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“It is submitted that a new state military formation composed of both Hutu and Tutsi members in adequate numbers and proportions at command level as well as rank and file (that is, extending current arrangements for power-sharing at the political level to the military organizational sphere) is a necessary condition for breaking out of the vicious violence.”¹

1 Introduction

There is a growing assumption underlying peace processes and post-conflict reconstruction practices that an integrated national military—one that includes former rebels and is representative of a society’s ethnic and religious diversity—will help prevent a resurgence of violence. It is thought that such integration provides a credible security guarantee to all sides, particularly in cases of civil war, allowing the warring parties to overcome credible commitment problems. As an alternative to demobilization, military integration allows former rebels to retain access to military power via state institutions and thus secures their ability to protect their interests moving forward. Hence resolving the government’s credibility problem: that it would otherwise use its monopoly over the coercive apparatus of the state to defect on concessions granted in the name of peace. Moreover, once integrated, the costs of rebel defection supposedly increase—since leaving the national military would, in theory, jeopardize access to state resources and patronage—which would logically lower the risk of future conflict. For these reasons, military integration has become an increasingly popular component of so-called “self-enforcing” peace agreements.²

For example, after the prolonged insurgency in the apartheid state of Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) that resulted in a shift to majority rule in 1980-81, British administrators oversaw an attempted integration of the former, white-dominated Rhodesian army with around

¹ Adekanye 1996, 37.
² Glassmyer and Sambanis 2008, 365.
50,000 black troops drawn from two different guerrilla armies.\(^3\) Similarly, Mozambique’s 1992 peace agreement, following over 15 years of civil war, sought to create a new national army balanced between the two former opponents—with each side contributing 15,000 soldiers.\(^4\) Indeed, in a systematic study of civil war peace agreements signed between 1989 and 2005, Derouen et al found that 37.1% (52 of 140) of such agreements included provisions for the integration of rebel soldiers into existing national armies.\(^5\)

Yet, despite its lauded promise and popularity within the international community, rebel-military integration has shown little actual effectiveness as a guarantee of future peace. A recent, comprehensive study by Glassmyer and Sambanis found no significant effect of such policies on peace duration, in either the short- or long-term.\(^6\) The question then becomes, why? Glassmyer and Sambanis argue that faulty design and implementation (which can make military integration a policy in name only), combined with a host of possible interaction effects (including with civilian reintegration programs, third party interventions, and power-sharing arrangements) may underlie these non-results.\(^7\)

While implementation obstacles almost certainly undermine military integration efforts in a host of contexts, I will argue that there are more fundamental issues at stake than poor execution. Rather, the neglected study of civil-military relations in the developing world, and their interaction with conflict processes, has led to dangerous optimism about the peace-enforcing potential of military integration—particularly in ethnically divided societies. Through a detailed historical analysis of Rwanda and Burundi, this paper will illustrate a vicious conflict trap that military integration fails to overcome—and, indeed, can play a key

---

\(^3\)Europa 1987, 1140; Keegan 1983, 681-684.
\(^6\)Glassmyer and Sambanis 2008, 381.
\(^7\)Ibid, 381-382.
role in perpetuating. Identity-based military recruitment policies, whether inclusionary or exclusionary, can each contribute to the outbreak and perpetuation of violence—whether successfully implemented or merely credibly threatened.

2 Military Integration and Conflict Traps

The ideas that I will develop throughout this paper rest on a set of underlying assumptions about the complex relationship between ethnicity and conflict. There is nothing predetermined, inevitable, or inescapable about ethnic conflict. Moreover, ethnic heterogeneity, by itself, cannot predict violence. Rather, ethnic conflict and its reproduction over time are the product of understandable historical processes—processes in which the modern state, be it the colonial state or the sovereign state, plays a vital role.

A growing body of scholarly work on ethnic conflict understands state institutions, and particularly how they categorize and treat identity, as central to the “propensity for political identities to become violent.” It is not diversity per se that leads to conflict (the mere existence of difference or even salient cleavages), but rather particular constellations of identity-based opportunities, constraints, and hardships created by the state, and the real impact they have on individuals’ lives. Identity thus becomes causally important because political institutions invest it with significant meaning: when the state makes access to power, patronage, education, business opportunities, and other resources (material or ideational) contingent on belonging to a particular hereditary group (or set thereof), individuals will come to see identity as central to politics and, by extension, conflict. Resistance to ethnic exclusion will logically organize itself along ethnic lines.
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8Daley 2006, 663. See also Adekanye 1996; Cederman, Wimmer, adn Min 2010; Mamdani 2001; and Wimmer, Cederman and Min 2009.
In an effort to test these ideas cross-nationally, Wimmer, Cederman, and Min have constructed an “Ethnic Power Relations” data set that measures, in a time-sensitive way, the relationship between ethnic groups and the state. For each group-year, they code access to executive power according to seven ranked categories: from a monopoly over state institutions and the exclusion of all other groups, through senior and junior partnerships in power-sharing arrangements, down to complete exclusion or powerlessness.\(^9\) Using this data, in two related articles, the authors find that “the likelihood of armed confrontation increases as the center of power becomes more ethnically segmented and as greater proportions of a state’s population are excluded from power because of their ethnic background.”\(^{10}\) In essence, they find that the more ethnically exclusionary the state, the more likely it is to face violent rebellion.

