very bitter. I often ask myself if I did enough, if I did my duty as I should have during that time, and I console myself sometimes by saying that November, '93, I wrote, way before the genocide, that we the Rwandan authorities were responsible, were guilty, because of the dictatorship and the violence that existed in our country, and that we were responsible because we did not speak out, because fear had shut our mouths. And then in '94, there was the genocide. So I would like to repeat my question when does a reporter stop being a reporter, and when does he become a criminal? And my last question: what can we do as a reporter so that international justice will not be suspect of serving other interests than justice? Thank you.

Thierry: Mrs. Kagwi. Speak more. I guess you can answer the first question. Thanks.

Charity Kagwi: Yes, now the first thing I want to say is that international law does not require us to show a link between the actual incitement and the killings. In fact, all we need to show is that there was the act of the incitement. The fact that the genocide did occur is not, in fact, relevant. However, what we have shown, and what we did show in the media trial was what the Kangura Journal and the RTLM did, was to stigmatize the Tutsi ethnic group within the Rwanda, to stigmatize them to such a level that killing them not only became a matter of national duty, but killing them was not like killing a human being. You were getting rid of a cockroach. That is why it was very easy for you to take up a machete, kill somebody, and go back home, and talk to your children. It was like getting rid of a snake, and in every single genocide there has been the stigmatization of the people, the dehumanization of the people that makes it easy, gives us, gives the people, the reason to take up whatever weapon they're going to do to exterminate what they consider is vermin in the society.

Another thing I would like to show is that what consistently happened within Rwanda, and this was shown through the Kangura Journal, was that the Tutsi population within Rwanda, were being held hostage to the war situation. What was being seen was that the people outside Rwanda, who were attacking the country were people from the 1959 Diaspora, mainly Tutsi, and the people within Rwanda, the Tutsi within Rwanda, were being held to be accomplices of the enemy. So I can just read one small extract that

shows the people in Rwanda, the Tutsi civilians in Rwanda were hostages to the war situation. This is in Kangura 54, and it says, "It is up to the Inyenzis, now Inyenzi means cockroach, and that came to mean the Tutsi people, now to demonstrate that they are courageous, and to know what till happen in the future. They should understand that if they commit the slightest mistake, then all of them will perish. And, that if they make a mistake of once again attacking, launching an attack, no accomplice will survive in Rwanda. They should know today that all Hutus have become united. They are united as one man." I think that's all I have to say about that.

Thierry Cruvellier: Mr. Biju Duval do you want to say something about that?

Biju Duval: Well yes, it's an important question. Mrs. Kagwi has just given more details concerning the Kangura Journal, and there again you mustn't create confusion. There's Kangura. There's RTL Radio. There are 80 other newspapers being sold in Kigali. There's Radio Muhabura. There's the government radio, and all that is a very complex reality. And as you have all understood certain words come back repeatedly, certain expressions "Inyenzi-Nkotanyi," accomplices of the cockroaches, and these will play an important role in the propaganda. And one of the main questions that was judged in Arusha was to identify and to know if these words have a criminal sense to them, if the use of these words has as it's purpose, direct extermination of a people, and of course in 30 seconds I can't present all the details of this debate, but I'd like to tell you that the debate does exist. It's a complex one, and it's a debate will even come before your Canadian courts, which last December rendered a decision, which encourages you to reflect on this subject, a decision which is diametrically opposed to the judgment of ICTR. So you can see the danger for justice. If in Montreal, in Ottawa, you are acquitted, and if for the same case you are found guilty for using the same words in Arusha, where's the role of justice? So you have to be very prudent, and maybe prudent or caution is not the right term. When you speak of justice, you must be brave, but you must be very rigorous in your use of principles. You must be brave, because you have to be brave to not follow the experts, to speak out for yourself, and that's the answer I would give to Mrs. Kagwi.

Thierry Cruvellier: Madame Kagwi wants to reply of course. Please shortly so we can move to the second question, very shortly.

Charity Kagwi: Okay. The Mugesera judgment that was rendered in Canada is in appeal, so I think that's not a complete issue, and neither is this one that was in the media trial. It's still going to go on appeal, and these issues will be handled in other courts. But I want note that while I read an extract from Kangura, this is an extract of Kangura 54 that came up in March, of 1994. At the same time within Rwanda, RTL was running a competition, was actually running what were advertisements for Kangura. They would tell people, and this was read straight onto the record, they'd tell people, "go read Kangura 54, read Kangura 54. See what Kangura 54 is saying". Now apart from that, there was a competition in which people were told, "go buy Kanguras, fill in answers, have answers, we're going to give you a lot of rewards for the people who win this," and, they also stated that you should rate RTL. Now the people, who were the owners of

RTLTM cannot take themselves away from what Kangura was saying at that time, because by advocating for the Kangura Journal what they were actually doing was propagating the message that Kangura was giving. So that's about what I'm going to say.

