



The Nigerian Civil War of 1967-1970 and the Rwandan Civil War/Genocide of 1994: A Comparative Appraisal of Post-Civil War Peace Building in Nigeria and Rwanda

EUGENE OBIORA EUGENE, JEREMIAH UKO AKPE
Nigerian Defence Academy, Kaduna, Nigeria

Abstract. The end of colonialism brought about the emergence of independent African states. Since independence, a number of African states including Nigeria and Rwanda have experienced civil wars among other crises. While the Nigerian Civil War ensued and lasted from 1967 to 1970, the Rwandan Civil War cum Genocide was experienced in 1994; 24 years after the Nigerian Civil War. While these wars were fought and won on the perceived premise of ‘no victor, no vanquished’, the Federal Military Government of Nigeria and the Hutu ethnic group of Rwanda were the actual victors while the people of Eastern Nigeria then known as Biafra and the Tutsi of Rwanda were the vanquished. How these countries have fared in their post-civil war peace building processes have not been placed side by side. It is for this reason that a comparative appraisal of post-Civil War peace building in Nigeria and Rwanda after their civil wars becomes necessary. Nevertheless, years after these civil wars, Rwanda unlike Nigeria adopted workable efficient policies and strategies that enabled her to carry out an effective national reconciliation for overall national integration, growth and development of post-civil war Rwanda. To say the least, Rwanda has overcome the overall ills of the crises unlike in Nigeria, where the causes and factors that brought about the civil war are still very much present. The study is comparative and analytical and adopts both primary and secondary sources. It concludes therefore, that the Nigerian Government should study and adopt some of the policies and strategies adopted by Rwanda in ensuring efficient and effective post-civil war peace building which has placed Rwanda on the track of overall national development.

Keywords: Civil War, Nigeria, Peace Building and Rwanda

1. Introduction

Since independence from the shackles of colonialism, a number of African states including Nigeria and Rwanda have experienced the scourge civil wars among other crises. While these crises and eventual ended, post-civil war peace building posed another challenge. While some of these countries managed to put the causes and events of the wars behind them by ensuring a post-civil war peace building and charting the course of common nation integration, growth and development, some are still living with the causes and events of the war, years after. Nigeria and Rwanda therefore, are examples of African states that have experienced civil wars with clear and divergent indices of post-civil war peace building which have affected positively or negatively, their national integration, growth and development.

The Nigerian Civil War of 1967 to 1970 is one of the significant events in the history of Nigeria. It was a three-year conflict which claimed the lives of thousands of soldiers and over two million civilians. The Nigerian government led by Gen. Yakubu Jack Gowon fought to prevent the secession of the Eastern region which was led by Gen. Chukwuemeka Odumegwu. Ojukwu.

Similarly, Rwanda, a sovereign state lying between Central and East Africa and one of the smallest countries on the African mainland, experienced a civil war and genocide in 1994. Rwanda is located a few degrees south of the Equator, bordered by Uganda, Tanzania, Burundi and the Democratic Republic of Congo. Rwanda is in the African Great Lake region and is highly elevated. Its geography is dominated by mountains in the West and savanna to the East, with numerous lakes throughout the

country. The climate is temperate to sub-tropical, with two rainy seasons and two dry seasons each year.

Nigeria and Rwanda have experienced Civil Wars which are arguably, said to have ended without a victor or a vanquished. In Nigeria, “no victor no vanquished” was the slogan at the end of the war. However, at the end of these wars, both the people of Rwanda and the people of Nigeria have continued to exist as members of one country respectively. However, whereas Rwanda have been able to manage their differences and put the past behind, the people of Nigeria have not been able to address the factors the caused the Civil War despite the fact that their war ended almost 24 years before the Civil War in Rwanda. This study therefore, examines the Nigerian Civil War of 1967 to 1970 and the Rwandan Civil War/Genocide of 1994 with the view to comparatively, appraise the nature of post-civil war peace building in these countries.

2. The Nigerian Civil War of 1967-1970: An Overview

The Nigerian Civil War was as a result of many factors, such as the coup and counter coup of 1966, killing of the people of Eastern region especially the Igbo, General Ironsi’s unitary system of government and the failure of the Aburi accord among others. The inability to address the eruption of violence throughout the country by the Nigerian Head of State then Lieutenant Colonel (Lt.Col) Yakubu Jack Gowon and Intransigency of then Lieutenant Colonel Emeka Odumegwu Ojukwu, the Governor of the Eastern region acted in concert to cause the Nigerian Civil War.

In an attempt to reconcile the differences between the Federal government and the Eastern Region, a summit was held from 5th January 1967 in Aburi Ghana. The summit was attended by senior military and police officers and government secretaries. It is worthy to mention that much of what was agreed at the summit was not implemented on getting back to Nigeria. By march 1967, two months after the Aburi summit, the Aburi Accord resolution had yet to be implemented, and there was growing tensions in the Eastern Region that Gowon had no intentions of implementing the details of the summit. The government of the Eastern Region issued a warning to the Federal government that the repeated failure to act on issues pertaining to Nigerian sovereignty could lead to secession.