In a similar vein, but focused on military institutions, Adekanye has developed a theory of instability based on ethnic dominance of the security sector. In states where a single identity group monopolizes the military, he argues that non-represented groups will turn to armed insurrection for a variety of related reasons: first, discrimination within a crucial state institution, such as the army, undermines the legitimacy of the state in the eyes of those it excludes—leading to affective grievances. Second, where the military is a primary source of state patronage, exclusion will also create material grievances as well as the perception that in order to access state resources an identity group must “capture” the state, including (fundamentally) its security forces. Finally, ethnic dominance of the military creates a sense of existential threat amongst excluded groups (which would logically be exacerbated by a recent history of ethnic violence). For these reasons, identity-groups disenfranchised from the

---

\(^{10}\)Wimmer, Cederman and Min 2009. 334.
national military will likely turn toward constructing their own militias and armies—and using them to protect and promote their understood interests.\textsuperscript{11}

These works provide solid ground from which to build a comprehensive understanding of how military ethnic recruitment practices can sustain conflict traps. If practices of ethnic exclusion instigate violent rebellion, then logically many conflicts are, in fact, characterized by a state military dominated by a single ethnic group (or set of allied groups) to the exclusion of others. And even where this was not the case at the outset of the dispute, once violence has actually erupted between the state and a rebellious ethnic group, those sharing the identity of the rebels may either leave the national military voluntarily (unwilling to fight against their kin) or be summarily discharged by a state doubting their loyalty. Either way, a mixed national military may quickly become an ethnically dominated one. For example, at the beginning of Nigeria’s civil war northern Hausa-Fulani officers—who had just seized power in a coup—decided to segregate the military by ethnic-region: sending all of the Ibo soldiers “home” to the south-east, all of the Yoruba to the south-west, and all of the Hausa-Fulani to the north. The Ibo region then seceded using its segregated branch of the officer corps to organize a new army. The ensuing civil war was thus essentially between two ethnic armies.\textsuperscript{12}

In the absence of outright military victory (which is exceedingly difficult to achieve in typical insurgent contexts), it is this very ethnic dominance of the state military during conflict that creates a trap. To convince rebels to put down their arms, some assurance of ethnic inclusion within the state military is probably necessary. Without this, ceasefires are unlikely to last and peace agreements unlikely to be signed—as very compelling reasons for further rebellion still exist, including both the material and affective grievances associated

\textsuperscript{11} Adekanye 1996, 43-44.  
\textsuperscript{12} See Luckham 1971.
with exclusion from the security sector as well as the credible commitment issues previously discussed.

Yet, the very prospect of rebel inclusion in military institutions can provoke intense resistance from extremists on the government’s side; particularly in the midst of identity-based conflicts where the perpetrators of ethnic massacres, cleansing, and/or genocide tend to fear reciprocal actions from their victims were they to gain access to military power. To inflict a nightmare on an ethnic other makes imagining that nightmare inflicted on oneself all the easier. Moreover, some officers that have engaged in acts of extreme violence may seek understanding and justification for their own behavior in a shared sense of existential threat—a fear that would preclude allowing any additional power to be handed to the opposition within a peace agreement. Where moderates seek military integration, extremists—unable to reconcile themselves with such inclusion—may then seize power via a military coup or defect from the government and initiate a new insurgency. Either action may serve as the spark which re-ignites the larger social conflict.

Even where government moderates win out and peace agreements involving military integration do move forward, such arrangements create problems of their own which may in turn lead to a renewal of conflict. Extremist rebel officers, who may not be satisfied with power sharing arrangements and see them instead as a stepping-stone to their own ethnic dominance, are incorporated alongside moderates. Also, the initial stages of integration often entail the wholesale absorption of rebel units without their immediate reorganization and dispersal amongst existing units. This process creates internal ethnic factions within the national military. Factions who, moreover, can easily mobilize and act as cohesive units since the military hierarchy itself often remains segregated—with whole branches of nested units dominated by an ethnic group. If politics fail to go their way—say if elections are
lost or if patronage is withheld—these factions (and their external allies) may then choose
to abdicate the peace process and use their new access to government armaments and the
military hierarchy to seize central power for themselves. In other words, military integration
creates (at least temporarily) a dangerous spoiler problem by doing exactly that which
it is designed to do: grant significant military capabilities to former combatants and their
leaders.\textsuperscript{13} Such a seizure of central power could, in turn, result in a new ethnically dominated
state (and army), resulting in a resumption of violence by those who formally controlled the
government as they rebel against such a reversal in fate.

