



# Prioritizing Protection from Mass Atrocities: Lessons from Burundi

Gregory Mthembu-Salter

Elana Berger

Naomi Kikoler

## **About the Centre**

The Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect was established in February 2008 as a catalyst to promote and apply the norm of the “responsibility to protect” populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity. Through its programs, events and publications, the Centre is a resource and a forum for governments, international institutions and non-governmental organizations on prevention and early action to halt mass atrocities.

Cover Photo:

United Nations peacekeeper writes notes at a mass grave in Gatumba, Burundi, August 16, 2004. Thompson Reuters.

The views expressed in the Occasional Paper are those of the author and are not necessarily held by the Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect.

© Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, 2011.  
All Rights Reserved

## CONTENTS

---

Executive Summary .....	1
Introduction .....	2
Responsibility to Protect .....	2
A Short History of Burundi .....	2
Regional and International Response .....	4
Mediation Efforts .....	4
The Use of Force .....	8
Economic Sanctions .....	11
Conclusion .....	12
Endnotes .....	13
Timeline of Major Events .....	16
Glossary of Acronyms .....	18



---

# Executive Summary

---

Over the course of the past forty years, waves of interethnic conflict in Burundi have killed hundreds of thousands of people and displaced over a million more. In 1993 the assassination of Melchior Ndadaye, the country's first Hutu president, by paratroopers from Burundi's Tutsi dominated armed forces, set off another round of violence with Hutu militias attacking Tutsi civilians and the armed forces retaliating by attacking Hutu communities. The situation ultimately devolved into a civil war that lasted for more than ten years.

In the wake of the 1994 genocide in Rwanda international attention to the situation in Burundi increased and regional states, as well as the United Nations (UN) implemented a range of measures aimed at ending the conflict in Burundi. These measures included the establishment of a mediation process, the threat of the use of force and then the ultimate deployment of a peacekeeping mission, and the authorization of economic sanctions.

This report from the Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect examines the measures used by the international community in response to the conflict in Burundi between 1995 and 2005. It seeks to identify the lessons that can be learned about preventing and halting mass atrocities. The intervention efforts utilized by regional and international actors were likely key in preventing worse atrocities from occurring in Burundi. However, because the measures were primarily focused on establishing long-term stability in Burundi rather than preventing mass atrocities, for ten years they failed to provide immediate protection to populations from the daily threats of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and ethnic cleansing.

---

# Introduction

---

Burundi's post-colonial history has been marred by ethnic conflict, genocide, and civil war between the government and various rebel groups. Over the past fifty years, more than 500,000 Burundians have been killed or maimed and over one million have been displaced.<sup>1</sup> In the mid-1990s, as ethnic conflict escalated into civil war, and genocide struck neighboring Rwanda, Burundi's neighbors, multi-lateral organizations, and donor states became actively involved in Burundi. This engagement was designed to bring an end to the war and promote democracy building and was ultimately successful in reaching these goals. On that basis Burundi can be considered a promising example of states exercising their responsibility to protect populations from mass atrocities. However, the view of Burundi as a promising case must be tempered by the reality that sustained external engagement failed to prevent the deaths of hundreds of thousands of Burundians. This was primarily because international engagement emphasized long-term political solutions—at the expense of immediate protection concerns, as reflected by the fact that “no robust measures were taken to curb the violence.”<sup>2</sup>

This paper assesses international and regional responses to Burundi's conflict between 1995 and 2004 to determine what lessons the Burundi experience can offer about the application of the responsibility to protect (R2P) norm. It does so by examining the grounds for applying R2P to Burundi and analyzing the nature, successes, and failures of the key measures taken by international and regional actors to prevent mass atrocities and promote stability—mediation, threat of use of force and preventive deployment, and economic sanctions.

---

## The Responsibility to Protect

---

The responsibility to protect norm seeks to ensure that the international community of states never again fails to act in the face of genocide and other gross human rights violations. R2P, as it is commonly abbreviated, was adopted by heads of state and government at the World Summit in 2005 and represents a commitment to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity (the “four crimes”). The norm stipulates,

first, that states have an obligation to protect their citizens from these crimes; second, that the international community should assist them in doing so; and, third, that if a state fails to appropriately exercise this obligation, the responsibility to do so falls to the larger community of states. This entails a responsibility to use “appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means in accordance with the United Nations (UN) Charter,” to protect populations at risk of, or experiencing, one of the four crimes. “Should peaceful means be inadequate and national authorities are manifestly failing to protect their populations,” states are “prepared to take collective action in a timely and decisive manner” through the UN Security Council.<sup>3</sup>

Regional and international efforts in Burundi pre-date the adoption of the responsibility to protect at the 2005 World Summit. Yet the situation in Burundi can aptly be characterized as one where R2P would have applied. Between 1993 and 2005, as many as 350,000 Burundians were killed as a result of ethnic violence and civil war between the Armed Forces of Burundi (FAB) and rebel groups.<sup>4</sup> Atrocities committed during this twelve-year period constitute war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide and thus fall within the scope of the responsibility to protect.<sup>5</sup> Although R2P was only formally established as an international norm in 2005, international and regional actors applied many of R2P's tenets in their response to the violence in Burundi as early as 1995. Additionally, beginning in 1993, and intensifying in the wake of the 1994 Rwandan genocide, international and regional actors used measures that may now be considered part of the R2P toolbox.

---

## A Short History of Burundi

---

Pre-colonial Burundi was governed by a complex social system led by a king who was responsible for maintaining order in society. There was an aristocratic class, the Ganwa, whose princes governed the various provinces of Burundi and competed with one another for the throne. Society was stratified, with Tutsi generally occupying higher social positions than Hutu, but the system was somewhat fluid as chiefs from both groups conferred with the king to maintain order.<sup>6</sup> While the Tutsi minority held greater power and wealth, ethnic identity in pre-colonial Burundi did not carry the same political or social importance that it does today, as it was only one of many ways to identify social status. Indeed, clan-based identity was much more significant.<sup>7</sup>

Burundi became part of the German East Africa administration in 1899. Germany primarily governed Burundi through indirect rule, maintaining the pre-colonial monarchical system.<sup>8</sup> In the wake of World War I, Burundi came under Belgian administration. While the Belgians largely continued the system of indirect rule, they governed predominantly through the Tutsi aristocracy, thus hardening the Hutu-Tutsi divide. The colonial administration's policies subjugated and oppressed the Hutu, and as a result ethnicity became the primary determinant of social rank and privilege.<sup>9</sup>

Subsequent to World War II, Burundi became a UN trust territory under Belgium's administration with the understanding that the mandate was to prepare the country for independence. Burundi's first elections were held in 1961 and were won by the Union for National Progress party (UPRONA), which was then popular among both Hutus and Tutsis. The party was led by Tutsi Prince Louis Rwagasore, who served as a unifying force within the country.<sup>10</sup> His assassination in October of 1961 profoundly altered the country's political landscape, as political parties quickly aligned with particular ethnic groups in the wake of his death.<sup>11</sup> Although Burundi gained its independence as a constitutional monarchy on 1 July 1962, independence ushered in a period of political instability—the country had four governments between 1962 and 1965.<sup>12</sup>

Following the assassination in January 1965 of the recently elected Hutu prime minister, Pierre Ngendandumwe, the king appointed a Tutsi Ganwa as the new prime minister. This met with disapproval by Hutu leaders whose candidates had decisively won the most recent election. This decision ushered in decades of uninterrupted Tutsi control of the government and military.<sup>13</sup> Over time, simmering ethnic tensions in Burundi became a source of violence, and for the next thirty years the people of Burundi suffered genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity.

In 1972 a group of Hutu rebels carried out a massacre of several thousand Tutsi men, women, and children. In response, the government, then led by Colonel Michel Micombero, retaliated by massacring over 100,000 people, most of whom were Hutus, with the educated Hutu elite a primary target. The killings forced several hundred thousand more Hutu refugees to flee, primarily into neighboring Tanzania. While the international community condemned the 1972 genocide, there was no international intervention.<sup>14</sup> The 1972 killings and resulting displacement paved the way for decades of ethnic violence. During the 1980s, refugees in Tanzanian camps formed an armed militia, the Party for the Liberation of the Hutu People (Palipehutu), which later would launch attacks on the FAB and Tutsi civilians in Burundi.

Pierre Buyoya, a Tutsi major in the FAB, seized power in 1987 through a coup d'état. Upon assuming power Buyoya signalled an intention to liberalize state institutions and improve relations between Hutus and Tutsis. However, a lack of improvement in the political standing of Hutus, combined with the actions of a group of hard-line Tutsis concerned about a dilution of their power, led to an increase in tensions between the two ethnic groups and ultimately to a resurgence of violence the following year.<sup>15</sup> In a wave of crimes against humanity, Hutu rebel groups, many of whom originated in Tanzanian refugee camps, killed several thousand Tutsis in the communes of Ntega and Marangara. The FAB retaliated by massacring tens of thousands of Hutus, resulting in more than 30,000 refugees fleeing into Rwanda and other neighboring countries.<sup>16</sup> Similar patterns of violence and retaliation occurred several more times in the following years.