To worsen the situation, on 27th May 1967, Gowon created 12 States out of the then existing four regions

of Nigeria and the Eastern region was divided into three states. Part of the reasons for this was to attenuate the territory under Ojukwu as new military governors would be appointed for the newly created states leaving only the East Central state for Ojukwu. The state creation was seen as the last straw that broke the camel’s back. At this point, there was no going back from the path of war. Meanwhile, even before the balkanization of the territories under Ojukwu, the Eastern Consultative Assembly had mandated the Military Governor to pull the Eastern region out of the federation as soon as possible. What the state creation of the 27th May did was probably to hasten the pulling out. Sequel to this, on May, 30th 1967, three days after states creation, Ojukwu declared Eastern Region an Independent and sovereign state of Biafra. By seceding from the federation of Nigeria, the condition for the journey to the slaughter house in the name of Civil War was created. The war was officially declared on 6th July, 1967 and ended on 15th January 1970 following the surrender of the secessionist forces by the Biafran Chief of staff, Major General Philip Effiong. The Nigerian Civil War is believed to have cost over 3 million lives with properties worth millions of naira destroyed.

3. Rwanda Genocide of 1994 in Historical Perspective

The Rwanda Civil War of 1994, no doubt was well organized, well informed, well-motivated and well prepared by the Hutu majority from the available evidence such as several hate speeches from prominent Hutu indigenes and nepotism from the administration of then president. Ethnic rivalry between the Hutu and Tutsi was one of the reasons for the genocide. Some scholars argue that racist ideology contributed to the war, some claim that the genocide was solely the responsibility of the Hutus intent to exterminate the Tutsi minority group, others posit that it was the responsibility of both Hutu and Tutsi groups. Going by the manner in which the killings were conducted, it will not be totally out of place to argue that it was well organized, well informed and well-motivated to exterminate the Tutsi ethnic group. In fact, given that high ranking officials in the local and national government, the army, the Presidential Guard, para-military and Hutu extremism all played active roles in the genocide. it was indeed a well-organized crime. Lemarchand even argued that the institutional apparatus of the genocide was already in place by 1992. The killings followed instructions from the highest level and looking at the sequence of the massacre one would not be totally wrong to say that it was well planned and organized.

However, the circumstances that led to the genocide can be traced back to pre-independence era. During the colonial period, Rwanda and Burundi were colonized by Belgium and the Colonial Masters referred to the area as Ruanda- Urundi. The Hutu were the majority and Tutsi minority, both speaking the same language, share the same customs and share the same hillsides. In pre-colonial period, the royal elites, chiefs and aristocracy of the Tutsi minority, cattle owning people, had established themselves as a feudal ruling class over the Hutu majority, that were mainly agriculturists. During the period, the Hutu majority were required to submit to bond labour services known as *Uburtwa*, while the Tutsi were not expected to perform this kind of labour service. What appears to have kept the people together is the institution of the *Uburtwa* a highly personalized relationship between two individuals of unequal social status. This patron/ client relationship involved reciprocal bonds of loyalty and exchange of goods and services. It provided a place, a status, within a hierarchical system. The patron was mostly Tutsi but the client could be Hutu or Tutsi of inferior social status. One person could be a client as well as a patron. Theoretically, the only person ultimately not a client of this system was the Mwani (Chief) himself. Thus, most Tutsi were clients and some Hutu patrons. At the top, however, there were always Tutsi and at the bottom always Hutu and/or Twa. This institutionalized relationship was reinforced under colonial rule and lasted until it was brought to an end in the 1950s.

The *Uburtwa* system and social order were predominant in central Rwanda, where Tutsi had their strongest influence. In the regions dominated by Hutu in the northern and south-western areas, different systems, mostly based on land-lease contracts or donation of agricultural products were developed; the patrons were often Hutu. However, the dominance of cattle as a form of disposable wealth meant that the Tutsi cattle chiefs were able to dominate central Rwanda. To mobilize the military funding was required, funding came only in the form of livestock, and Tutsi controlled the cattle. In these parts, Hutu was almost synonymous with client.

The *Uburtwa* did have some important effects. First, it institutionalized the economic differences between the mainly cultivating Hutu and the cattle-breeding Tutsi. Secondly, it was an instrument of control that turned Hutu into socio- economic and political clients and Tutsi into patrons. Lastly, it led to a process of "ethnic" amalgamation, particularly among Hutu. The result was an "ethnic" Hutu-Tutsi dichotomy,

following the socio-economic and political process engendered by Tutsi extension and occupation.