Thierry Cruvellier: Thomas Kamilindi, maybe you want to answer the second question at what point a journalist becomes a criminal? How would you understand that?

Thomas Kamilindi: Thank you very much. It's extremely difficult to answer that question, because journalists are human like everyone else. Sometimes reporters think they are supermen or women, but no we are human beings. We have feelings like everyone else, and we are members of society. And we can be caught up in the circle of violence like anyone else. We can identify with the group responsible for violence, like other members of society can do. So that is why as reporters we should be more objective. In April last year, I was in Cote d'Ivoire covering journalism, covering the situation in Cote d'Ivoire, and I spoke to journalists about what we lived in, in Rwanda. I said that certain reporters participated in this violence by speaking out, but other reporters spoke out against the violence. 48 of them were killed because they spoke. So these reporters asked me, "how can we know if what we're doing is wrong?" They didn't know the answer to that question. They had already gone too far. They had entered the hate media without knowing it. So I told them, "look at what you write. Listen to what you say, and analyze yourself. If you are demonizing people, if you are stigmatizing other tribes, other clans, you're involved in violence. How did you get there?" They don't know. So I said, "you're no longer reporters. You're no longer journalists, and I would like to congratulate the politicians who managed to co-opt you, and co-opt you without you're knowing it. I congratulate these politicians. They're good politicians. Very effective. Now, stand up and be reporters, do your job, report the facts objectively." And during these three days I stayed with them, they reacted, and somebody said, "well there was a politician who has said, well, we want Cote d'Ivoire for the people from Cote d'Ivoire". They said, "can we repeat that?" Well yes, you can say that, you can say that this politician said that. You can report that, and public opinion will know how to react to this politician, who is an ultra-nationalist. You can report the facts, but don't get involved.

So in conclusion, it's hard to know as a reporter when you've taken the wrong turn. Despite ethics and so on, it's hard to know when you've taken the wrong turn, but don't be a coward. Stand up for your work as a reporter.

Thierry Cruvellier: So what I just heard here, we see here we have certain journalism, then we have propaganda, but then we have another level, which is crime. Maybe the lawyers could inform us about this, what this actually means in terms of law.

Biju Duval: Well I think the question here is absolutely crucial. When you're talking about international justice in Arusha, as in the Hague has only one purpose, and only one subject: crime against humanity and genocide. That is the most capital of all crimes. That's the sole subject, and the sole purpose of international criminal justice. There's one thing I want to say here. I think that's why this trial for the incitement to genocide is not

a really a trial about freedom of expression, even distorted. It's not a kind of journalism as I say, which has gone wrong, which has really been incriminated here, which has really been judged by international law. What we're talking about here is a journalism, which is no longer going to be called journalism. What we're talking about here is a crime. What they're trying to do is exterminate people. And in Kigali, in the studios of the RTLM after April 6, then it's absolutely clear what we have here is not journalists who were at the microphone. They're actually wearing military uniforms. They had weapons. Every morning, they went to headquarters in order to get their instructions. They themselves take part in combat, and then they return to the microphone, the microphone which they use, themselves, as a weapon. They use it as another form of weapon, but really we're not talking here about freedom of expression. It's a different matter altogether. What we have here is the most capital of all crimes, the crime against humanity, namely genocide. And that's what, in fact, as from 1945 has been examined by the international criminal justice system, and it's on the basis of this criminal involvement in the most capital of all crimes that the judges in Nuremberg, and also the United Nations delegates in 1948, it was in those areas that they imposed legal standards. They created the charge of direct and public incitement to genocide. So this is the mission of the international criminal system, and the international criminal system- if we want it to be legitimate- if we want it to be legitimate in ethical terms and also in legal terms to protect all of mankind without any political involvement, then it has to be limited solely to it's main purpose, which is the essential purpose, otherwise in fact, it will lose all effectiveness. Thank you very much.

Thierry Cruvellier: I'm sorry, maybe we can move onto the third question now. We've got 25 minutes I think, and that's all the time we have. We don't have any more than that. First we'll give the floor to the ladies.