In part as a response to the 1987 coup and flare up of violence, international donors and human rights organizations began to pressure Burundi's government to initiate political and economic reforms. During the early 1990s, international donors threatened to reduce and withdraw foreign aid and loans to the country unless Burundi made more rapid progress toward becoming a democracy.<sup>17</sup> Under the weight of donor pressure President Buyoya agreed to hold multiparty elections. Soon thereafter, in July 1993, Melchior Ndadaye, head of the newly established, primarily Hutu party, Front Pour La Democratie au Burundi (FRODEBU), was elected as the first Hutu president. He assumed office on 10 July 1993 and was assassinated only three months later by FAB paratroopers.<sup>18</sup>

In the wake of Ndadaye's assassination, Hutu militias such as Palipehutu were mobilized to resist the government, still mostly Tutsi in its composition. These militias also targeted civilians, killing Tutsi men, women, and children in machete attacks or by dousing them in kerosene and burning them alive. Thousands of Burundian Tutsis were killed by such militias in just a few days after Ndadaye's death.<sup>19</sup> Claiming to be acting to restore "peace and order," the FAB retaliated by massacring entire Hutu villages with grenade attacks, burning down their homes, and slaughtering their cattle. At least 50,000 people were killed over the next two months.<sup>20</sup> As had been the case in 1972, the international community of states again did little to stop the war crimes and crimes against humanity being perpetrated against Burundian civilians.

Eventually, with violence escalating, the Security Council did become seized with the matter and authorized the appointment of Mauritanian diplomat Ahmedou Ould Abdallah in 1993 as the secretary-general's special representative to Burundi to try to resolve matters. With

Abdallah's assistance, a compromise was reached between FAB generals and FRODEBU and, in February 1994, Hutu FRODEBU leader Cyprien Ntaryamira was sworn in as president.<sup>21</sup> This short-lived calm ended when Ntaryamira was killed in the same plane explosion that killed Rwanda's president Habyarimana in April 1994. The ensuing events in Rwanda became the tipping point leading to heightened international attention on Burundi.<sup>22</sup>

### **The Rwandan Genocide and an Increase in International Attention on Burundi**

In the aftermath of the Rwandan genocide in 1994, international and regional actors intensified their efforts to broker a peace agreement. Concerned that Burundi may follow a similar path, the level of engagement in Burundi was "out of proportion to the significance in traditional strategic or economic terms of this Maryland-sized country."<sup>23</sup> The response included "a UN and several special envoys, a UN commission of inquiry, an OAU [Organization of African Unity] military observer mission, regional summits and negotiations, several high-level fact-finding delegations, a number of NGO [non-governmental organization] initiatives, an ongoing Washington policy forum, and ultimately, regional sanctions."<sup>24</sup>

The sudden death of Burundi's president unleashed a domestic power struggle. Concerned about the possibility of large-scale violence, Abdallah appeared on television with political leaders to appease the concerns of average citizens, stressing that the government remained intact.<sup>25</sup> These public demonstrations of government stability, led by the special representative, may have forestalled the outbreak of mass violence and may be one of the few examples of effective and immediate preventive and protective action. Although no genocide comparable to Rwanda's unfolded in Burundi, a steady stream of ethnically based attacks and counterattacks continued throughout this period.

Abdallah's mediation in the wake of Ntaryamira's death resulted in the "Convention of Government," which established a power-sharing agreement between Hutu- and Tutsi-led parties and the army leadership. The new government, headed by FRODEBU's leader Sylvestre Ntibantunganya, was established in September 1994 and granted Tutsi parties 11 out of 23 cabinet posts and 40 percent of local government positions.<sup>26</sup> The power sharing formula provided a solution to the political stalemate but did little to calm the violence, in part because the arrangement was not accepted by all parties. The pact was in fact rejected by FRODEBU's minister of the interior, Léonard Nyangoma, who left Burundi to form the Conseil National Pour la Défense de la Démocratie (CNDD), a Hutu rebel militia that aimed to defeat the Burundian armed forces. Concerned about the persisting violence and the threat from the CNDD,

Ntibantunganya resorted to the army to restore order, yet the army used the threat of the CNDD as justification to attack Hutus more generally, adding to the feeling among many Hutus that Ntibantunganya had betrayed their interests. The formation of the CNDD marked a serious escalation in the civil war and in the atrocities endured by the population.<sup>27</sup>

By 1995 clashes between the overwhelmingly Tutsi military (FAB) and various militia groups (including Palipehutu and CNDD) had spread to most provinces, with civilians bearing the brunt of the conflict and experiencing the four crimes. Tens of thousands of Hutus fled to neighboring countries, including to Tanzania, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Rwanda, while displaced Tutsis gathered primarily in camps within Burundi, protected by the FAB and the government-sponsored paramilitary Gardiens de la Paix. As farmers deserted their fields and harvests, production slumped and hunger and malnutrition rates increased throughout the country. The UN continued to follow events in Burundi and had dispatched envoys, but it was not until 1995 that the first genuine appeal for international assistance to end the civil war and its attendant atrocities came from within Burundi in the form of a request for mediation assistance.

---

## **Regional and International Response**

---

### **Mediation Efforts**

Mediation is a process whereby a third party seeks a non-adversarial resolution to a dispute between parties to a conflict. Mediation has been considered a key protection and prevention measure in the R2P toolbox. Paragraph 139 of the World Summit Outcome Document (WSOD) states that the international community "has the responsibility to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means, in accordance with Chapters VI and VIII of the Charter of the United Nations, to help protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity." Chapter VI encourages parties to a dispute to seek a peaceful solution, and authorizes the Security Council to call upon them to do so, "by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements." In his 2009 report *Implementing the Responsibility to Protect*, the UN secretary-general underscored the value of mediation in averting conflict and resolving differences, whether it is done by national



authorities, the UN, or regional organizations. In the 2009 General Assembly debate on the responsibility to protect, several member states echoed the secretary-general's view on mediation, identifying it as one of the measures relevant for halting and preventing mass atrocities. Most recently mediation was used to stem the violence that erupted in Kenya following the country's disputed 2008 elections; this particular episode has been considered a successful application of the responsibility to protect.

Mediation was at the heart of international efforts in Burundi and was used to seek a sustainable political solution to the civil war by creating a power-sharing agreement between political and armed groups representing the Hutu and Tutsi communities. Numerous actors were involved in the mediation efforts: NGOs, neighboring states, and regional and international organizations. Three mediators—Julius Nyerere, Nelson Mandela, and Jacob Zuma—presided over the various stages of the peace process.

The main mediation effort, which became known as the Arusha process, was initiated in 1995 when Burundi's president, Sylvestre Ntibantunganya, requested mediation assistance from the Carter Center (an American democracy and good governance NGO led by former US president Jimmy Carter). President Ntibantunganya told the Center that his government required foreign assistance to end the ongoing civil war between the military and rebel militias,<sup>28</sup> owing to his lack of influence with either side: as a Hutu, he had little control over the Tutsi-dominated armed forces; and as the head of what was widely seen as a Tutsi government, he was viewed as a Tutsi sympathizer by Hutu militias.<sup>29</sup>

In requesting the help of the Carter Center Ntibantunganya explicitly recognized the need for international assistance, linking his government's inability to protect its population with the very real possibility of mass atrocities made evident by earlier events in Rwanda and Burundi. This connection has subsequently become a core element of the emerging R2P norm. If a government is unable or unwilling to protect its population—that is, if it is manifestly failing—the international community of states has a responsibility to assume that role. In the case of Burundi, the inability of the Ntibantunganya government to protect its population meant that international actors had an obligation to take all measures necessary to halt crimes and prevent future atrocities.

### **Mediation Led by Julius Nyerere**

While the civil war between the Tutsi-dominated FAB and Hutu militias, including the CNDD and the Palipehutu, continued and civilians remained the target of atrocities, the Carter Center accepted Ntibantunganya's request for assistance and consulted widely on how best to proceed.

The Center organized two summits with regional leaders to discuss the situation in Burundi and possible candidates to lead a political mediation effort between the country's numerous warring factions.<sup>30</sup> OAU secretary-general Salim Ahmed Salim requested that former Tanzanian president Julius Nyerere, who had co-chaired the second summit, take on the job. Salim argued that Nyerere possessed both a prominent international profile and intimate knowledge of Burundi's problems, having presided over a neighboring country that had hosted over 200,000 Burundian refugees.<sup>31</sup> Nyerere's appointment, however, was a risk for the OAU. Despite his positive reputation in Africa and internationally, in Burundi he was deeply distrusted by the Tutsi political and military elite of whom he had been critical.<sup>32</sup> He was nevertheless selected as the primary mediator with the charge of assisting the parties in reaching a power-sharing agreement.<sup>33</sup>

Nyerere commenced the negotiations with a series of meetings between March and April 1996. Early disputes between the two key parties—the primarily Tutsi-led UPRONA and the primarily Hutu-led FRODEBU—centered on the inclusion of the CNDD, Palipehutu, and other Hutu militias in the mediation process. Nyerere had originally called for the inclusion of all parties, including the CNDD, in any talks he convened. However, the military and UPRONA strongly objected and accused FRODEBU of complicity in CNDD attacks on Tutsi civilians.<sup>34</sup> The issue of who would be permitted to participate in the process became so contentious that it soon contributed to an early breakdown of negotiations, with Nyerere unable to get the parties to the table.

Successful mediation often requires logistical support from outside actors in order to encourage or pressure the feuding parties to not only participate in the process but also to make a concerted effort to reach compromises that will lead to conflict resolution and, crucially from an R2P perspective, an end to mass atrocities. Thus in an effort to strengthen the faltering mediation process, in June 1996, regional leaders convened the first of many summits on Burundi in Arusha, Tanzania. Regional leaders urged an immediate cessation in the fighting and called for all-party negotiations.<sup>35</sup> The primary outcome of the meeting was that the Tanzanian and Ugandan presidents convinced Burundian president Ntibantunganya to accept a regional intervention force, which they and Nyerere believed could bring the parties, especially the military, to the negotiating table.<sup>36</sup> However, widespread opposition to such a force combined with pre-existing tensions between the Tutsi-dominated FAB and Ntibantunganya's predominantly Hutu FRODEBU party led to a military coup on 24 July 1996, which returned Pierre Buyoya of UPRONA to power.<sup>37</sup> Several days later a second regional summit was held in which the

regional intervention force plan was aborted and economic sanctions were imposed.