Due to long practice, the discrimination between them became normal due largely to the economic class between them. In physical description, the Tutsi were taller and slimmer than the Hutu, with longer faces and narrower noses. However, due to intermarriages, occupation and migration, the difference may not be easily noticed by someone who is not conversant with their history. Here, it is pertinent to note that both the Hutus and the Tutsis were all loyal to the Tutsi kings. As head of the late 19th century Rwandese state the Mwani owned all land and cattle. He ruled despotically, but had a political board of great chiefs and a permanent council of abiru (ritual specialists) who advised him about the divine obligations connected to his office. Although, there could be few Hutu who were also kings, but the general belief is that all bami (plural of Mwani) were Tutsi.

As earlier said, the Hutu and the Tutsi had different statures, they had the same culture and spoke the same language. The seed of discord was further widened during the colonial period when the colonial masters saw them as different people and therefore treated them differently. During colonial rule, first by Germany, and in 1916, Belgium occupied Ruanda-Urundi as a result of the World War I East African campaign against Germany. The two kingdoms of Rwanda and Burundi had only been marginally administered from Berlin (via Dar-es-Salaam) since 1899. In 1914 there were just six German civil servants in Burundi and five in Rwanda, i.e. a total of eleven officials for a territory twice the size of Belgium. Having discovered that the existing Mwani kingdoms already functioned as fully- fledged nations before the arrival of the Europeans and also, undoubtedly because of a shortage of colonial personnel, the Germans decided from the very beginning to favour a policy of indirect rule. The occupation came about through protectorate "treaties" negotiated between the Germans and the Mwani. This meant that full use was to be made of the existing political system, which was much stronger and more centralized in Rwanda than in Burundi. After World War I, the League of Nations mandated Belgium to administer Rwanda and in 1946 the country became a Belgian trust territory under the United Nations.

The colonial masters preferred working with the Tutsi people and therefore appointed them to occupy different positions in the government thereby making, indirectly though, the minority ethnic group to

become the 'majority' group. In education, government, and important positions the Tutsi were favoured and regarded while the Hutu were ignored and disregarded. In the words of Monsignor Classe "you must choose the Batusi (Tutsi), because the government will probably refuse Hutu teachers...., In the government positions, every branch of the administration, even the unimportant ones, will be reserved henceforth for young Batusi." As a result of this colonial policy, the Hutus were regarded as subordinate to the Tutsi minority, and by 1930s, the collective identity that existed between the Hutus and Tutsis disappeared.

Meanwhile, from 1950s, things started taking different dimension, the Hutu majority began to protest, agitate and question the activities of the Belgians. These protests were carried out by a group of intellectuals from Hutu majority, nine in numbers, they were all former seminarians. They published what they called a BaHutu manifesto (this was a document drafted by nine Rwandan Hutu intellectuals in 1957. It was a political document that called for Hutu ethnic and Political solidarity as well as the political disenfranchisement of the Tutsi people) agitating and demanding for change in the practice of the Belgians by favouring and giving the Tutsi superior sense of identity, in state of the Hutu majority. They protested against the political monopoly of one race, the Tutsi race, which also gave rise to economic monopoly of the Tutsis. The Belgians seeing that the protest was serious and could not be stopped or ignored, proposed that the official use of the terms Hutu and Tutsi should be abolished, this proposal was rejected by the Hutu majority due to the fact that their majority identity will be at stake and will be of no use. Also, this too would prevent the statistical law from establishing the reality of the facts. Gradually and steadily, ethnic sentiment took over Rwanda and political parties were formed along ethnic lines. The Hutu also demanded that monarchical system of government in Rwanda should be abolished and replaced with Republican system of government.

In November 1959, the first major clash between the Hutus and Tutsis occurred. This was as a result of assaults of Hutus sub-chief by the Tutsi militants. This assault did not go well with the Hutu, who retaliated by destroying and killing every Tutsi they could lay their hands on. In the conflict, many Tutsi people were killed and their properties destroyed. The Belgians inability to control and curtail the chaos favoured the Hutu majority who sacked the Tutsi chiefs and replaced them with the Hutu. The new Hutu chiefs immediately ordered for the execution of

the dismissed Tutsi chiefs and the Tutsis, and this led to mass exodus of the Tutsi out of Rwanda to neighbouring countries like Congo, Uganda, Burundi and Tangayika.

In 1960, elections were held, and the Hutu won several seats and this singular event enhanced the potency of their voice in the government. As the crisis remained unabated, in 1961, the government decided to abolish monarchy in Rwanda and replace it with a Republic. This development of course further led to Hutu supremacy and domination. According to UN Trusteeship Commission report in 1961, "the developments of these past eighteen months have brought about the racial dictatorship of one party...an oppressive system has been replaced by another one...it is quite possible that someday we will witness violet reactions on the part of the Tutsi". The international organization foresaw what was coming and warned against it, but the warning was ignored. On 1 July 1962, Rwanda became an independent state under a Republican government championed by Gregoire Kayibanda, a politician and committed Hutu who believes in Hutus majority, domination and Tutsi subordination to the Hutu ethnic group.