Herein, then, lies the crux of the conflict trap: in the midst of an ethnic insurgency or
civil war, military integration seems both necessary for peace processes to move forward and
an obstacle to their very success. Without the prospect of integration, ethnic rebels have
little incentive to stop fighting: no matter what the government offered, without access to
armaments in the future, they could not protect their gains nor prevent the government
from reneging. Yet, the prospect of granting such power to ethnic rivals may be absolutely
unacceptable to government hard-liners who see ethnic dominance over security institutions
as essential to their very survival. At the same time, power-sharing may also be unacceptable
to extremists in the rebel camp—who may go along with such arrangements at first, in order
to prevent demobilization and maintain or expand their power, and then use their new
position within the national military to seize the central power that so eluded them as an
insurgent force.

\textsuperscript{13}For a more comprehensive treatment of spoiler problems, see Stedman 1997; and Greenhill and Major
3 Historical Background

Having laid out the paradox of military integration as a component of peace processes, I now turn to the endemic conflicts in Rwanda and Burundi. Although different in many respects, both of these conflicts highlight the interplay between civil-military relations, military recruitment practices, and insurgency that lay at the heart of the ethnic conflict trap I have theorized. First, however, it is necessary to provide some background to the origins of conflict in both countries—particularly how identity came to be so central to violence.

3.1 The Pre-Colonial State and Identity

The pre-colonial history of Rwanda-Burundi is fundamentally contested. Mythologies of the past feed understandings and justifications, on both sides, of the ongoing conflict. Indeed, whether one believes in the separate origins of Hutu and Tutsi, has become a practical litmus test of support. Those empathizing with the Tutsi focus on the class distinctions between groups and deny any essential or evolutionary difference between them. On the other hand, those of Hutu persuasion embrace the separate origins hypothesis and thus see Rwanda-Burundi history in terms of foreign conquest, imposition, and rule by the outsider Tutsi. Historical truth, as it so often does, likely lies somewhere in between.

Nineteenth century European notions of race and social darwinism accompanied colonizers into Africa and held great sway over how they understood and recorded what they encountered. Of particular importance was the “Hamitic hypothesis”: that “white” Africans from the northeast had migrated southward in the distant past, bringing with them greater civilization and political organization than was indigenous to “black” Africa. When Ger-

\[\text{Mamdani 2001, 41-42.}\]
\[\text{Des Forges 1995, 44; Newbury 1998, 10.}\]
man and then Belgian colonialists arrived in Rwanda-Burundi they observed that Tutsis tended to look different from Hutus, being on average taller and of more slender build. Whatever the actual reasons for this difference—and many have been hypothesized, from actual Tutsi migration into the region to disparities in wealth and nutrition—the Europeans interpreted what they saw as evidence of racial distinctness.\(^{16}\) Thus, the German and Belgian colonialists came to see the ruling Tutsi clans of the area through the lens of the “Hamitic hypothesis”—as descendants of migrating “white African hamites” and thus superior to other social groups and naturally born to rule over them.

Such racialized and racist notions of identity generally obscured from missionaries and colonial administrators the more complex social reality and identity formations of the region. Although separate kingdoms, Rwanda and Burundi shared the same hierarchical and feudal-like system of political administration. Both were ruled by a king (\textit{mwami}) drawn from a princely class of competing aristocratic dynasties. In Rwanda, these dynastic families were considered part of the broader Tutsi identity while in Burundi they were termed \textit{ganwa} and viewed as a distinct social group apart from the Tutsi.\(^{17}\) When not currently in possession of the kingship, the other dynastic families held significant, autonomous power over the regions.\(^{18}\)

Across both states, distinctions between Hutu, Tutsi, and Twa (the three primary identity groups) fell largely along economic and political lines, rather than according to cultural or linguistic differences. Members of all three sub-groups spoke the same language (Kinyarwanda) and shared a similar culture. Indeed, intermarriage was common—although it did not result in a blurring or mixing of identities as practices of strict patriarchal descent

\(^{16}\)Mamdani 2001, 44.
\(^{17}\)Mamdani 2001, 70-71; Loft and Loft 1988, 89.
\(^{18}\)Loft and Loft 1988, 89.
meant that every child inherited the identity of his or her father, while wives lost their own.\textsuperscript{19} Rather, identity categories reflected archetypes of economic production and/or feudal relations.