Despite regional sanctions and widespread atrocities against civilians by all sides, Nyerere was still unable to bring the parties to the negotiating table. Buyoya's government argued that pre-talks within Burundian society were first needed and sought to set stringent conditions for the talks, including which parties would be permitted to participate in the process. These conditions were that no talks could be held: (1) with those who participated in, what he referred to as, the 1993 genocide; (2) while the regional economic embargo was in place; (3) before the disarmament of Hutu militias; (4) in Tanzania, a country deemed hostile to Burundi; and (5) under the mediation of Julius Nyerere, who was perceived as partial.<sup>38</sup> Regional leaders responded to Buyoya's conditions with further economic sanctions.

The debate over who should participate in the peace process was one of the factors that continued to delay the formal mediation process.<sup>39</sup> Despite an unwillingness to consider working under Nyerere's direction, President Buyoya organized a national debate on reconciliation and invited all political parties except the CNDD to participate. Buyoya argued that "internal negotiations would show the world that Burundi could solve its own problems without external interference."<sup>40</sup> Yet, as these talks led to no concrete outcome, regional actors continued to place pressure on all parties to resume the formal process in Arusha with Nyerere as the mediator.<sup>41</sup>

Several factors, including regional sanctions discussed further below, combined in the spring of 1998 to bring the parties back to Nyerere's negotiating table. The formal Arusha process commenced in June 1998 with 19 parties, including Nyangoma of the CNDD, participating.<sup>42</sup> However, around the time the talks began, the military wing of CNDD, the Forces pour la Défense de la Démocratie (FDD), split off from the CNDD, forming a separate militia group known as the CNDD-FDD. The fragmentation of the CNDD further complicated the mediation process. The immediate result was that while the CNDD was represented in the negotiations by Nyangoma, the CNDD-FDD was excluded from the negotiations. Although the CNDD-FDD argued that Nyangoma no longer represented their interests, Nyerere refused to seat a representative of the new group at the table. Some, including the International Crisis Group, argued that "the marked absence of one of the main actors in the war in Burundi, the armed branch of the Hutu rebel movement, leaves its leaders with no other choice than to resort to violence, through which they hope to regain a position of strength."<sup>43</sup> Others have argued that the absence of a CNDD-FDD representative from the negotiations was not responsible for the continued

violence of the CNDD-FDD. Rather, the reason for the split appeared to be that the military wing was simply not ready to negotiate and remained determined to secure a military advantage or even victory. Regardless of its motivations, it is clear that while the Arusha process moved forward, both the CNDD-FDD, as well as the armed wing of Palipehutu, the Forces Nationales de Libération (FNL), continued targeting those civilians suspected of supporting the government. The FAB continued to retaliate with a practice of extrajudicial executions and forced displacement.<sup>44</sup> Thus the onset of the formal mediation process resulted in little relief for civilians experiencing mass atrocities.

### **Mediation Led by Nelson Mandela**

An unexpected event changed the course of the mediation process. The sudden death of Nyerere provided an opportunity for Nelson Mandela, who had just completed his sole term as president of South Africa, to take over as the leader of the mediation efforts. The first thing Mandela did was to try to draw the militias back into the talks.<sup>45</sup> When there was no progress, Mandela concentrated instead on bringing the remaining participants in the negotiations to a final agreement. He built on the foundations laid down by Nyerere, who had established committees to explore five key areas of focus in the negotiations: (1) the nature of the conflict, (2) democracy and good governance, (3) peace and security, (4) reconstruction and development, and (5) guarantees to support the accord's implementation.<sup>46</sup>

One of the main unresolved issues was the future composition of the armed forces, which was at that point still predominantly Tutsi and was viewed as a threat to Hutu communities. Mandela's simple solution was to make it 50 percent Tutsi and 50 percent Hutu. This was widely criticized by some Burundian parties who argued that it was too simplistic or that it gave more military power to Tutsis than their proportion of the population warranted.<sup>47</sup> Yet the proposal addressed core issues on both sides of the ethnic divide. Tutsis were concerned that they would be the victims of genocide if Hutus controlled the government and military, while Hutus feared that Hutu politicians would be killed if the armed forces were not reformed.

In late August 2000, the Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement was signed.<sup>48</sup> The agreement established a transitional government and included Mandela's suggested 50/50 reform of the military. It also contained, in Article 6, principles and measures relating to the prevention, suppression, and eradication of genocide, war crimes, and other crimes against humanity—three of the four crimes that states committed to protect populations from in endorsing R2P at the 2005 World Summit. The provisions called for: legislation to counter these crimes; the creation of a UN

commission of inquiry; measures for combating impunity; educational programs; regional cooperation; the promotion of national inter-ethnic cooperation; a monument to remember victims of the crimes; and a day of remembrance.<sup>49</sup>

The signing of the Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement was a major achievement, setting Burundi on a long road toward constitutional democracy and human rights protection, and ideally, away from a bloody past and present. Yet the civil war and related atrocities were not over. Absent from the negotiations were representatives of the two armed militias still at war with the military—the CNDD-FDD and Palipehutu-FNL.<sup>50</sup> Their refusal to sign the agreement left them as a significant threat as they remained beyond the reach of the ceasefire and cessation of hostilities provision included in it.<sup>51</sup> The two militias actually intensified their attacks on government forces after the signing of the Arusha Agreement,<sup>52</sup> and they, along with the military, killed hundreds of civilians. The full implications of this became tragically clear in the early months of 1999 as FNL fighters created road blocks on the road to Bujumbura, the country's capital, ambushing buses filled with passengers. Later that year, FDD forces killed dozens of civilians and burned over 600 homes in the eastern provinces of Burundi to discourage those who had fled to Tanzania from returning. FNL and FDD frequently ambushed regroupment camps, attacking soldiers and stealing food from civilians.<sup>53</sup> Additionally, human rights defenders and humanitarian workers were abducted, attacked, and killed by the militias and threatened by government forces.<sup>54</sup> Hampered by the violence and lack of support, even among some of its signatories, implementation of the agreement stalled.<sup>55</sup>

To prevent the agreement from falling apart, Mandela convened a regional summit in Arusha in July 2001. He managed to secure an agreement on a transitional government, which entailed a Tutsi leadership for 18 months, after which a representative of a predominantly Hutu party would take over. Mandela then convened another summit in October 2001 in Pretoria where it was agreed that troops from the South African National Defence Force (SANDF) would deploy to Burundi to protect Hutu politicians returning from exile to serve in the transitional government.<sup>56</sup>

### **Mediation Led by Jacob Zuma**

The thrust of the mediation efforts by the end of 2001 was thus almost entirely focused on negotiating with the CNDD-FDD and Palipehutu-FNL to reach a ceasefire with the government. South African deputy president Jacob Zuma had been delegated by his government to take over this task from Mandela. In early December 2002, Zuma successfully negotiated a ceasefire agreement between the military and CNDD-FDD. The implementation of this agreement was to

be monitored by an African Union (AU) Force to be called the African Mission in Burundi (AMIB). By mid-2003, over 3,000 troops had been deployed to Burundi.<sup>57</sup> Despite AMIB's presence, both the CNDD-FDD and the military repeatedly violated the ceasefire agreement and the fighting intensified. Throughout 2003, atrocities continued unabatedly, as rebel groups indiscriminately attacked civilian villages and the armed forces carried out extrajudicial killings.<sup>58</sup>

Though President Buyoya argued that he should stay in office until a ceasefire had been secured, he was prevailed upon by Zuma and regional actors to step down as scheduled in the agreement on transitional government. At that point, FRODEBU's candidate, Domitien Ndayizeye, was duly sworn in as president in April 2003.<sup>59</sup> Seven months later, the government and the CNDD-FDD finally signed a comprehensive peace agreement that arranged for the group's integration into the military as well as the political arena. With the CNDD-FDD's entry into government, clashes between its forces and the FAB largely subsided and the population finally saw a reduction in atrocities. Meanwhile, Zuma continued to seek to persuade the leaders of the Palipehutu-FNL, the one militia continuing hostilities against the government (hostilities that included a massacre of 150 civilians in August 2004), to agree to a ceasefire. The armed group ultimately agreed to a ceasefire in late 2006 and demobilized and joined the political process in 2009.

### **Civil Society Mediation**

In addition to the official Arusha peace process, numerous NGO initiatives complemented and/or established a parallel track for negotiations. These "track two" negotiations were useful in two respects. The first is that they provided an alternate means for dialogue, especially crucial when the Nyerere-led Arusha peace process was stalled or delayed. Secondly, these initiatives provided a way for rebel militias not engaged in the official mediation to continue to participate in the process.<sup>60</sup> In 1996, Sant'Egidio, a religious organization involved in peace negotiations, offered "its good offices for secret peace talks between the government of Burundi, representatives from the army and the major opposition groups in exile."<sup>61</sup> The leader of the CNDD, Leonard Nyangoma, and President Buyoya began secret talks through Sant'Egidio in 1997, which led to an agreement on issues including a ceasefire. Although it went largely unimplemented, it was made public.<sup>62</sup> Other NGO initiatives included the Political Dialogue Project, which from 1996 to 2000 facilitated conversations between major political and military stakeholders. Its founder and director, South African parliamentarian Jan Van Eck, also encouraged military groups not party to the Arusha peace talks to nevertheless engage with the mediator in an attempt to find common ground between all of the parties.