4. The Rwanda Genocide of 1994

The Rwanda genocide lasted from April 7 to July 15 1994. It was between Hutus and Tutsis groups. It was a genocide against the Tutsi minority by the Hutu majority. Without fear of contradiction, the Rwanda genocide of 1994 shocked the whole world, in fact, it was regarded as one of the inhumane killings witnessed after the Nazi extermination against the Jews. The genocide started as a result of hate speeches, hate campaigns, hate preachment and nepotism against the Tutsi minority. Prominent Hutu leaders on several occasions openly called for the elimination of the Tutsi minority, they perceived as a threat to achieving their political and economic supremacy. The press played an important role in the genocide, because the press was constantly used as a channel to preach hate speeches, hate statements and inciting statements. One of the champions of hate campaign against the Tutsis, Hassan Ngeze, an editor of *Kangura* and specialist in propaganda was quoted in his article popularly referred to as "the Hutu Ten Commandment" published in December 1990, to have stated that "any Hutu who married a Tutsi woman, befriended a Tutsi woman or employed a Tutsi as a secretary or a concubine was to be considered a traitor since all Tutsi women worked only for the interest of their own ethnic group. For similar reasons, any Hutu involved in any business

dealings with Tutsi was also deemed a traitor.” Hassan also urged Hutu to be firm and vigilant against their common Tutsi enemy. Hutu were encouraged to man and take strategic positions in government, in administration and economy. He emphasized that only Hutu should be employed in the armed forces. This publication was widely circulated in Rwanda. In fact, community leaders read Hutu Ten Commandment in public meetings. The most used and known commandment was the number eight which stipulated that the Hutu must stop having mercy on the Tutsis. Also, Hassan immediately after the Rwanda Patriotic Front (RPF) attack, again, was alleged to have called for the extermination of the Tutsis through hate speech, he was quoted as thus “we say to the *inyenzi* (cockroaches) that if they lift up their heads again, it will no longer be necessary to go fight the enemy in the bush. We will start by eliminating the internal enemy, they will disappear”. By internal enemy, Hassan was referring to the Tutsi group, because RPF was a Tutsi militant group.

Similarly, Mugesera, a university lecturer in 1991 openly called for the elimination of the Tutsis. He was not only targeting the RPF but their accomplices, the political parties opposed to the ruling party and the Tutsi minority. He openly called for the extermination of the Tutsi. He preached to his audience never to show mercy to any Tutsi irrespective of age and gender. He perpetrated this under the excuse of RPF trying to undermine the armed forces and overthrow the ruling party. With the excuse that RPF is trying to exterminate the Hutus majority, he warned his audience to rise up and defend themselves. He closed by saying “know that the person whose throat you do not cut now will be the one who will cut yours.” These incessant incitements by the Hutu elites generated a conflict in 1992 where few Tutsi were killed but the situation was quickly brought under control but there was no remarkable effort to deal with the real cause of the conflict. It was the inability to deal with the root cause of the conflict that created the condition for the event of 1994.

Although, one of the reasons for the inability of the government to deal with the root cause of the conflict and in fact, one of the things that baffled the people of the world was that all these incitements had the full support of the president of Rwanda who could not hide his emotions and therefore gave in to the agitations of his Hutu people. The president gave his full support by sponsoring some of these individuals, and by favouring the Hutu majority in government appointments and developments. Put it differently, he encouraged nepotism in governing Rwanda.

Unfortunately, there was no serious intervention by the United Nations and the Great powers. The reason for the late intervention of the United Nations to quell the genocide is still controversial. However, it is better late than never. It was the public outcry and the intervention of the global body that contributed in the stabilization of the situation. In 1994, two missiles were fired from a hill just outside the airport perimeter of Rwanda and the plane crashed into the presidential palace. There was no survivor from the plane crash that killed the presidents of Rwanda, Habyarimana (a Hutu) and the president of Burundi, Cyprian Ntaryamira, who asked for a lift from president of Rwanda, after a one-day summit of African leaders in Darussalam, Tanzania in 1994. Following the crash, violence flared beginning the genocide of over 1,000,000 Rwandans of mainly Tutsi minority and moderate Hutus. Victims of the massacre were butchered to death and pointedly gunned down in villages across Rwanda, mostly by their Hutu neighbours and friends. According to Uwayijenga, one of the victims of the genocide, a militiaman came up to kill me. I was astonished because he was a friend. He used to come to our house every day. He farmed my father’s fields and he received salary. My mother gave him food. We used to play with him and he was like a brother to us, even though we were not from the same family. I asked him why he wanted to kill me when I had done nothing to hurt him. I begged him to take pity on me. He said nothing but just hit me on the head with a machete. He had bits of wood in his hands which stuck into my face. When he thought I was dead, he left.