In Rwanda, the Tutsi comprised a politically dominant class who tended to monopolize high-level chieftancies and own cattle. The Hutu were, conversely, a serf-like population of predominantly agriculturalists subject to mandatory labor corvees and whose ability to own cattle was highly regulated by the state.\textsuperscript{20} Indeed, when new populations were conquered and incorporated into the Rwandan state, they became Hutu regardless of their prior identity.\textsuperscript{21} While fairly rigid, this economic and political division of labor still permitted social mobility on the margins. Through a practice known as \textit{kwihutura}, “the rare Hutu who was able to accumulate cattle and rise through the socioeconomic hierarchy could... shed Hutuness—and achieve the political status of Tutsi.”\textsuperscript{22} The reverse could also hold: impoverishment over the generations and the complete loss of property (cattle and land) could lead to the loss of Tutsi status.\textsuperscript{23}

In Burundi, Tutsi identity was more variegated and complex than in Rwanda. Below the princely \textit{Ganwa} class, the Tutsi were subdivided into two important groups: the Tutsi-Banyaruguru (non-productive families who formed part of the royal court) and the Tutsi-Hima (pastoralists). Intense, prolonged rivalries between the two principle \textit{Ganwa} clans—the Bezi and the Batare—led to the formation of further divisions amongst the Tutsi and the rise of important regional sub-groups: the Tutsi-Banyabururi and the Tutsi-Banyaruguru (allied with the Bezi and Batare respectively). As in Rwanda, Hutu were largely cultivators tied to

\textsuperscript{19}Mamdani 2001, 53-54.
\textsuperscript{20}Ibid, 66.
\textsuperscript{21}Ibid, 70.
\textsuperscript{22}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{23}Ibid.
the ruling elite via a feudal structure of land tenure and Twa were hunter-gatherers. Yet, unlike in Rwanda, some Hutu lineages achieved incorporation in the higher political class (without becoming Tutsi) and thus held important chiefly positions. Burundi’s pre-colonial monarchy was also more decentralized, with greater fluidity between political-economic identity groups, and hence contained greater opportunities for upward mobility.

The purpose of this discussion is to highlight that, on the eve of colonization, Hutu, Tutsi, and Twa were important identity categories invested with real social meaning. They were also predominantly political and economic categories that had not yet been rigidified into wholly hereditary identities. Women could marry into a new identity and men, though with difficulty, could move between groups with great changes in their economic fortune. Internal divisions within these overarching categories were also quite important—especially amongst the Tutsi in Burundi.

3.2 The Colonial State and the Ethnicization of Identity

After their conquest in 1897, the kingdoms of Rwanda and Burundi were jointly administered as a single German colony (Ruanda-Urundi). When Germany lost its colonial possessions during and after the first World War, Ruanda-Urundi was placed under Belgian trusteeship by the League of Nations and then the United Nations. Both Germany and Belgium exercised highly indirect rule via the traditional political hierarchies of each territory. In the process, they deepened the power of the monarchy as well as consolidated Tutsi control over the Hutu and Twa.

---

26 Loft and Loft 1988, 89.
More importantly, however, to an understanding of how identity became the focus of later conflict, the Belgian colonial state racialized and ethnicized pre-colonial identity categories and imbued them with a racist doctrine justifying Tutsi supremacy. The boundaries of who was considered Tutsi versus Hutu, in particular, where shifted by colonial authorities to reflect predominantly racial characteristics—at times, regardless of born political or economic status. Those with more “caucasian” features and who were of above average height were recategorized as Tutsi, while those who were shorter with more “negroid” features were considered Hutu, and those with “pygmoid” features Twa. An official census, conducted in 1933-34, then counted and classified every individual as Hutu, Tutsi, or Twa. Categorizations were based on sometimes contradictory sources of information and guidelines for designation. In many places, local churches provided the census takers with data on the genealogy and identities of their congregations (which probably reflected a mix of “self-understandings” as well as interpretations of group membership by European missionaries). At times, the census administrators also relied on their own observations of an individual’s racial characteristics and physical measurements and/or applied what became the legendary “10 cow rule”—wherein a head of family who possessed 10 or more cattle was classified as Tutsi. The colonial state then instituted a system of identity cards: each individual was issued a personal card marking their official ethnic identity. Identity thus became racialized, strictly hereditary, and legally enforced by the state—clearly demarcating and rigidifying the boundaries between groups and imbuing them with meaning that clearly transcended economic and political categories.