Blythe McKay: (?) My name is Blythe McKay (?), and I have a question for Thomas Kamilindi. You mentioned that journalists have a role to play for the good, and I was wondering what positive roles are media in Rwanda currently playing in rebuilding Rwanda and reporting on the genocide, and is it enough?

Thomas Kamilindi: So once again after 10 years of genocide, it's difficult for Rwanda to get over the situation, to recover. So I just want to talk about the press here. I'm not going to talk about other things, for example, the creation of the journalism school, or this kind of initiative. The press at the present time, it's weak in financial terms and professional terms. Well, the journalists themselves are traumatized, as is the rest of society, so there's a haunting feeling. They're afraid that they're going to go back to the mistakes of the past, with the divisions, the extremism, etc. So there is a press that censors itself very much, and also it's sometimes very passionate. I'll explain why. Well it's very easy, for example, for the press in Rwanda to report certain things without any evidence. This could also happen. Interahamwe is the name which has been given to the militia. It's the name of the militia who exterminated the Tutsi in '94. So sometimes they do some good things. There are sometimes journalists who do, in fact, report the facts as they are, as they took place without being in favor of any political party, without being partisan in any way. So it's difficult still. Nevertheless, there are some good steps,

which have been taken, but there are still problems.

And as regards reconciliation, as regards reporting genocide, there's also the issue of international solidarity. That's very important. At the present time, there are some Americans, in fact, who are setting up a project, and I'm going to get involved in it. It's still at the early stages, which is called Benevolencia. I guess this term came from Bosnia, an initiative by Jewish people there, who saved people in Bosnia, people who were being hunted. Benevolencia, I guess it means benevolence really, is where it comes from, goodwill. So they want to go back to the origins of genocide, the sources of it, the traumatism, trauma healing, this kind of thing. Through leaflets, radio programs, small plays, for example, plays on the radio, factual programs, documentaries, magazines, because these programs while they're fiction, and we also have documentaries based on the facts. So this is the kind of thing they're trying to do in order to go back to the source of the problem of genocide. There is, for example, at the ICTR, and it's a pity that the international press is not at all interested in what this tribunal is doing, but there's an agency there, which everyday, the Hironnelle Agency, which reports everyday. They're based there, and they report everyday what's going on at the ICTR, the trials, etc. So as I say, things are being done, but nevertheless problems do remain.

Thierry Cruvellier: Next question please.

Alex Ferrier (?): Hi I'm Alex Ferrier. My question is for the panelists, who were at the ICTR. During the trial process, did you find the tribunal to actually be impartial, or did they demonstrate favour to either side in this conflict?

Thierry Cruvellier: That's a question for me. I was not supposed to answer. Yes, it's been a major concern for most observers of the tribunal, and it still is. There is clearly a deep feeling among those who have been covering the trials that the political drive that created the tribunal is still there. In a way the ICTR has not emancipated itself from its political origin, and so it is still being felt that the trials are pretty much influenced politically, and under the political influence, are sensitive to the political concerns of both the international community and the Rwandan government.

Thierry Cruvellier: Yeah sure.

Jean Boscu Culiny (?): Thank you. I'm Jean Boscu Culiny (?). I'm a student at Laval University. I'm preparing my doctorate in law on the prevention of genocide. I've only one question. It's addressed to Mr. Duval, but before asking my question, I'd like to express what was said by my compatriots if when he asked whether everything was done which could have been done. I was there. I know that everything was done that could have been done, and I'd say that some people are very courageous. So my question, Mr. Duval. Before asking the question, I'd like to say two things; one which is factual, and deals actually with the events before and after April 6, 1994. It seemed to me, that Mr. Duval thinks that before April 6, 1994, the RTIM was not broadcasting really incendiary or inflammatory messages. That's not true. I was there. Everybody knows, that even before April 6, 1994, that the newspaper, news media were, in fact, making broadcasts

advocating genocide. Maybe he has other information, but I was there. I actually witnessed that. So I don't know really who could decide this between us.

Now as regards the law issue, well I very much appreciated your argument, but I don't agree with you on one point. You talked about the conviction of Julius Streicher by the Nuremberg courts, the court in Nuremberg, in fact, he was convicted not because of what he said during the genocide, during the holocaust, but rather long before that, he began long before that. He continued- it wasn't because he actually broadcast inflammatory things before the holocaust. He was convicted because of the newspaper he published, which is anti-Semitic, and also because he persecuted a race. He was convicted for crimes against humanity through persecuting a race or an ethnic group.