The news of the brutal killings spread widely across the world. Dead bodies littered the streets, vultures and dogs fed on them. According to Nteziryago “I ran like some sort of animal. I had to eat the twigs from the trees. I saw the corpses of my relatives on the hills. Sometimes, I would stumble upon someone who had been hit by a machete but who was still breathing.” Many families lost all members of the family. Many children lost their parents and guardian. Victims of the genocide in Rwanda carried the trauma for a long period and most people did not believe their loved ones were killed. They always believed it was a dream that someday they might come back home. It is safe to note that the effects of the genocide were enormous and fatal.

It is alleged that an estimated 1,000,000 people were massacred within the period of 100 days, and about 70 percent of the Tutsi population was recorded to have been savagely sent to their creator. Numerous Tutsi women were reportedly rape in a sexual

violence. Some were subsequently killed after being raped by their abusers. The massacre ended with the intervention of RPF (Rwanda Patriotic Front) and United Nations Forces in July 1994.

5. Post-Civil War Peace building Activities in Nigeria and Rwanda: A Comparative Analysis and the Panacea for Nigeria's Debilitating Unity

With the victory of Rwandan Patriotic Front in the Civil War, they assumed control of the affairs of government. They took over the government positions and formed a new government. The Rwandan Patriotic Front was renamed as the Rwandan Patriotic Army (RPA) and it became a national army. Paul Kagame, one of the leaders of the Rwandan Patriotic Front served in dual capacities as the Vice President of Rwanda and Minister of Defence. Pasteur Bizimungu, a Hutu served as the president. Bizimungu had some control over domestic affairs but Kagame remained commander-in-chief of the army. In 2000, Paul Kagame, took over the presidency from Pasteur Bizimungu and began a large-scale national development drive, launching programmes to develop Rwanda as a middle-income country by 2020.

The country began developing strongly on key indicators, including the human development index, health care and education. Annual growth between 2004 and 2010 averaged 8% per year, the poverty rate reduced from 57% to 45% between 2006 and 2011, and life expectancy rose from 46.6 years in 2000 to 64.3 years in 2018. A period of reconciliation began as well as the establishment of courts for trying genocide suspects. These included the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) and Gacaca, a traditional village court system reintroduced to handle the large caseloads involved. Women represented a larger share of the post-war population and were not as frequently implicated in the genocide. They were entrusted by the regime with more tasks of reconciliation and reconstruction.

However, Rwanda is one the African countries that have managed its crisis without the assistance of foreign countries or organisations. Today, Rwanda is one of the developed nations in the world attracting investments from a lot of investors. In fact, Rwanda has become a destination for billionaires and celebrities. Given the level of destruction and hatred in Rwanda during the genocide it is difficult to believe that Rwanda would survive without a doubled Marshal Plan. However, Nigeria fought a Civil War that lasted from 1967-1970, yet Nigeria and

Nigerians are still living with it. There are still ethnic, regional and religious tensions, corruption and nepotism after many years of the war. Nigeria is still experiencing almost all the factors that led to the Civil War. Nigeria should learn from the peace building and reconciliation mechanisms of Rwanda. Many thought that it would take more than a generation for Rwanda to recover from the genocide but they have been able to disappoint a lot of people and live happily as Rwandans and no longer as Hutus and Tutsi. Rwanda applied various mechanisms which helped in healing the wounds and made the people to live above their differences.

5.1 Political Peace Building in Rwanda

The one advantage enjoyed by the Rwanda Patriotic Front in the Civil War was that its military victory was total. This gave them the vantage position during negotiation. This allowed the RPF to consolidate its power across the country over the next few years. It persuaded former enemies and ordinary Hutus to change allegiances; dealt militarily with the numerous threats to the new political dispensation, including former génocidaires (those who were guilty of genocide due to their involvement in the Civil War) within and outside its borders; and defined a post-conflict future for Rwanda.

After Rwandan Patriotic Front victory in 1994, it held national consultations known as "Urugwiro Village discussions," named after and held at the presidential residence, took place over several months in 1998 and 1999. Firmly guided by RPF leaders but involving representatives of all parts of society, the discussions helped frame the government's vision and policies for building peace and reconstructing the country (enshrined in law a few years later), which became manifest in some of the key transformations of the country. Of overarching importance was the commitment to align all initiatives to the aim of strengthening national unity. A National Unity and Reconciliation Commission was established in 1999 to educate, sensitize and mobilize the population in areas of national unity and reconciliation. Also notable was the strong emphasis placed on independent and homegrown solutions. The pledge to make the RPF the motor of government that would bring about real change in the country. Decentralization has been a central subject in post-genocide governance in Rwanda, non-partisan elections are held at the local level, where all citizens can participate in community planning and initiate processes to hold civil servants accountable. In the case of Nigeria, it is on record that after the Nigerian Civil War, nobody from the South Eastern