Such transformations of identity—which, after all, occurred across all of colonial Africa—carry with them no inherent predisposition toward violent conflict. These particular constructions of racial/ethnic identity were, however, embedded within a racist discourse (based in the previously discussed “Hamitic hypothesis”). More than merely categorizing and defining, the Belgian colonial state treated Ruanda-Urundi’s identity groups in radically different ways. Indeed, colonial policies were discriminatory by design—granting political, religious, and educational advantages to Tutsis while depriving Hutus and Twa of post-primary educational opportunities and excluding them from administrative positions in the colonial government. Tutsis were also granted extreme advantages in land dispute settlements when the colonial administration restructured the (traditionally mixed) indigenous courts into Tutsi-monopolized institutions. Under Belgian colonialism, “Political, social, and even economic relations became more rigid, unequal, and biased against the Hutu, while the power of many people of Tutsi origin greatly increased.” By teaching and mythologizing the superiority of the Tutsi, while simultaneously restricting an individual’s life opportunities to those granted to their group identity as a whole, the colonial state vastly increased disparities and resentments between Hutu and Tutsi in both kingdoms.

4 Endemic Conflict

4.1 Rwanda

Inter-ethnic conflict broke out in Rwanda prior to independence. In 1959, the “Rwandan Revolution” overthrew the Tutsi monarchy with the tacit consent of Belgian officials.

33Daley 2006, 665.
34Uvin 1999, 255.
political upheaval was accompanied by anti-Tutsi pogroms. Several thousand Tutsis were massacred—the primary targets being wealthy Tutsi and those in positions of administrative power—and over 100,000 more fled to neighboring countries, including Burundi, Uganda, and Tanzania.\textsuperscript{35}

At this time, the state security forces were in the process of transition. Three separate military organizations currently operated on the territory: the Force Publique Congolais, the Garde Territoriale Rwandaise, and the metropolitan Belgian troops (3 battalions of paratroopers). All three were officered exclusively by white Europeans, around 150 total officers and NCOs. The disastrous collapse of the newly independent government in the Congo, after massive mutinies by the African rank-and-file against their still entirely Belgian officer corps, led to the withdrawal of the Force Publique from Rwanda and the transformation of the Garde Territoriale into a national, “Africanized” army. Throughout this process, the departing Belgian colonial officials chose to recruit 100% Hutus into both the new officer corps and the existing rank-and-file.\textsuperscript{36}

Pre-independence national elections, held in 1960-61, led to the victory of the Paremehutu party (Parti du Mouvement de l’Emancipation Hutu)—a radically anti-Tutsi party whose primary objective was the promotion of Hutu interests—over the pro-monarchist (Tutsi) party UNAR (Union Nationale Rwandaise). Although a small number of Tutsis were included in Parliament and the Cabinet, the regime that came to power upon independence in 1962, under President Grégoire Kayibanda (an ethnic Hutu) was widely viewed as pro-Hutu. Even amongst Hutus, Kayibanda was seen as favoring the South of the country and his own region of Gitarama in particular.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{36}Lefèvre and Lefèvre 2006, 11-12; British National Archives, Colonial Office (CO) 822/2064, document 11, p.2.
\textsuperscript{37}Newbury 1998, 9 and 16; Plaut 1994, 150.
Thus, at independence, Tutsi’s were excluded from both effective political power and military institutions. As previously discussed, this type of ethnic dominance of the state should lead us to expect further ethnic conflict. Indeed, in 1961, Tutsi exiles in Uganda and Burundi began launching guerilla assaults into Rwanda. The incursions continued throughout 1962 and culminated in a large campaign by 1500 rebels from Burundi that came within 30 miles of the capital city, Kigali, before being stopped. Violent anti-Tutsi reprisals followed these assaults, particularly after the failed strike at the capital. It is estimated that around 2000 Tutsi civilians still living in Rwanda were massacred in 1962 and 10,000 to 14,000 more in 1963—including all of the Tutsi members remaining in the government.\footnote{Newbury 1998, 16; Plaut 1994, 150; Reed 1996, 48; Uvin 1999, 256; Uvin 2001, 153.}

Given their outright military defeat, the Tutsi rebels withdrew to Uganda, ending the insurgency for the time being. Although the conflict posed a tangible threat to the Rwandan state, it did not result in any abiding changes to the ethnic composition of state institutions—both military and political power remained exclusively in the hands of Hutus. Power-sharing, in other words, was not even attempted.