### **An Assessment of Mediation Efforts**

Mediation efforts were ultimately successful in ending Burundi's civil war and halting atrocities against civilians. As a protection tool, however, the process suffered from several weaknesses. The efforts were premised on the belief that a negotiated political solution would automatically lead to a cessation in violence and atrocities. Accepting the need for a political solution as the starting point, "the international community only faintly recognized that continuing violence posed the greatest threat, in that it continually renewed and strengthened mutual fear and distrust that undermined efforts at peacebuilding. The violence was seen as a result of the parties' dispute rather than as a cause."<sup>63</sup> This, along with other factors, meant that at times "the solutions issuing from the talks...addressed the wrong problems. The continuing fighting between Hutu insurgents and the Hutu government after 2003 serves as evidence for this."<sup>64</sup>

Furthermore, while the ultimate goal of the talks was to develop a power-sharing and army integration agreement, the frequent exclusion of key perpetrators of atrocities from the process made it difficult to bring an end to the fighting. Thus those committing the worst of the atrocities found themselves outside of the talks and thus lacked incentives to cease their hostilities, including their attacks on civilians.

Another weakness in the early stages of the process was the fact that the military did not perceive Nyerere as a neutral third party. In fact, the FAB leadership believed that he and the Tanzanian government (which they conflated) were implacably biased against it. They thought that Nyerere was too pro-Hutu and thus that he regarded the armed forces as an enemy to be defeated.<sup>65</sup> Moreover, as other experiences have made clear the success of mediation efforts are largely determined by their reliance on robust supportive measures, such as the presence of peacekeeping forces and human rights monitoring. These measures must be chosen in a sensitive manner that takes into account the interests of the various parties and the pressure points likely to motivate them toward compromise rather than to harden positions. Such measures were not always successfully employed during Burundi's mediation process. This is a factor that is explored in greater depth below.

Mandela has always been modest about his part in securing the Arusha Agreement, once claiming merely to have "tied up the loose ends" after Nyerere did all the hard work.<sup>66</sup> In fact the agreement could not have happened without Mandela. A number of factors substantiate this point. First, Mandela and his government enjoyed the credibility that came with South Africa's democratic transition from minority rule. Second, the country's growing "African superpower" status, its perceived neutrality, and Mandela's own tremendous international

reputation were equally critical. While the Arusha Agreement is frequently regarded as a comprehensive peace agreement covering virtually all relevant issues, the fact that those militias perpetrating a large number of crimes against civilians were not parties to the agreement, combined with weaknesses in its implementation, actually resulted in an increase in fighting and attendant atrocities in the wake of its signing. Mandela's successor, Jacob Zuma, is credited with bringing the remaining rebel militias, notably the CNDD-FDD and Palipehutu-FNL, into the agreement. The mediation efforts thus played a crucial role in bringing a negotiated end to the civil war and, most importantly from an R2P perspective, to the four crimes.

### **The Use of Force**

The success of mediation is often contingent upon the use of appropriate supportive measures. In Burundi the mediation process was buttressed by the threat of the use of force and later the deployment of peacekeepers. The responsibility to protect stipulates that when a government is manifestly failing to protect its populations from war crimes, crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing and genocide, and peaceful means are inadequate to protect such populations, the international community is prepared to take collective action including Chapter VII use of force to protect them.

The use of force to prevent and halt crimes was contemplated at several points throughout Burundi's civil war but was never authorized. However, after the Arusha Agreement was signed, Nelson Mandela approved the deployment of a South African peacekeeping force in 2001, which was later transformed into an AU and subsequently a UN mission. Neither the threats of the use of force in the mid-1990s nor the peacekeeping mission effectively prevented atrocities. While Burundian president Ntibantunganya said that "peace enforcement," a veiled reference to military intervention, would be called on if parties did not participate in the mediation process, the threat actually made government officials less inclined to work through the Arusha initiative.<sup>67</sup> Peacekeeping forces that were ultimately deployed also failed to improve security conditions for civilians, given that their mandates were extremely limited.

### **Threat of Military Intervention by the United Nations**

In December 1995, just before the Nyerere mediation process began, UN secretary-general Boutros Boutros-Ghali warned the Security Council that there was "real danger of the situation in Burundi degenerating to the point where it might explode into violence on a massive scale."<sup>68</sup> He noted that the situation was "characterized by daily killings, massacres, torture and arbitrary detention" and "an increasingly marked

genocide trend of a socio-ethnic nature” with “perpetrators enjoying impunity.”<sup>69</sup> His call echoed concerns raised earlier in July by the OAU’s secretary-general, Salim Ahmed Salim, who warned that intervention might be needed to stop genocide in Burundi.<sup>70</sup>

Boutros-Ghali suggested developing a humanitarian intervention force led by countries that had rapid response capabilities. The force would be based in then-Zaire and could be sent, if needed, to Burundi.<sup>71</sup> Boutros-Ghali rooted his concern in the need to prevent atrocities by arguing for a “military presence capable of intervening rapidly in the event of a sudden deterioration of the situation in Burundi [that would serve as] a preventive measure that could help to avoid a repetition of the tragic events in Rwanda.”<sup>72</sup>

The efforts of Boutros-Ghali to spur international action to bring an end to the violence in Burundi did not result in the application of preventive or protective measures. Crucial states were simply not ready to back Boutros-Ghali’s preventive deployment initiative. Within the Security Council, France, a key donor of military and economic aid to Burundi, was concerned that even mere discussion of such a force could trigger pre-emptive mass atrocities. The French government thus favored preventive diplomacy over deployment.<sup>73</sup> The United States, on the other hand, did support Boutros-Ghali’s initiative. Given that it refused to provide troops for such a mission, however, Washington would have had to exert diplomatic pressure on other states to provide soldiers and logistical support for the plan to move forward—a role it failed to play.

The lack of sincere support from key state actors, combined with the government of Burundi’s strong rejection of the idea of any international military operation, led to a weak Security Council resolution in March 1996 that merely called for consultations about a force.<sup>74</sup> Talk of a UN intervention force without a clear commitment to finding a political settlement concerned the Tutsi-led military, who viewed the force as a response to Hutu demands. This made the military reluctant to come to the negotiating table.<sup>75</sup> In effect, the resolution did nothing to provide protection to Burundi’s population and instead, by threatening the use of force without being prepared to follow through on this threat, the Council created a moral hazard and likely slowed the progress of Nyerere’s peace process.

### **Threat of Regional Intervention by Uganda and Tanzania**

In June 1996, regional leaders, impatient with the delay in official peace negotiations, convened a meeting of UPRONA, FRODEBU, and a number of smaller political parties. Faced with a civil war raging on their borders, refugee flows, and

regional instability, Tanzanian president Benjamin Mkapa and Ugandan president Yoweri Museveni pressed President Ntibantunganya from FRODEBU and his UPRONA prime minister, Antoine Nduwayo, to request a regional intervention force. A regional force was regarded as more appealing than the threatened UN intervention. The force would be largely composed of Tanzanian and Ugandan troops mandated to defend government institutions.<sup>76</sup>

Frustrated by his powerlessness over the primarily Tutsi military, President Ntibantunganya agreed immediately. Prime Minister Nduwayo was much more reluctant, but, according to Nyerere, finally agreed to co-sign the president’s formal request for troops rather than support the UN initiative. When news of the plan leaked there was uproar among the Tutsi political and military elite who immediately pressured Nduwayo to refuse to co-sign a troop request. Nduwayo complied. There was a brief standoff before Mkapa and Museveni finally abandoned the idea of sending troops.<sup>77</sup> The episode damaged relations between the military and the Tanzanian government, including with Tanzanian mediator Nyerere. Relations between the military and President Ntibantunganya, already strained, were destroyed. On 23 July 1996, the military informed the president that it could no longer guarantee his safety, prompting him to take refuge in the US Embassy. Two days later, in a coup d’etat, the military declared Pierre Buyoya once again the head of state.<sup>78</sup> Buyoya clearly implicated the threat of intervention as a motive behind the coup, “the idea of intervention alone has caused the fall of whatever government was left.”<sup>79</sup> The threat of regional intervention thus served to solidify the position of hardliners within and outside the military and actually exacerbated the security situation in the country. It would take nearly two years before the parties would return to the mediation table.

### **SANDF/AMIB/ONUB Peacekeepers**

The 2000 Arusha Agreement “called for a UN peacekeeping operation to assist with the implementation of the peace agreement.”<sup>80</sup> However, the UN refused to authorize the force because both the CNDD-FDD and the Palipehutu-FNL failed to sign the agreement and continued their fight against the military, which meant that there was no comprehensive ceasefire in place. In October 2001, then mediator Nelson Mandela agreed to deploy a 700-member South African force to Burundi. In a context of continued armed confrontation, its mission was to protect returning politicians in order to enable the power-sharing transitional government to take shape.<sup>81</sup> The SANDF force was able to deploy within two weeks and camped right in the center of Bujumbura.<sup>82</sup> The troops carefully adhered to their limited mandate of protecting politicians and did nothing to either assist or inhibit the military’s counterinsurgency operations.