So having said that, I've made those points. Now I've got to ask you a question. If Mr. Streicher was convicted and sentenced in 1945, then you rely on the 1948, December 9 conviction concerning the prevention of genocide in order to say that the law should have gone backwards? I don't think it should. I think rather that law has evolved. The protection of human rights has evolved since then. So we can't go back to before 1945. It's only from 1945 onwards that we have to look at things. If in 1945, Julius Streicher was found guilty, then you'd expect therefore a journalist to be found guilty now, a journalist, who created a media, which was calling for genocide.

You talked about another gentleman, I don't want to talk about that now, because it's before the Supreme Court, the case, but I would ask the students in journalism here to consider the judgment of Georges Ruggiu, Georges Ruggiu, which did not consider the other judgments, particularly Mugesera. Thank you very much.

Biju Duval: Thank you very much. It's a long question, but a very short answer. At least I hope it will be short. Well, the effect or the impact of law, or the effect first of all, of the impact, and I'm talking only about RTLM, because we shouldn't mix everything up. Before April 6, as you said, these were also inflammatory programs, which would lead to genocide. These are the facts. So I think therefore that as regards to the substance here, that I think we could almost agree with one another. It's obvious that given the extremely tense situation, given the civil war situation, the hidden civil war, in fact, which existed before April 6, then when you have programs, which lead to a violent political fight in which the ethnic factor is very obvious, then these programs, such programs, obviously are not conducive to peace. They're not conducive to the Arusha Peace Accords, so we agree on this. And I would even go as far to say, and here, I guess historians will have to consider this in some way or another, maybe the answer is yes to some degree did these programs, in fact, lead to the genocide, the explosion after April 6? Yes, we probably agree on that, on the analysis. But here once again, I'm not speaking here as a witness of April, 1994, I'm talking rather as somebody involved in a trial. Now a trial means actually judging people based on the evidence, and the evidence here was, in fact, 300 radio recordings. There was an enormous amount of evidence here. 300 radio programs. So I'll ask all of you to actually go back to the source of information here, and there was a lot of evidence. Look at the judgment of December 3, look objectively, look carefully, scrupulously at the programs selected by the tribunal.

That is essentially what was said before April 6, 1994, and you'll see, in fact, those programs which were inflammatory, and not, in fact, a direct cause to extermination, even the worst.

So we can come back to this on the legal question, but I think the point is clear. Simone Monasebian? Because we would like to take a few other questions.

Simone Monasebian: Yeah, it's a mistake to suggest that the entirety of the judgment was based on 303, 45- minute cassette tapes when RTLM broadcasted for 365 days, several hours a day, sometimes 24 hours a day. But within those 300 some-odd tapes, there are numerous examples of RTLM expressing before April 6th that they knew their broadcast had an impact, and just one of them was on January 21, 1994, when one of the RTLM broadcasters said, "Little Tutsi children in Nyamirambo came over to me and said, Kantano, why do you persecute us? We are few in number, and when we walk down the down street, CDR, the militia, beats us up, pounces upon us. Why do you hate us just because we're Tutsis? We're few in numbers. Please don't heat up people's head." And there's a term for that in Kenya and Rwanda, which is called "gushushway nitway" (?) to heat up heads. Chauffer la tête. And RTLM acknowledged on several occasions in these 300 some-odd tapes before April 6th that people were getting beaten up. There was causation demonstrated by their very own words.

And finally on the other thing that Mr. Biju Duval says that, my colleague Charity Kagwi points out that there was lay witness testimony. When Francois-Xavier Nsanzuwera talked about the four times that he was incited against on RTLM, twice before April 6, and twice after to his knowledge, and we only have one of those four tapes, are we to discount his testimony? Should people be acquitted because not all the tapes existed? Should we have no genocide trials if nobody was fortunate enough to record those tapes? The judges relied on witness testimony. The judges relied on expert testimony and the tapes, and in all three circumstances found that there was sufficient evidence that these journalists knew, they were told by the Ministry of Information, they were told by Francois-Xavier Nsanzuwera, who was threatened if he continued to stop RTLM, he would be killed. They were told they did not care, and they were lawless, and that is why they were convicted.

Thierry Cruvellier: Thank you, next question please.