Hutu domination continued, and even deepened, under Juvenal Habyarimana, who seized power in a military coup in 1973 (after supposedly orchestrating widespread killings of Rwandan Tutsis in response to the Hutu massacres across the border in Burundi).\footnote{Minority Rights Group 2009, “Rwanda: Overview.”} Habyarimana’s government—comprised entirely of members of the only legal political party (Hutu) that he himself had founded, the Mouvement Révolutionare National pour le Développement (MRND)—consciously strove to end Tutsi prominence in education and the civil service, which had survived under Kayibanda. Access to schooling and state employment were allocated first by region and then by ethnicity. 60% of slots were earmarked to the north (the President’s region of origin) and 40% to the south. Within each region, Tutsi’s were granted
9% of remaining positions—their official share in the total national population—regardless of regional demographics.\textsuperscript{40} Furthermore, throughout the two decades of Habyarimana’s rule, only a single Tutsi ever achieved officer status in the military.\textsuperscript{41}

By the late 1980s, a new Tutsi rebel group began to organize itself across the border in Uganda. The Rwandan Patriotic Army (RPA), in fact, originated within the ranks of the National Resistance Movement (NRM)—an insurgency that eventually toppled the Ugandan President, Milton Obote. Attacks against the Rwandan exile community by Obote’s forces had encouraged increasing numbers of recruits to join the NRM, where they gained experience and confidence. Although the political leadership of the movement, called the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), operated across the exile community (in Tanzania, Burundi, Uganda, and the Congo), the military wing grew as a virtual shadow army within the Ugandan military (the NRM having become the national military after their victory)—even paralleling its command structure.\textsuperscript{42}

In late September of 1990, conflict resumed when 4000 Rwandan soldiers secretly left their barracks, deserted the Ugandan Army, and began marching toward the border. Gathering support throughout the exile community, by the time of the actual invasion, their ranks numbered as many as 10,000.\textsuperscript{43} The first three weeks of the campaign saw remarkable success, with the rebels capturing two cities in the north as well as a large military depot. The RPA, however, was once again defeated when Belgian, French, and Congolese troops arrived to aid the Habyarimana regime. Yet, at the same time, international pressure led to the opening of peace negotiations.\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{40}Dorn and Matloff 2000; Reed 1996, 482.
\textsuperscript{41}Uvin 1999, 258.
\textsuperscript{42}Reed 1996, 484-486.
\textsuperscript{43}Plaut 1994, 151; Reed 1996, 487-488.
\textsuperscript{44}Reed 1996, 488-490.
Although the insurgency at resumed, in January of 1993, a power-sharing agreement was announced as part of the Arusha Accords. The agreement contained many provisions for dividing power between the existing government under the MRND and the rebel RPF: democratic elections would be held, RPF troops integrated into the new national army, and an RPF battalion stationed in Kigali as a signal of good will by the government. The announcement was accompanied by anti-Tutsi violence in Gisenyi (with 300 fatalities) and negotiations stalled over the details of military integration. By early 1994, a final compromise was achieved: the Rwandan Presidential Guard would be abolished and the new national military (including officer posts) split 50-50 between the RPA and the existing army.\textsuperscript{45}

On the way home from Arusha, after vowing to implement the accords, President Habyarimana’s plane was shot out of the sky by two surface-to-air missiles. Extremists within the Presidential Guard—known for strongly opposing any accommodation with the Tutsi rebels—were suspected. Not only would the Presidential Guard not let the crash site be inspected by anyone, including UN observers, but, citing anonymous sources within the French military, the newspaper Le Figaro reported that the serial numbers on the weapons matched those of a batch of SAM-16 missiles seized from Iraq and sold to Rwanda. The orchestrated killings of Tutsis began within hours of the crash, culminating in the genocide that killed millions.\textsuperscript{46}

As the genocide progressed, the RPA re-invaded from Uganda and, eventually, utterly defeated the Rwandan military (who no one now came to aid). Over one million Hutus fled the country, including most of the militia and armed forces. The new RPF government then flipped the ethnic state on its head, excluding Hutu from political power and creating legal restrictions to bar Hutu recruitment into the military and police—despite temporarily

\textsuperscript{45}\textit{Dorn and Matloff 2000; Plaut 1994, 151; Reed 1996, 492-494.}
\textsuperscript{46}\textit{Dorn and Matloff 2000; Plaut 1994, 151.}
installing a Hutu President and committing to military integration as part of the proclaimed reconciliation program. From the late 1990s through 2001, Hutu militias operating from bases in exile waged a large-scale insurgency against the new Rwandan state, targeting both government forces and Tutsi civilians. Beginning in 1997, Rwanda sent troops into the multi-nation conflict in the Congo—using the opportunity to attack the refugee camps out of which the militias were operating, killing tens of thousands of militia members and civilians.\textsuperscript{47}

Since 2001, a tenuous peace has existed. The likelihood of that peace becoming permanent, however, appears slight. The Rwandan state remains dominated by a single ethnic groups, with Hutu individuals still largely excluded from political and military institutions. This creates strong incentives for a resumption of violence. Indeed, Hutu expatriot rebels may simply be biding their time—reorganizing in the face of their defeat and gaining experience and strength by participating in other conflicts in the war-torn Congo provinces—just as the Tutsi forces once did in Uganda.