SANDF soldiers thus avoided becoming targets of the warring factions and successfully defended the politicians under their protection, as none were attacked while under guard. However, there is little evidence that their presence had any direct preventative effect on the perpetration of atrocities against civilians. Instead, it appears that the FAB increased their attacks on civilians in the early months of 2002 killing at least 80 Hutu civilians, many of them children in the Bubanza and Bujumbura provinces. Similarly, armed groups including the CNDD-FDD and FNL continued their own attacks on civilians.<sup>83</sup> Nevertheless, their protection of politicians was essential for the implementation of the political transition prescribed by the Arusha Agreement, which several years later resulted in a comprehensive ceasefire between the government and armed militias—a development that ultimately brought an end to the mass atrocities.

In December 2002, then mediator Jacob Zuma negotiated a ceasefire agreement between President Buyoya and the CNDD-FDD, which had not been party to the original Arusha Agreement. It was agreed that the combatants would not be disarmed, but would be assembled together with their weapons in camps guarded by an AU force to be called the African Mission in Burundi (AMIB) of which SANDF was a contingent. In January 2003, South Africa, Ethiopia, and Mozambique agreed to contribute troops for AMIB, and by mid-year over 3,000 had deployed in Burundi.<sup>84</sup> Their main objective was “to create conditions sufficiently stable for the UN Security Council to authorise a UN intervention,”<sup>85</sup> a near impossible task given that AMIB lacked a mandate to protect civilians. As a result, “after several months on the ground, senior AMIB officials drafted rules of engagement (ROEs) to allow their troops to use force to protect civilians in ‘imminent danger of serious injury or death,’ including in cases of genocide and mass killings, although such engagement required prior authorization from military and civilian officers.”<sup>86</sup>

Although AMIB had deployed, the mission made little progress in establishing camps for demobilized fighters and both sides repeatedly violated the ceasefire agreement, with the fighting in fact getting worse. AMIB itself became the target of militia attacks. As AMIB soldiers were establishing a camp for Palipehutu-FNL near the Kibira forest, CNDD-FDD forces fired upon them. AMIB soldiers were again attacked, along with Palipehutu-FNL fighters arriving at the camp when it opened in June 2003. Palipehutu-FNL’s counter attacks resulted in a month of escalating violence in the Kibira region.<sup>87</sup> In October 2003, Zuma brokered a power-sharing deal between the CNDD-FDD and the government and CNDD-FDD finally ceased hostilities. Subsequently a new unity government incorporating members of the militia was sworn in.<sup>88</sup> Meanwhile, AMIB attempted to assemble

CNDD-FDD fighters into the agreed-upon camps. Ceasefire violations continued, however, limiting AMIB’s ability to support the disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration of former combatants. AMIB was essentially assigned a “nearly impossible mission” with only 3,500 personnel operating on a limited budget, the AU force was tasked with stabilizing a still tense situation where the Palipehutu-FNL continued to engage in armed attacks.<sup>89</sup>

Reporting to the UN Security Council in late 2003, Zuma formally asked that AMIB be replaced by a UN force. In May 2004, in response to Zuma’s request and because of the progress in establishing a comprehensive ceasefire agreement with the CNDD-FDD, the council passed resolution 1545 establishing the Opération des Nations Unies au Burundi (ONUB), which formally commenced operations in June 2004, for an initial six-month period.<sup>90</sup> At the outset ONUB was almost entirely made up of former AMIB personnel, but gradually Kenya, Nepal, and Pakistan contributed soldiers to the force, which totalled 5,650 troops.<sup>91</sup> With a Chapter VII mandate, ONUB was authorized to protect civilians. It enforced the ceasefires, administered the camps for CNDD-FDD fighters, and later facilitated either their demobilization or integration into the new national armed forces—Forces de Défense Nationales (FDN), which formally replaced the FAB in early 2004.<sup>92</sup>

### **Assessment of the Use of Force Measures**

The threat of intervention by the UN in 1995 was inextricably linked to a desire to ensure that Burundi did not follow a similar path to genocide as Rwanda. The desire to prevent large-scale atrocities and curb the conflict’s spillover into neighboring countries similarly motivated Tanzania and Uganda to advocate the deployment of a regional intervention force in 1996. Not only were these discussions fruitless, but they likely hampered the mediation process, particularly by heightening distrust between the Tutsi military elite and Hutu political leaders and delaying the military’s engagement with Nyerere. Thus the threats of force, rather than having the result of protecting populations, probably exacerbated the risks primarily because there had never been a genuine commitment on the part of the international community to authorize a deployment or provide the necessary troops. Had the threats actually been followed by a robust military force with a mandate to protect civilians, the result may have been significantly different. Burundi’s objection to external forces in its territory was hardly surprising and should have been anticipated by the international community.<sup>93</sup>

SANDF’s deployment in 2001 marked the first time foreign troops entered Burundi at the invitation of the government. SANDF’s initial mandate, limited to the protection of political leaders, addressed the concerns of Hutu politicians about

the military and at the same time reassured the military that SANDF had no intention of compromising national sovereignty. SANDF's open public profile, meanwhile, was a visible sign to Burundians of strong foreign engagement in, and commitment to, their political transition. Similarly, warring factions eschewed targeting AMIB because of its limited mandate. The force could thus play a "critical security role in Burundi in a situation where the UN was initially unwilling to provide a peacekeeping force in the absence of a comprehensive ceasefire."<sup>94</sup> Its limited mandate, however, also meant that "all sides continued to target civilians, even in areas where AMIB was present."<sup>95</sup> In September of 2002, for example, the Burundian army targeted and executed hundreds of civilians in the Gitega province.<sup>96</sup> The army and Palipehutu-FNL carried out attacks on residential districts throughout Bujumbura in July 2003 killing hundreds of civilians and abducting dozens of children to use as soldiers.<sup>97</sup> Thus, similar to the mediation process, the deployment of foreign peacekeepers to Burundi contributed to the development of long-term peace and security but did not protect civilians from immediate threats of atrocities.

## Economic Sanctions

Pursuant to paragraph 139 of the WSOD, the international community can employ economic sanctions against governments who fail to protect their populations. Increasingly sanctions experts have been calling for the use of targeted sanctions against specific perpetrators, be they government officials or non-state actors as the consequences are less onerous to average citizens. In Burundi economic sanctions were one of the earliest measures employed.

## Regional Sanctions

In the wake of the coup that brought Buyoya to power, the failed military intervention efforts of Tanzania and Uganda, and the stalled mediation process, regional leaders imposed broad economic sanctions on Burundi in late July 1996. Regional heads of state refused to recognize Buyoya as president and stated that the sanctions would be lifted only when constitutional order was restored and unconditional negotiations with all parties to the conflict, including armed groups, had begun.<sup>98</sup> The sanctions were not enacted with the specific intent to immediately halt atrocities but to pressure actors to participate in the peace process, a process that was expected to ultimately end these atrocities.

The sanctions forbade any export or import of Burundian goods through regional states, except for items that a hastily assembled sanctions committee exempted on humanitarian grounds.<sup>99</sup> Then mediator Nyerere supported the plan, arguing that sanctions were "the most effective method of

international coercion" available.<sup>100</sup> Some contend that his strong endorsement was a means of enhancing the credibility of his lagging mediation efforts.<sup>101</sup>

Hutu-dominant FRODEBU applauded the sanctions as well. The party's secretary-general later commented that "the incumbent power had refused to enter negotiations, to negotiate with those they said were génocidaires.... [T]hey refused to discuss the reform of the army. But with sanctions they realized that the regional heads of state were implacably opposed to the reversal of democratic institutions in Burundi."<sup>102</sup> "Without sanctions" he added "I am not sure that the government would have negotiated."<sup>103</sup> Tutsi parties, including UPRONA, said that the sanctions were a violation of Burundi's sovereignty and akin to a declaration of war. They blamed all the regional states that signed the plan, but reserved particular criticism for Nyerere and the Tanzanian government. As one URPONA negotiator saw it, "they were strangling us. It was a criminal act against us. How can we reconcile when you are strangling us? You cannot make us negotiate with a gun against our head."<sup>104</sup>

Sanctions initially increased the scarcity of goods and the price of imports, including fuel, which led to a rise in prices for all goods. Slowly, however, despite the continuation of the embargo, prices started coming down for imports while stockpiles of goods waiting to be exported declined—indicating that reliable smuggling routes had been established.<sup>105</sup> Senior military officials had created a black market that served to further entrench their power. Despite this, however, the embargo ensured that domestic and foreign investment in Burundi came to a standstill, worsening poverty and creating hardships for the Burundian people.