Ernesto Caceres: My name Ernesto Caceres, I'm a second-year student here at Carleton, and I have two separate but connected questions dealing with the current state of Rwanda. I'm wondering in the past panel it was discussed that the low literacy rate in Rwanda lead to the depth of, I guess the commitment to radio, and the listening to radio. I was wondering if there's anything currently in Rwanda that is going on to increase the literacy rate in English, French or Rwandan? And also my second question is does radio still have the same impact now that it did 10 years ago? I know that I guess what was the RPF is in control of the country now, are they promoting a certain pro-Tutsi line that is anti-Hutu in the radio, and are the people of Rwanda listening into it with the same kind

of loyalty that they listened to RTLM? Thank you.

Thierry Cruvellier: I guess Thomas would be the one answering that question.

Thomas Kamilindi: Rwanda is still a country with a low level of literacy. But when I follow the education policy, I see that there's a break, given what happened before. Before we had an elitist type of education. They educated the elite, but today this has changed. Now we have a mass type education, education of the masses, but this hasn't borne results yet. And this can be seen at the higher level also. Before '94, there were a few universities. Today I think there are about 10, about 10 or 12 universities including private universities, so something is being done, but we still haven't seen actually the results of this in terms of literacy.

Now in terms of radio, do people listen to the radio as much as they used to? Is the situation as it was? The answer to that is yes. We still have only one radio station, the state radio network. But over the last three or four weeks, there has been a new private radio network, which was setup, which has started to broadcast, which is still at the trial level, and which broadcasts only music for the moment. It's a very young network. It has a small team there, not very large, not that much experience, but there are about four or five private radio projects, which in fact, have been approved by the government. And they think that the frequencies have been attributed already to some, so they should to broadcast soon. So as from June, maybe there'll be four radio networks, which will be broadcasting, which are not government-owned, and therefore I think myself, that this will break, this will break the myth of the radio, because the radio has an enormous mythic value there. That's the way the situation is. Only the government for the moment has access to radio and television. There's only one television network, except a corporation which redistributes foreign programs also. In other words, it's still the same problem. And radio is listened to as much as it was 10 years ago. It still has a myth value as regards the promotion of two ethnic groups. There has been a break. Genocide created an enormous rupture, an enormous break. It's very, very difficult therefore to promote the two ethnic groups, but that's the situation.

In legal terms, for example, we've set up a system, a traditional justice system, or semi-traditional justice system, and we hope that it's a system where everybody will judge everybody else. So they'll judge their peers, and it's the people who decide who is guilty and not guilty. So we think that this might reconcile the two groups. A lot has been done. I'm just giving out one example, given all the shortcomings, and given all the weaknesses that such a system might have.

Thierry Cruvellier: One question from the floor first, and I'll get the question from Maria.

Jean-Claude Ngaboziza (?): Thank you. I am Jean-Claude Ngaboziza.(?) I'm a survivor of genocide. I was in Rwanda in '94, and I have a question for Mr. Duval, and if I may, I would just like to make one comment. I would point out that in '94 the journalists were fully aware that their statements would, in fact, lead to people being killed. They were

fully aware of this. Habimana Kantano, for example, who we quoted, did, in fact, ask I remember this very well, he asked his militia to show some pity towards a Tutsi, who was a goalkeeper in his favorite soccer team, Rayon Sport, but he said, “don’t kill that one. Close your eyes.” But he was very aware of the fact of what was going on, and what was being done. I’d also mention that the only positive point for the media, because instructions were given openly, you could change where you wanted to hide. Once you found you were a target, you change your hiding place.

So I have a question for Mr. Duval. I understood that he regrets that Mr. Nahimana was, in fact, convicted, by acts, which were committed by others, because he, in fact, was just directing things. So my question is as follows. Nahimana was the head. He was the boss, if you will. He could authorize the broadcasting of certain facts, of certain events. By authorizing the broadcasting of certain messages, was he not guilty? Yes or no. That’s the question by authorizing that.