Rwanda thus seems stuck in an endemic cycle of ethnic dominance and insurgency (although who controls the state has changed over time). The one attempt to end this dominance—to share power politically and integrate the security sector—failed to survive even into the initial stages of implementation. Rather, it seems that extremists in the Presidential Guard preferred a resumption of conflict than granting Tutsi rebels future power within the state military.

\textsuperscript{47}Minority Rights Group 2010, “Rwanda: Overview”; Minorities at Risk Project 2009, “Assessment for Hutus in Rwanda.”
4.2 Burundi

Although the 1959 revolutionary events in Rwanda certainly influenced politics across the border, Burundi at least temporarily escaped inter-ethnic violence and approached the 1961 pre-independence elections still firmly under control of the monarchy. Three principal political parties competed in these elections: UPRONA (Union pour le Progres National), the PDC (Parti Démocrate-Chrétien), and the PP (Parti du Peuple). UPRONA, led by Prince Louis Rwagasore, was supported by the Bezi dynasty but advocated for mass democracy and purposefully reached out to and included Hutus. The PDC, on the other hand, was supported by the pro-monarchist Batare dynasty, the Catholic Church, and the departing Belgians. The PP was an explicitly pro-Hutu party. UPRONA won with an overwhelming majority, taking 58 out of 64 seats in the National Assembly and making Prince Rwagasore the Prime Minister heading toward independence. Prince Rwagasore was, however, deeply unpopular amongst ethno-conservative Tutsi, both because of his advocacy for mass democracy and because he had married a Hutu woman. He was assassinated two weeks after the elections, allegedly by the PDC and with Belgian approval.48

Unlike in Rwanda, the departing Belgians certainly did not construct a new national army dominated by Hutus. Quite the converse: in Burundi, the army was largely Tutsi, although not exclusively so. Indeed, a non-insignificant number of Hutu officers were trained and incorporated into the military hierarchy.49 Burundi thus gained independence in 1962 as a monarchy—with a parliament dominated by a political party in crisis and a military disproportionately Tutsi but still inclusive of Hutu officers.

In May of 1965, new parliamentary elections were held and, once again, UPRONA won with an overwhelming majority, capturing 23 of 33 seats. After the assassination of Prince Rwagasore, however, UPRONA had split into Hutu and Tutsi wings with the Hutu faction numerically dominant. Thus, the 1965 UPRONA victory was widely interpreted as a Hutu victory. Fearing Hutu political dominance, King Mwambutsa IV then refused to inaugurate the new Assembly and Senate and modified the constitution so that he could nominate his cousin as Prime Minister—despite his not possessing a seat in parliament nor having even run in the elections.\textsuperscript{50}

Responding to these events, in October of 1965, Hutu officers led a coup attempt against the monarchy. The coup failed, resulting in the mass execution of Hutu military and political leaders. These executions then provoked a major Hutu uprising in the central and northern areas of the country. An estimated 500 Tutsis were massacred in Muramvya province alone by Hutu mobs. The government then sent the now predominantly (but not yet wholly) Tutsi army into the countryside where they retaliated by killing thousands of Hutus.\textsuperscript{51} This was Burundi’s first major outbreak of inter-ethnic violence.\textsuperscript{52}

In the midst of this strife, a growing rift developed between the King and the army—leading to another coup attempt in 1966. This time, the coup was instigated by Tutsi-Hima officers led by Michel Micombero. After successfully seizing power, Micombero abolished the monarchy and established a single-party state under a reconstituted UPRONA, which had been transformed into an essentially Tutsi party. Micombero also quickly moved to make the army an ethnic institution: by the late 1960s, a series of purges had virtually eliminated all Hutu officers and substantially decreased Hutu representation amongst the rank-and-file.\textsuperscript{53}
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Indeed, throughout his time in power, Micombero recruited the bulk of the security sector from amongst the Tutsi-Hima of the southern Bururi province.\(^{54}\)

Thus by 1970, Burundi looked like an inverted reflection of Rwanda—with an ethnically dominated state and military, but by the Tutsi rather than the Hutu. Evidencing similar patterns of exclusion and marginalization, even if directed against a different group, the likelihood of conflict would logically be elevated in Burundi as well. Predictably, then, 1972 witnessed a large Hutu rebellion in the south of the country, resulting in the deaths of an estimated two to three thousand Tutsi. Once again, the army was sent into the countryside to pacify the population and, once again, conducted reprisal massacres far in excess of the original violence. By the end, somewhere between 100,000 and 200,000 Hutus were killed.\(^{55}\)

A series of military governments in the 1970s and 1980s, all led by Tutsi-Hima from Bururi province, maintained Tutsi dominance of the state’s political and military institutions. In the late 1980s, fully 99.5% of the officer corps and 99.7% of noncommissioned officers and troops were Tutsi.\(^{56}\) Beginning around this time, and under intense international pressure, President Pierre Buyoya initiated a slow process of democratization. First, Hutu politicians were incorporated into the government and given half of all ministerial posts, although the key ministries of defense, foreign affairs, and the interior were left in the hands of Tutsis. Overt discrimination was then ended in educational institutions; but maintained in the army.\(^{57}\)

Meanwhile, a small rebellion broke out in the north of the country, when Hutu farmers killed upwards of 3,000 local Tutsi. The government responded in the same manner as it always had, sending in the military to conduct massive reprisals; an estimated 20,000
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Hutus were massacred.\(^{58}\) This time, however, the insurgency spread under the organizational umbrella of the Palipehutu (parti pour la liberation du peuple hutu) and grew into a full scale civil war.