region has been the president of the country. In fact, only Dr. Alex Ekwueme from Anambra state from the South Eastern region has been the vice president of Nigeria. It is alleged that the region which is mainly Igbo is punished for their role in the civil war. Yet after the war it was declared, “No victor, No vanquished”. Evidence on ground suggests that some Nigerians are Nigerians while some Nigerians are in Nigeria meaning that some Nigerians are not totally acceptable as Nigerians. In fact, in the political development, important positions are being occupied by the people that won the Civil War. It is not out of place to say that in theory, the war was “No Victor and No Vanquished but in practice the “Winner Takes it All”. No wonder factors that led to the war are still manifesting today in Nigeria. There are still ethnic agitations for an independent country due to marginalization and nepotism. There has not been proper reconciliation between the South and the North. This is evident in the hate speeches between the two regions even after decades of civil war. For instance, Dr Junaidu Mohammed from the northern region was alleged to have said that “it must be a northerner or no Nigeria...if Goodluck Jonathan wins PDP’s endorsement to contest the 2011 presidential election, there would be violence.” Also, Asari Dokubo, the leader of the Niger Delta People’s Salvation Force (NDPSF) was alleged to have said “they (northerners) are wasting their time. We own them. We are feeding them. They are parasites. A beggar has no choice... they are beggars and parasites.” If 50 years after the war some Nigerians are still claiming to be the real owners of the country or that leaders should not come from certain region(s), it means that the circumstances that led to the war are still much present with us.

5.2 Security Sector

The reform of militaries and security institutions in post-conflict environments is one of the most difficult parts of peace building. Often, such reforms fail to achieve their targets. More damaging, they are also exploited in struggles over state power between emerging actors, creating new triggers for instability. Post-1994 Rwanda faced an additional challenge: one side of the reform equation had committed genocide against the other. Between 1997 and 2007, 60,000 ex-combatants were demobilized. This included the ex-FORCES Armées Rwandais (FAR, the pre-1994, largely Hutu, Rwandan government army) and the various armed groups involved in the genocide, the former génocidaires most of whom had fled to the Democratic Republic of Congo, then eventually returned to Rwanda.

During this period, the Rwandan Defense Force, (RDF), the name given to the new national army in 2002 was considerably reduced. In broad terms, the reintegration of ex-fighters back to civilian life has been successful compared to other African countries that experienced crisis. Integration of the different forces in the RDF served as a conflict management strategy in Rwanda. Ex-FAR soldiers and rebels now serving in the RDF were deployed near their native communities to help establish trust in the new dispensation among wary locals. Also, workshops based on the traditional Rwandan concept of *Ingando* a military encampment or assembly area were used to instill a sense of national identity and overcome mutual fear and suspicion. *Ingando* was both an ethos and a means for promoting stability, reconciliation, and professionalization within the armed forces. By the late 2000s, the RDF was in the vanguard of peace building. The Rwandan Armed Forces were regarded as heroes at home and abroad. The soldiers had become an example for reconciliation to other countries because of their growing international reputation: professional, disciplined, and courageousness.

In the case of Nigeria, it was very recently and during the administration of President Goodluck Johnathan that an Easterner was appointed the Chief of Army Staff. Before then, very few Igbo indigenes was deemed fit to occupy the position despite their contributions and efforts to the armed forces. Yet, after the Nigerian Civil War, the government claimed they have absorbed the Biafran soldiers into their armed forces. Nepotism and corruption are regarded as one of the factors that led to Nigerian Civil War of 1967. General Ironsi was alleged to have surrounded himself with his kinsmen, and also favouring them with critical decisions and appointment. Yet, after the civil war, Nigeria has refused to learn from history. It is worrisome and indeed a threatening situation that since 2015 till date, almost all heads of security agencies are from a particular part of the country. The president has severally been accused of favouring his kinsmen in job opportunities into strategic and important security organisations in Nigeria. The President refused to listen to the calls of some well-meaning Nigerians like Chief (Dr) E.K. Clark and Colonel Dangiwa Umar (retired), in separate open letters to President Buhari on the 14th June, 2020 and 30th may, 2020, respectively, which warned the president of the danger of nepotism, and corruption. For proper reconciliation, equal opportunities should be given to all irrespective of their roles in the war just like Rwanda and was honoured for her discipline, professionalism and courage. Nigeria should learn to accommodate all

Nigerians irrespective of their tribe, ethnicity, region and religion.