Until the imposition of sanctions, the European Union (EU) and UN Security Council had strongly endorsed the regional peace initiative on Burundi. Afterward, however, they were equivocal, quietly indicating their concern about the negative humanitarian and economic impact of the sanctions. Yet by April 1996 the EU and the United States had frozen all non-emergency aid to Burundi.<sup>106</sup> Despite their unease with the sanctions, the EU and the Security Council chose not to try to wrest the diplomatic initiative from regional leaders. They also did not take action to strengthen African initiatives, failing not only to enact sanctions themselves but to provide technical assistance to those who did.<sup>107</sup> Some have argued that had Western states provided stronger support for the sanctions and the entire political process, an early compromise would have been reached, thus resolving the conflict, ending atrocities, and protecting populations.<sup>108</sup>

The pressure imposed by sanctions initially moved Buyoya to seek a compromise. In September 1996, he lifted a ban

on political parties and announced the imminent restoration of the parliament. But when Buyoya discovered that regional heads of state would still not recognize him as president, he halted any further political reform and turned his back on Nyerere's mediation process for the next two years.<sup>109</sup> Instead, Buyoya greatly intensified the military's counterinsurgency against the Hutu militias and, much more controversially, ordered the establishment of massive internment camps around the country in order to depopulate areas suspected of rebel activity. At its peak, the operation had rounded up some 350,000 people, most of whom were Hutu villagers. Conditions inside the camps were horrendous, given that the government lacked the capacity to run them and that international humanitarian agencies kept their distance.<sup>110</sup>

In June 1998, Buyoya was able to secure an agreement with FRODEBU whereby party members would be incorporated into the government in exchange for their recognition of Buyoya as head of state. FRODEBU also ceased its support for the sanctions and began publically advocating for their removal. Although regional leaders retained the sanctions, they began to allow an increased number of humanitarian exceptions. They also recognized Buyoya as president once he returned to Nyerere's negotiating table. Over the next few months, the practical administration of sanctions by regional states became increasingly lackadaisical; and they were ultimately lifted in January 1999.<sup>111</sup>

### **Assessment of Sanctions**

As sanctions were very broad in their application, the country's poverty-stricken civilians bore the brunt of their effects. Their harsh humanitarian consequences in turn alienated many parties.<sup>112</sup> Targeted sanctions by the region might have kept donors more supportive of a sanctions regime and would have been less cruel to the wider population. Yet regional leaders rejected targeted sanctions on the grounds that they were in no practical position to impose them. An asset freeze on selected Burundian politicians would not have stopped them from moving their money around the rest of the world, and a travel ban would also have been hard to enforce, particularly since Burundi's border with the Democratic Republic of the Congo was wide open.

This case demonstrates that regional sanctions can indeed generate political pressure, as the promise of their removal and the resumption of development aid was an incentive for politicians to negotiate. But it also shows how their effectiveness may diminish over time, particularly if enforcement weakens and a lucrative black market develops. Implementing sanctions, moreover, is a huge administrative challenge, especially for states with weak capacity as it requires complex coordination among numerous parties including governments, NGOs, and the

United Nations.<sup>113</sup> States implementing sanctions, as in the Burundi case, generally hope that suffering civilians will blame their government for their worsening hardship, placing popular domestic pressure on government actors to comply with international demands. But this may require a strong political force within the country that can cast this hardship as resulting directly from the actions of the government and can organize collective action among suffering civilians, something that was not consistently present within Burundi.

---

## **Conclusion**

---

For most Burundians, the civil war effectively ended when the CNDD-FDD ceased armed attacks and entered into an agreement to join the government in 2003. Over the next two years, the CNDD-FDD succeeded in convincing voters that it was the true custodian of Hutu interests, as reflected in its landslide victory in the 2005 elections and the ascension of Pierre Nkurunziza to the presidency. Since then, however, President Nkurunziza and the CNDD-FDD have governed in a manner that lacks transparency and accountability. The government is also suspected of harassing its political opponents and in some cases even sponsoring violent attacks on opposition leaders and supporters.<sup>114</sup> Recent political turmoil surrounding the 2010 elections, which were boycotted by the opposition, indicates that the possibility of a slide back to civil war remains real. Burundi's uneasy peace reveals the limits of international peacebuilding and prevention efforts to date. There remains no doubt, however, that the incidence of war crimes and crimes against humanity has greatly declined and that the threat of genocide has subsided—in part due to continuous regional and international engagement in Burundi.

External actors have intervened in Burundi numerous times since 1993. While their primary motivation in most cases was to facilitate Burundi's transformation into a multi-party democratic state, and secondly to protect lives, their initiatives did have a lasting impact on improving overall security in Burundi and in ending the civil war. Regional leaders played an especially crucial role in implementing measures, thus demonstrating how regional responses can be successful in securing lasting peace and protecting lives. A comprehensive peace agreement may have been reached more quickly and more lives could possibly have been saved, however, had states more strongly focused their efforts on protecting populations, in addition to their emphasis on finding a political solution to the crisis. It is the understanding that states have a responsibility to take measures that will protect populations that the norm of R2P contributes to addressing situations of mass atrocities like that in Burundi.



It is clear that the measures taken in Burundi were a direct response to what had happened in Rwanda. “A mixture of guilt, determination to learn from experience, and desire to avoid blame for any repetition of such events coloured much of the international activity in Burundi.”<sup>115</sup> Yet the engagement of regional and international actors was “framed by their inability to understand the role that violence played in Burundian politics, and a reluctance to use military force as a possible solution.”<sup>116</sup> As a result, measures focused on

protecting populations from immediate threats and occurring mass atrocities—a key component of the responsibility to protect—were not taken. While the measures discussed in this paper ultimately brought stability to Burundi, thus leading to an end to atrocities, for many years they failed to protect Burundians from the daily threats of genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and ethnic cleansing. Thus any view of Burundi as an R2P success story must be tempered by this reality.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> These figures were derived by adding reported death tolls for major incidents over this period and humanitarian reports on civilian impacts.

<sup>2</sup> Michael S. Lund, Barnett R. Rubin, and Fabienne Hara, “Learning from Burundi’s Failed Democratic Transition, 1993-1996: Did International Initiatives Match the Problem?” in *Cases and Strategies for Preventive Action*, ed. Barnett R. Rubin, *Preventive Action Reports* (New York: Century Foundation Press, 1998), 72.

<sup>3</sup> 2005 World Summit Outcome, General Assembly resolution A/Res/60/1, 15 September 2005.

<sup>4</sup> Lund, Rubin, and Hara, “Learning from Burundi’s Failed Democratic Transition.”

<sup>5</sup> See for example, the report of the International Commission of Inquiry for Burundi, United Nations Security Council, S/1996/682, paragraph 496: “Having concluded that acts of genocide against the Tutsi minority were committed in Burundi in October 1993, the Commission believes that international jurisdiction should be asserted with respect to these acts.” Available at: <http://www.usip.org/files/file/resources/collections/commissions/Burundi-Report.pdf>.

<sup>6</sup> Juana Brachet and Howard Wolpe, *Conflict Sensitive Development Assistance: The Case of Burundi*, Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction: Social Development Papers, no. 27 (June 2005), 5.

<sup>7</sup> Rene Lemarchand, *Burundi: Ethnic Conflict and Genocide* (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Centre Press, 1994), 10.

<sup>8</sup> Peter Uvin, “Ethnicity and Power in Burundi and Rwanda: Different Paths to Mass Violence,” *Comparative Politics* 31, no. 3 (1999): 258.

<sup>9</sup> Brachet and Wolpe, *Conflict Sensitive Development Assistance*, 5-6.

<sup>10</sup> Lemarchand, *Burundi: Ethnic Conflict and Genocide*, 53

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 54.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 54-69.

<sup>13</sup> In 1966 Michel Micombero became president of Burundi, swiftly tightening control of the state, banning opposing political parties, abolishing the monarchy, and filling the ranks of the army and civil service with Tutsis from his clan.

<sup>14</sup> Uvin, “Ethnicity and Power in Burundi and Rwanda,” 258.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> Lemarchand, *Burundi: Ethnic Conflict and Genocide*.

<sup>17</sup> Interview conducted by Gregory Mthembu-Salter with President Buyoya, Ahmedou Ould Abdallah, Mark Bomani of the Nyerere facilitation team, as well as Belgian and French diplomats involved at the time.

<sup>18</sup> It is believed that they feared that Ndadaye’s plan to install more Hutus not only in the civil service, but also in the FAB, and more significantly in its officer corps, would threaten their positions. World Bank structural adjustment plans that called for reforms in the public and private sector intensified this fear.

<sup>19</sup> Uvin, “Ethnicity and Power in Burundi and Rwanda,” 262.

<sup>20</sup> Rene Lemarchand, *Burundi: Analysis of the Evolution 1993-1995*, available at: [www.grandslacs.net/doc/0034.pdf](http://www.grandslacs.net/doc/0034.pdf). The ethnic balance among the dead is unknown. The International Commission of Inquiry into Human Rights Violations in Burundi estimates that approximately half were Hutus.

<sup>21</sup> Lennart Wohlegmuth, “NGOs and Conflict Prevention in Burundi: A Case Study,” *Africa Development* XXX, nos. 1&2 (2005): 187. See also, Ahmedou Ould-Abdallah, *Burundi on the Brink 1993-95: A UN Special Envoy Reflects on Preventive Diplomacy* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2000).

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>23</sup> Lund, Rubin, and Hara, “Learning from Burundi’s Failed Democratic Transition,” 48. Some of the most notable dialogue and facilitation efforts were run by The Carter Center, Community of Sant’ Egidio, International Alert, Accord, International Center for Conflict Resolution, Search for Common Ground, International Crisis Group, Parliamentarians for Global Action, Swedish Agency for International Development Cooperation, United Methodist Church, Synergies Africa, and World Vision. See also Wohlegmuth, “NGOs and Conflict Prevention,” 187.

<sup>24</sup> Lund, Rubin, and Hara, “Learning from Burundi’s Failed Democratic Transition,” 48. See also, Ahmedou Ould-Abdallah, *Burundi on the Brink 1993-95: A UN Special Envoy Reflects on Preventive Diplomacy* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2000).

<sup>25</sup> Lund, Rubin, and Hara, “Learning from Burundi’s Failed Democratic Transition,” 56-8.

<sup>26</sup> Gregory Mthembu-Salter, “Burundi’s Peace Agreement Without Peace,” *Track Two* 11, nos. 5-6 (2002): 24.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 24-5.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>29</sup> Economist Intelligence Unit, Burundi Country Report 2nd quarter 2005, page 34.

<sup>30</sup> The candidates included South African archbishop Desmond Tutu, former Malian president Toumani Toure, and former Tanzanian president Julius Nyerere.

<sup>31</sup> Interview with Salim Ahmed Salim, Dar es Salaam, November 2001.