Biju Duval: Thank you very much. Now as regards your first comment, I think that we agree. It’s perfectly clear that after April 6, 1994, Kantano in particular, became the archetype, if you will, of the criminal journalist against humanity. Now the second observation, and this is the whole question of the trial of Ferdinand Nahimana. As you can appreciate, it’s difficult for me to answer this at length, well just in 30 seconds, but I do nevertheless, well I will answer the main point, what seems to be the main point. I’ll rise to the challenge there. You talked about the difficult sense of deposition of international justice, which is exercised under a certain pressure, which by it’s very nature does, in fact, endanger it’s fans or it’s equity. And therefore, there’s a risk. There’s a very serious risk, an inherent risk, if you will, which is characteristic, if you will, of crimes against humanity. There’s a temptation here, a temptation to find a scapegoat, to get somebody convicted because of crimes committed by other people, because people are so horrified by something that surpasses anything we’ve seen before, and in order to withstand that temptation, which is absolutely fatal in terms of the justice system, there’s only one way you can withstand this. You have to establish principles of law, principles of law which have to be applied with absolute rigor. These principles of law are individual penal responsibility, individual criminal responsibility. You can be found guilty only if you yourself have committed a crime, or if you are, as you say, the person in charge, the boss if you will, and it’s on that basis that the international criminal justice system was set up in Nuremberg. You have to first convict the leaders. And of course, you must define international justice, international law, in fact, defines who a leader is, what the person in charge is, it’s the person who exercises effective power of control similar to that which is, for example exercised by a military commander over his troops. You have to prove in that situation that you do have an almost military power of control over somebody. And what’s striking here, and what’s very interesting, and what’s shocking also in the Nahimana case is that as from April 6, as from the call for extermination, Nahimana is totally absent. He’s not involved. And there was no contact which was ever established here, no link between him, who was at the other end of Rwanda, and the journalists of RTLM. So that’s the serious question here, which the ICTR has to decide on, and my criticism here of the judgment is that these standards, these absolute criteria which make it possible to avoid finding a scapegoat, these criteria

were not, in fact, applied, at least that's the way I analyze things.

Thierry Cruvellier: I can see the reactions, I know. But it's really time to stop. You'll have time in private.

Simone Monasebian: Thierry, can I just say something? This is very short, just brief, a reference. All I can suggest is that people read Mr. Nahimana's comments of April 25, 1994, in the judgment, and when you see what his comments of April 25 were, I leave it to you to decide whether or not he was sanctioning RTLM, and applauding it, and saying that it did reach the majority of the population, and did good work. So look at the judgment.

Thierry Cruvellier: Thank you, yeah, read the judgment. That's a good point. Thank you, I want to thank, of course, all the participants, and Mary Kimani has the last comment.

Mary Kimani: I just wanted to add a comment, because I see we've concentrated on Nahimana, and the head of Kangura, and we've not dealt at all with the Rwandan journalists, who are still in jail in Rwanda. I think it's important to underline that as much as the decision at ICTR is important, we have to think about what motivated the actual journalists to follow the instructions of their leaders. And unless we address the things that make such local journalists to follow whatever they are told, we still have not solved the problem. We can sentence Nahimana, we can sentence the head of Kangura, but we have to do something about the ordinary journalists. I've talked to many of them, and for a lot of them, the problem was not ideology. They didn't necessarily believe in the genocide. For a lot of them, it was a question of fear, it was the question of poverty. It was a question of having been brought up to believe that the majority population they were once suppressed, and they have to fight to make sure that this oppression does not return. And I think we have to do this in all the other communities that are in conflict to make sure we address the things that make journalists likely to follow what their leader says.

The second very brief point I want to outline, it's very easy in such a symposium and we're in a hurry, to let things pass off very quickly without correction. Inyenzi it means cockroach. True, and it was used to mean that, but Inyenzi has a separate meaning, and if you have history books, go and read them, and it's that play of words that made RTLM and Kangura very effective. If you miss out on the second meaning, you miss out on the entire meaning.

Last thing, ...

Audience: What is it?

Mary Kimani: Inyenzi was at times used for the former for some of the brigades of the monarchical armies, and it was used in the early '60s during the invasion back into Rwanda of the Tutsi leaders that had been sent out, trying to come back to restore

themselves to power. So if you miss out on that meaning, that clear of meaning by RTLM and Kangura, you might miss out on why it was so effective.

The last thing is there's a lady who asked the question of what the press is doing now. I have to add this because I work for Internews. It's an organization that currently is taking the stories of what is happening at the ICTR, and what is happening in the Rwandan national courts, making a newsreel, and taking it to the rural audience by cinemobile, and even in prison. So there are people who are trying to make sure that there's more information so that people can make better decisions hopefully in the future.

Allan Thompson: Thank you very much. Thank you very much to the panelists. I remind those who were still at the microphones, please we have volunteers, who are going to come and speak with you. They want to take your names, your questions, and who you would like those questions to be directed to, and this will become part of the proceedings. We're moving to the lunch period now. For those who don't know their way around this campus, look for volunteers who will lead the way. You can go underground or above ground to the Residence Commons for lunch. We will resume on time at 2:00. It's a buffet. So you can eat very quickly. Thank you.