Despite the civil war, and conceivably in an attempt to end it, President Buyoya continued with his reform and democratization efforts. Multi-party elections were to be held in June of 1993 which Frodebu (Front pour la Démocratie au Burundi), a Hutu party, was expected to win—inspiring two failed coup attempts by extremists in the Tutsi-dominated military prior to balloting.\(^{59}\) Nevertheless, the elections went forward and Frodebu won both the presidency and the majority in parliament by a landslide: Melchior Ndadaye (a Hutu) received 64.75% of the presidential vote while his party took 80% of parliamentary seats. President Buyoya graciously accepted the results and resigned from office. On taking power, Ndadaye immediately began implementing pro-Hutu reforms and openly announced plans to reform the Tutsi-dominated military—threatening the long-entrenched privileges of the southern Tutsi-Hima officers.\(^{60}\) After a mere 100 days, Tutsi officers stage another coup attempt which, although failing to secure power for themselves, does succeed in assassinating President Ndadaye.\(^{61}\)

After the coup, a ruling coalition takes power but loses control over both the army and the countryside. Rampant massacres of Tutsis in rural areas by Hutu militias are accompanied by indiscriminate killings of Hutus by Tutsi army units. By 1997, the U.S. Department of State was reporting anti-Hutu violence on a genocidal scale by Burundi’s security forces—leading to 50,000-100,000 total deaths.\(^{62}\) During the civil war, which officially ran from 1993
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to 2000, an estimated 200,000 Burundi citizens were killed between military battles, reprisals against civilians by both sides, and inter-communal violence.\textsuperscript{63}

In 2000, the Arusha accords were signed by the government and the majority of the rebel groups (which had fractured repeatedly over the course of the war), providing for a transitional government with an initial rotation of the presidency to be followed by multi-party elections. The agreement also called for the integration of the military, which was to be split 50-50 between Hutus and Tutsis. Initially, the existing government forces allow integration to move forward—recruiting Hutus into the rank-and-file. Officer integration, however, proved far stickier: initially, army officers blocked the recruitment of Hutus into their ranks and then staged two failed coup attempts in 2001.\textsuperscript{64}

With the help and oversight of a UN mission as well as seconded foreign officers from Belgium and the Netherlands, however, within a few years former rebels had been successfully incorporated into the officer corps—and the military brought to the 50-50 ethnic balance agreed to at Arusha.\textsuperscript{65} Moreover, in 2005, multi-party elections were held and Pierre Nkurunziza (a Hutu) became President. All without a return to violence. The question has now become, can the power-sharing achieved through military integration be sustained when the international community inevitably withdraws?

Over the course of its post-independence history, Burundi has been subject to endemic violence; violence perpetuated both by ethnic dominance of the state and by attempts to transcend that dominance and create inclusivity. Decades of Tutsi rule inspired repeated Hutu rebellions. At the same time, efforts by more moderate Tutsi politicians to open up both political and military institutions to Hutus in 1965 and 1993 led to military coups and
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mass violence. The last attempt to move in this direction, made in the midst of war fatigue and with the aid of international peacekeepers and foreign officers, has seen greater success and offers some hope that the path of military integration, although difficult, may still be possible.

5 Conclusions

This paper hopes to provide a necessary corrective to the optimism surrounding military integration as a component of peace processes, particularly in the context of ethnic conflicts. Although military integration does theoretically solve a particularly thorny issue in civil war termination theory—the ability of the government to credibly commit to the concessions it has made in the name of peace—it fails to overcome the particular conflict trap that develops when ethnic dominance of state institutions leads to rebellion. Rather, movements toward power-sharing and integration are often unacceptable to military hard-liners, who will use their access to armaments and the command hierarchy to seize central power and undermine peace negotiations, and thereby re-ignite the conflict.

This is not to argue against the normative ideal of an integrated, inclusive military. I am merely challenging the simplicity of its asserted effectiveness. Ultimately, military integration is the right path—and perhaps the only path that can both lead to long-term peace and accompany inclusive democratic practices—but it is also a dangerous and difficult path.
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