<sup>32</sup> Mthembu-Salter, “Burundi’s Peace Agreement Without Peace,” 25.

- <sup>33</sup> Gilbert M. Khadiagala, "Burundi," in *Dealing with Conflict in Africa: The United Nations and Regional Organizations*, ed. Jane Boulden (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003), 225.
- <sup>34</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>35</sup> Ibid., 226.
- <sup>36</sup> Ibid., 225–6.
- <sup>37</sup> Ibid., 227.
- <sup>38</sup> Léonidas Nijimbere, "Insider Mediators, Exploring Their Key Role in Informal Peace Processes: The Burundi Peace Process," Berghof Foundation for Peace Support, 2009, 2, available at: [http://www.berghof-peacesupport.org/publications/MED\\_Insider\\_Mediators\\_Burundi.pdf](http://www.berghof-peacesupport.org/publications/MED_Insider_Mediators_Burundi.pdf).
- <sup>39</sup> Interview with Mark Bomani, former head of Nyerere Foundation facilitation, Dar es Salaam, 2001.
- <sup>40</sup> Khadiagala, "Burundi," 230.
- <sup>41</sup> Ibid., 232.
- <sup>42</sup> International Crisis Group (ICG), "Burundi's Peace Process, The Road from Arusha," ICG Africa Report, no. 2, 20 July 1998, available at: <http://www.crisisgroup.org/en/regions/africa/central-africa/burundi/002-burundis-peace-process-the-road-from-arusha.aspx>.
- <sup>43</sup> International Crisis Group, "Burundi: Internal and Regional Implications of the Suspension of Sanctions," ICG Africa Report, no. 3, 4 May 1999, available at: <http://www.crisisgroup.org/en/regions/africa/central-africa/burundi/003-burundi-internal-and-regional-implications-of-the-suspension-of-sanctions.aspx>.
- <sup>44</sup> Human Rights Watch, *Proxy Targets: Civilians in the War in Burundi* (New York: HRW, March 1998).
- <sup>45</sup> Mandela did this by publicly by calling them "freedom fighters" and holding long meetings with them to hear their concerns.
- <sup>46</sup> International Crisis Group, "Burundi Peace Process: Tough Challenges Ahead," Central Africa Briefing, Arusha/Brussels, 27 August 2000.
- <sup>47</sup> Mthembu-Salter, "Burundi's Peace Agreement Without Peace," 33.
- <sup>48</sup> Mandela invited Bill Clinton and several African heads of state to the Arusha summit, hoping their presence would exert pressure on the Burundian parties to sign the agreement. Gregory Mthembu-Salter interview with Nelson Mandela, Johannesburg, November 2000.
- <sup>49</sup> Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement for Burundi, Chapter II, Article 6.
- <sup>50</sup> Gregory Mthembu-Salter, "Burundi Recent History," in *Africa South of the Sahara 2008*, ed. I. Frame (London: Routledge, 2008), 157.
- <sup>51</sup> Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement for Burundi, Chapter III, Article 25.
- <sup>52</sup> Mthembu-Salter, "Burundi—Recent History," 158. Buyoya, in turn, threatened to block the establishment of a transitional government prior to the elections, as the agreement demanded, until there was a ceasefire. FRODEBU accused Buyoya of thereby staging another coup, and it seemed as if the whole agreement might unravel.
- <sup>53</sup> Human Rights Watch, "Burundi: Neglecting Justice in Making Peace," Volume 12, no. 2, 2 April 2000.
- <sup>54</sup> Amnesty International, "Burundi: Preparing For Peace – One Year On: A Public Appeal By Amnesty International," August 2001, 1, available at: <http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/AFR16/037/2001/en/a86c1f14-d8f8-11dd-ad8c-f3d4445c118e/afr160372001en.pdf>.
- <sup>55</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>56</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>57</sup> Mthembu-Salter, "Burundi—Recent History," 159.
- <sup>58</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>59</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>60</sup> Nijimbere, "Insider Mediators," 2.
- <sup>61</sup> Wohlegmuth, *NGOs and Conflict Prevention in Burundi*, 205.
- <sup>62</sup> Lund, Rubin, and Hara, "Learning from Burundi's Failed Democratic Transition," 81.
- <sup>63</sup> Ibid., 72.
- <sup>64</sup> Nijimbere, "Insider Mediators."
- <sup>65</sup> Mthembu-Salter, "Burundi's Peace Agreement Without Peace," 28. See also Lund, Rubin, and Hara, "Learning from Burundi's Failed Democratic Transition," 80.
- <sup>66</sup> Gregory Mthembu-Salter interview with Mandela, November 2000.
- <sup>67</sup> For references to President Ntibantunganya's calls, see Khadiagala, "Burundi," 226.
- <sup>68</sup> Stephen Wiseman, "Preventing Genocide in Burundi, Lessons from International Diplomacy," *Peaceworks*, no. 22, July 1998, 11.
- <sup>69</sup> "Letter dated 19 December 1995 from the Secretary-General Addressed to the President of the Security Council," Security Council document S/1995/1068, 29 December 1995.
- <sup>70</sup> Lund, Rubin, and Hara, "Learning from Burundi's Failed Democratic Transition," 77.
- <sup>71</sup> Ibid., 70.
- <sup>72</sup> "Letter dated 19 December 1995 from the Secretary-General Addressed to the President of the Security Council," Security Council document S/1995/1068, 29 December 1995.
- <sup>73</sup> Weissman, "Preventing Genocide in Burundi," 12.
- <sup>74</sup> Ibid., 12–13. Security Council resolution S/RES/1049 (1996), 5 March 1996, para 13. "Encourages the Secretary-General to continue his consultations with Member States concerned on the Organization of African Unity, as appropriate, on contingency plan both for the steps that might be taken to support a comprehensive dialogue and for a rapid humanitarian response in the event of widespread violence or a serious deterioration in the humanitarian situation in Burundi." They also expressed concern that perpetrators of genocide in Rwanda were supporting ethnic violence in Burundi and that the radio was being used to incite ethnic hatred and violence.
- <sup>75</sup> Ibid., 13.
- <sup>76</sup> Mthembu-Salter, "Burundi—Recent History," 155.
- <sup>77</sup> Gregory Mthembu-Salter Interview with an official in the Tanzanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Dar es Salaam, 1999.
- <sup>78</sup> Mthembu-Salter, "Burundi—Recent History," 155. Buyoya's return to power is referred to as a "three-year-long creeping coup."
- <sup>79</sup> Khadiagala, "Burundi," 227.

- <sup>80</sup> Kristiana Powell, *The African Union's Emerging Peace and Security Regime, Opportunities and Challenges for Delivering on the Responsibility to Protect*, ISS Monograph no. 119 (Ottawa: The North-South Institute, May 2005), 34, available at: <http://www.iss.co.za/pubs/Monographs/No119/Mono119.pdf>.
- <sup>81</sup> Mthembu-Salter, "Burundi—Recent History," 158.
- <sup>82</sup> "South Africa: No Rest for Weary Peacekeepers," IRIN, 30 June 2009, available at: [www.irinnews.org/PrintReport.aspx?ReportId=85073](http://www.irinnews.org/PrintReport.aspx?ReportId=85073).
- <sup>83</sup> Amnesty International "Burundi: Unlawful Killings on the Rise," 24 June 2002.
- <sup>84</sup> Mthembu-Salter, "Burundi—Recent History," 159. At its peak AMIB consisted of 3,335 troops from South Africa, Ethiopia, and Mozambique, with military observers from Burkina Faso, Gabon, Mali, Togo, and Tunisia. See also, Powell, *The African Union's Emerging Peace and Security Regime*, 34.
- <sup>85</sup> Powell, *The African Union's Emerging Peace and Security Regime*, 34.
- <sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, 34.
- <sup>87</sup> Human Rights Watch, "Everyday victims: Civilians in the Burundian War," Vol. 15, no. 20(A), December 2003.
- <sup>88</sup> Mthembu-Salter, "Burundi—Recent History," 159.
- <sup>89</sup> Powell, *The African Union's Emerging Peace and Security Regime*, 37. South Africa bore the brunt of supporting the AMIB force. Ethiopia and Mozambique did not have the financial resources, transportation capacity, and reimbursement guarantees required to deploy as scheduled and were only able to do so with assistance from South Africa, the United States, and the United Kingdom. The EU, which committed €25 million, provided the most significant external contribution to AMIB. Financial constraints led to delays that adversely impacted AMIB's operational performance throughout the mission.
- <sup>90</sup> Mthembu-Salter, "Burundi—Recent History," 159.
- <sup>91</sup> Powell, *The African Union's Emerging Peace and Security Regime*, 36.
- <sup>92</sup> Economist Intelligence Unit, "Burundi Country Report," February 2004, 13.
- <sup>93</sup> Ould-Abdallah, *Burundi on the Brink*, 50. In the end only 18 military observers were deployed.
- <sup>94</sup> Powell, *The African Union's Emerging Peace and Security Regime*, 40.
- <sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, 37.
- <sup>96</sup> Amnesty International, "Burundi: Protection of civilians should be top of regional heads of state agenda," 7 October 2002, available at: <http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/AFR16/017/2002/en/c0d69679-faeb-11dd-8917-49d72d0853f5/afr160172002en.pdf>.
- <sup>97</sup> "Burundi: War on civilians demands immediate action." Amnesty International Press Release. AFR 16/009/2003.
- <sup>98</sup> Mthembu-Salter, "Burundi's Peace Agreement Without Peace," 27.
- <sup>99</sup> Khadiagala, "Burundi," 227.
- <sup>100</sup> UN Integrated Regional Information Network (IRIN), "Great Lakes," IRIN Weekly Round Up, no. 2, 29 July to 4 August 1996, available at: <http://www.africa.upenn.edu/Hornet/irin20.html>.
- <sup>101</sup> Khadiagala, "Burundi," 227.
- <sup>102</sup> Mthembu-Salter, "Burundi's Peace Agreement Without Peace," 28 (fn. 43 and 44).
- <sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>104</sup> Mthembu-Salter, "Burundi's Peace Agreement Without Peace," 28.
- <sup>105</sup> Gregory Mthembu-Salter, *A policy past its sell-by date: An assessment of sanctions against Burundi* (London: Action Aid, 1999).
- <sup>106</sup> Mthembu-Salter, "Burundi's Peace Agreement Without Peace," 28.
- <sup>107</sup> Weissman, "Preventing Genocide in Burundi," 16.
- <sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>109</sup> Mthembu-Salter, "Burundi's Peace Agreement Without Peace," 28.
- <sup>110</sup> Economist Intelligence Unit, "Burundi Country Report," March 1997, 38.
- <sup>111</sup> International Crisis Group, "Internal and regional Implications of the Suspension of Sanctions," 4 May 1999, available at: <http://www.crisisgroup.org/-/media/Files/africa/central-africa/burundi/Burundi%20Internal%20and%20Regional%20Implications%20of%20the%20Suspension%20of%20Sanctions.ashx>.
- <sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>113</sup> Khadiagala, "Burundi," 228.
- <sup>114</sup> Human Rights Watch, "We'll Tie You Up and Shoot You," 14 May 2010, available at: <http://www.hrw.org/en/reports/2010/05/14/we-ll-tie-you-and-shoot-you-0>.
- <sup>115</sup> Lund, Rubin, and Hara, "Learning from Burundi's Failed Democratic Transition," 69.
- <sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, 88.