5.3 In the Area of Justice

Rwanda's official policy of unity and reconciliation exalts rather than merely emphasizes Rwandan-ness. One of the steps taken by Rwanda to restore peace in war torn country was to abolish ethnic nationalism and wipe out ethnic consciousness in the people of Rwanda. The idea of referring to some as Hutu or Tutsi was discouraged. They were made to see themselves as Rwandans. In fact, open discussion of the genocide was banished and was seen as law against the land. While the government kept the memories of the war for historical purposes, it was a taboo for individuals to discuss the issues around the war. Consistent with other government initiatives, officially aimed at overcoming tribalism and building a national identity, Ndi Umunyarwanda (I am Rwandan) is also about shoring up a single narrative of the country's past, present, and future.

Ndi Umunyarwanda (I am Rwandan) was established in 2013, a year after the community-based Gacaca courts finished their work. Following the Urugwiro Village discussions, the RPF turned to Gacaca, a traditional forum meaning "justice on the grass" out of practical necessity. Before this, no conventional means to hold ordinary Rwandans who committed genocide accountable existed. There were simply too many cases; nearly two million, or about 1 in 5 Rwandans were implicated. The majority of trials ended in convictions, with crimes against property resulting in fines paid to victims or community work; and prison sentences for murder and other serious crimes. At a minimum, masses of isolated Rwandans finally had their pain and frustration recognized.

In the case of Nigeria, till now, no individual was punished for his or her role in the Nigerian Civil War despite almost all evidence showing that both sides committed war crimes. The Asaba massacre, economic blockade, Onitsha killings and killing of some non-Igbo Biafrans and others did not attract any penalty after the war. Only the Biafran soldiers who were in the army before the war but fought on the side of Biafra were punished. The punishment was according to someone's level of participation. Some were outrightly sacked while some were reintegrated with loss of seniority. On the whole, there not been any serious efforts to punish those who committed war crimes. After the counter coup of July 28, 1966 in the three-month following it, over thirty thousand Easterners living in the north were attacked, robbed and killed by northerners and over one million left

their businesses and properties and returned to the east. While in Rwanda, those who took active part were tried and convicted and that served as a great lesson to the promoters of hatred and violence but in Nigeria, no one has been tried or punished for his role in the war. This is part of the reason why conflicts often erupt in Nigeria because perpetrators often go free. Furthermore, the economic blockade which blocked the flow of all food and ammunitions supply by land, air and sea. With this move by the federal government, it is regarded as the single most destructive political decision in the whole of West African history as it led to the dead and malnourishment of over two million civilians most of whom were children. According to France and other foreign powers, it was a genocide aimed at exterminating Igbo people once and for all. Yet, nobody has been punished or held accountable for the war crimes. How then do one say that the war was without victor and vanquished? In fact, the victors keep reminding the vanquished not to allow the repeat of the war because they will not hesitate to do so. More so, after the war, millions of Igbo was bereaved, homeless and unemployed. To worsen the situation, Nigeria changed her currency during the war and many Easterners who still had the old currency were left in a very critical position. Nigerian government awarded every Easterner a grand total of 20 Nigerian Pound regardless of how much money the person had prior to the war. Yet the war was declared no victor, no vanquished. It is obvious that justice has not been served for the innocent citizens that were killed during the Nigerian Civil War. To avoid a repeat of 1967 to 1970 civil war, Nigerian government must learn how to reconcile her differences by learning from the Rwanda approach. It should come from the hearts and actions of the people.

5.4 Economic Development

"Vision 2020" which was launched in 2020 was another important outcome of Urugwiro Village. Unlike most countries' strategic frameworks for their future development, which involve changing course, building on or reversing existing projects, the RPF essentially had a blank slate. The Vision 2020 document and subsequent policies oriented to it were critical to building peace and consolidating the RPF's legitimacy. The rhetoric of an investment-friendly, modernizing economy was supported by substantial policy shifts like regional integration between neighbouring countries like Uganda and Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). But regionalization of the Eastern Africa has also demanded a fundamental shift in people's minds. The adoption of a new economic

identity, tech-savvy, service oriented, outward-looking, and linked strongly to East Africa has placed a strain on the rhythms and culture of Rwanda's countryside, historically closed to the outside world. For some time yet, public officials needed to convince local populations that rapid, dislocating economic change will be beneficial to them in the long run. During his first two terms in office, President Kagame proved exceptionally adept at managing a frequent scourge of one-party dominated states: patrimonial politics. Described by some scholars as "developmental patrimonialism,"

In Rwanda between 2001 and 2015, overall poverty reduced by 19.8 percent while extreme poverty declined by 23.7 percent. Rwanda became one of the world's fastest growing economies year on year; the only low-income country in the World Bank's top 30 "easiest places to do business;" and a mini tourism mecca, increasing revenues from visitors from US \$27 million in 2000 to US \$438 million in 2017. Donors also lauded the government on delivery: Rwanda walked the talk on corruption as almost no other aid recipient did. Donors praised the government's seemingly ceaseless attention to accountability, transparency, and efficiency in deploying its scarce resources to key sectors of the economy.