## Timeline of Major Events

---

- 1961**     **September** First Democratic Elections are held: Uprona wins with 80 percent of the vote.
- October 13** Prime Minister-elect Louis Rwagasore, son of the king, is assassinated.
- 1962**     **July 1** Burundi becomes independent.
- 1965**     **January 15** Prime Minister Pierre Ngendandumwe (a Hutu) is assassinated. The king appoints a Tutsi to replace him.
- 1972**     Hutu rebels attack Tutsi civilians in the south of the country. The FAB responds with massive attacks on Hutus, killing an estimated 200,000 sending many more into exile.
- 1987**     Pierre Buyoya, a Tutsi major in the FAB, seizes power in a Coup d'état.
- 1988**     Hutu rebel groups, many of whom originated in Tanzanian refugee camps, kill several thousand Tutsis in the communes of Ntega and Marangara. The FAB retaliated by massacring tens of thousands of Hutus.
- 1993**     **June 1** Melchior Ndadaye, a Hutu and the leader of Frodebu, is elected president with 65 percent of the vote, defeating Buyoya, who wins 35 percent.
- October 21** President Ndadaye is assassinated prompting interethnic violence that targets Tutsis and moderate Hutus. Repression by the army sends 800,000 Hutus into exile; 350,000 Burundians, mostly Tutsis, are internally displaced. Deaths in October and November are estimated to total between 50,000 and 100,000. Ahmedu Ould-Abdallah is appointed as UN Secretary-General's Special Representative to Burundi.
- 1994**     **January** Cyprien Ntaryamira, former minister of agriculture, is elected president by the National Assembly.
- April 6** President Ntaryamira is killed over Kigali airport in an airplane carrying him and the president of Rwanda.
- April-July** Genocide in Rwanda kills hundreds of thousands of Tutsis and moderate Hutus.
- September 10** A "Convention of Government," based on the principle of power sharing is adopted by Burundi's political parties and endorsed by the National Assembly. The agreement is rejected by Léonard Nyangoma, a Hutu politician who subsequently formed the CNDD, a Hutu rebel militia, marking a point of escalation in the civil war.
- October 1** Sylvestre Ntibantunganya of Frodebu, a Hutu, is elected president by the National Assembly.
- 1995**     **July 16-17** UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali visits Burundi. The Secretary General ultimately raises the need for a UN protection force.

- 
- 1996** **March** Julius Nyerere, former president of Tanzania, is appointed to lead mediation efforts for Burundi and given the mission of bringing peace to the country.
- Regional Military Intervention is threatened.
- June** President Ntibantunganya is convinced to accept a regional intervention force.
- July 24** A military coup brings Pierre Buyoya into power by force after weeks of turmoil.
- July 31** Regional governments impose an economic embargo on Burundi.
- 1998** **June 28** Formal mediation, known as the Arusha process, commences managed by Nyerere.
- The CNDD splits with its military wing, the FDD, forming a separate group known as the CNDD-FDD. While the CNDD is represented in the Arusha process, the CNDD-FDD is excluded.
- Fighting between the FAB and armed rebel groups, including the CNDD-FDD, continues to result in the perpetration of atrocities.
- 1999** Regional sanctions are removed.
- November** After the death of Julius Nyerere, former South African President Nelson Mandela is appointed mediator for Burundi.
- 2000** **August** The Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement, establishing a ceasefire and transitional government, was signed by Buyoya and a number of rebel groups, with the notable exception of the CNDD-FDD and the Palipehutu-FNL which intensified their attacks in the wake of the agreement.
- 2001** **October** At a summit in Pretoria the parties to the Arusha Agreement accept a SANDF mission in Burundi with a mandate to protect Hutu politicians returning to the country.
- Jacob Zuma is appointed to replace Mandela as mediator.
- 2002** **December** The CNDD-FDD signs a ceasefire agreement with the government.
- 2003** **April** The African Union deployed the African Mission in Burundi (AMIB).
- April 23** Domitien Ndayizeye, a candidate from the predominantly Hutu FRODEBU party, is sworn in as president.
- 2004** **May 21** Resolution 1545 created the UN operation in Burundi (ONUB).
- August 13** Palipehutu-FNL, the last rebel group continuing to fight the FAB, massacres at least 150 Congolese refugees in Gatumba.
- 2006** **September** Palipehutu-FNL signs a ceasefire agreement with the government and the civil war ends.
-

## Glossary of Acronyms

<b>AMIB</b>	African Mission in Burundi	African Union mission deployed in April 2003.
<b>AU</b>	African Union	
<b>CNDD</b>	National Council for the Defense of Democracy <i>Conseil National Pour la Défense de la Démocratie</i>	Hutu militia formed in 1994 following the assassination of President Ndadye. Led by Léonard Nyangoma.
<b>FAB</b>	Armed Forces of Burundi	National military until 2004
<b>FDD</b>	Force for the Defence of Democracy <i>Forces pour la Défense de la Démocratie</i>	The military wing of CNDD which broke away in 1998 to form the CNDD-FDD.
<b>FDN</b>	National Defense Forces <i>Forces de Défense Nationales</i>	New national military which formally replaced FAB in early 2004.
<b>FNL</b>	National Liberation Forces <i>Forces Nationales de Libération</i>	Armed wing of Palipehutu, established in 1985 and led by Agathon Rwasa.
<b>FRODEBU</b>	Front for Democracy in Burundi <i>Front Pour La Démocratie au Burundi</i>	Predominately Hutu party formed in 1992. Led by future President of Burundi Melchior Ndadaye.
<b>OAU</b>	Organization of African Unity	The predecessor to the AU
<b>ONUB</b>	United Nations Operation in Burundi <i>Opération des Nations Unies au Burundi</i>	
<b>Palipehutu</b>	Party for the Liberation of the Hutu People <i>Parti pour la libération du peuple hutu</i>	Armed militia founded in 1980 by Hutu refugees in Tanzania.
<b>R2P</b>	Responsibility to Protect	
<b>ROEs</b>	Rules of engagement	
<b>SANDF</b>	South African National Defence Force	Deployed to Burundi in 2001 at the behest of Nelson Mandela to protect Hutu politicians returning from exile.
<b>UPRONA</b>	Union for National Progress Party	Tutsi-led bipartisan party which won Burundi's first elections held in 1961.
<b>WSOD</b>	World Summit Outcome Document	

# **The Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect**

Ralph Bunche Institute for International Studies  
The CUNY Graduate Center, 365 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5203, New York, NY 10016-4309  
Phone: 212-817-2100 • [www.GlobalR2P.org](http://www.GlobalR2P.org) • Email: [info@GlobalR2P.org](mailto:info@GlobalR2P.org)

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

Dr. Mónica Serrano

## **SPONSORS**

Governments of Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France,  
The Netherlands, Norway, Rwanda, Sweden, The United Kingdom  
Arsenault Family Foundation  
Carnegie Corporation of New York  
The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation  
The Open Society

## **PATRONS**

Kofi Annan  
Lloyd Axworthy  
Roméo Dallaire  
Jan Eliasson  
David Hamburg  
Lee Hamilton  
Prince El Hassan bin Talal  
Sadako Ogata  
Fidel V. Ramos  
Mary Robinson  
Desmond Tutu

## **INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS**

Gareth Evans  
Mohamed Sahnoun  
Jan Egeland  
Thelma Ekiyor  
Rosemary Foot  
Carolina G. Hernandez  
Ricardo Lagos Escobar  
Frank Majoor  
Juan Méndez  
Edward Mortimer  
Ramesh Thakur  
Thomas G. Weiss



Ralph Bunche Institute for International Studies  
The CUNY Graduate Center  
[www.GlobalR2P.org](http://www.GlobalR2P.org)