In Nigeria's case, regions are carefully selected for developmental projects. After the war, Nigeria hardly developed despite her enormous natural and human resources. Recently, Nigeria was regarded as the headquarters of poverty. Similarly, corruption, bad leadership and nepotism have derailed the country from the part of development. The economy of Nigeria since the civil war has been going back and forth and recently, downward with no clear direction.

5.5 Reconciliation of Women

As it is in most cases in wars, the Rwandan women suffered disproportionately in the violence of the early 90s and especially the genocide. It is estimated that between 250,000 and 500,000, mostly Tutsi women were exposed to some form of gender-based violence, mainly rape. Two-third of the raped victims later tested positive for the HIV/AIDS disease. In the aftermath of the genocide, women were more numerous up to 70 percent of the population in Rwanda due to the higher rates of death, exile, or imprisonment of men. Women's mental health and economic well-being were shattered. Hutu women faced the added burden of being socially excluded and shamed due to their husbands' suspected role in the killings. A seemingly hopeless situation opened

the way for women to play leading roles in repairing a broken society. Without much planning or coordination, at least initially, women began to distribute assistance and relief to communities, mediate and resolve disputes, and advocate for peace. Women increasingly became involved in shaping policy, driving socio-economic change and even serving as judges on Gacaca, once the exclusive preserve of "wise and respected old men" (inyangamugayo). The emergence of women in important and non-traditional roles after the genocide stirred and intersected with conversations at the national level. Ideas and experiences were eventually co-opted into the RPF's policymaking as a core tenet. Set in Rwanda's 2003 Constitution, a law requiring that women hold a minimum of 30 percent of elected positions was improved upon in practice in ways that may never have been foreseen. In 2018, 49 women sat in Rwanda's parliament, which represented 61 percent of total seats, the highest proportion in the world. Four of the seven Supreme Court seats were also held by women in 2018. The centrality of women to all parts of Rwanda's peacebuilding and post-conflict recovery is distinct in the African context. In doing so, it has accelerated the process of overcoming the entrenched patriarchy once common in Rwanda and still pervasive across the continent. With all these mechanisms, Rwanda was able to reconcile the two major ethnic groups and forged ahead for uncommon development.

In Nigeria, despite the fact that women were the most affected and traumatized group during the war, Nigeria has not really given women a reasonable role in leadership, political representations and national development. The few women that had the opportunity to serve performed admirably. For a proper reconciliation and peace building, women should be given equal position or even more positions than men just like in Rwanda.

Like Rwanda, Nigeria should call for national conference where all parts of the country will be represented to deliberate on the way forward of the country. New constitution that will capture the agitations of the minorities should be encouraged. Women should be given more percentage in leadership, political representation and national development. Until Nigeria follow in the footsteps of Rwanda's peace building process, it may continue to experience underdevelopment, corruption, ethnic and religious tensions, and marginalization of women in elective positions.

6. Conclusion

Nigeria and Rwanda experienced civil wars 1967 to 1970 and 1994 respectively. These wars were fought, won and lost by the warring factions in both Nigeria and Rwanda. Ironically, the wars were said to have been fought and ended with “no victor and no vanquished.” Nevertheless, the trust and perceived harmonious existence among the major ethnic groups or warring factions of these countries vanished. However, it was expected that these countries would set the ball rolling at the end of the wars for efficient strategies for effective peace building for overall national reconciliation, integration, growth and development.

By and large, for two countries (Nigeria and Rwanda) that experienced civil wars at different times, 1967 to 1970 and 1994 respectively and 24 years after the Nigerian Civil War, the countries or at best, the former, would have recovered through efficient policies and effective peace building mechanisms for the common good of the country. Between the two countries, Rwanda has overcome the cause, events and consequences of the Rwandan Civil War and Genocide while Nigeria years after the war, is still enmeshed in the debilitating situations that have continued to set the country against the path of national reconciliation, integration, growth and development.

For a country as blessed as Nigeria in both natural and human resources to continue to express feelings of marginalization, nepotism, corruption from the federal government decades after the civil war is disheartening. There have been continuous calls for restructuring of the country in such a way that will give power to each region but many forces that are benefitting from the woes of the Nigerian state are against this considered approach for positively addressing the challenges of peace building in post-civil war Nigeria. All of these highlighted above, are no longer present in Rwanda and to a large extent, are also no longer tenable in Rwanda. Rwandan post-Civil War/Genocide development and unity should be a lesson for Nigeria. To avoid a repeat of the 1967 to 1970 civil war, Nigerian government should study the post-civil war and genocide peace building policies, strategies and framework that the Rwandan Government employed in ensuring the liberation of Rwanda from the overall ills of the 1994 Rwandan crisis.

References

- Encyclopaedia Britannica.Inc. accessed on 5 June, 2020.
- P. Effiong (2003) *Nigeria and Biafra: My Story*, New Jersey: Sungai Corp.
- M.Meredith (2005) *The State of Africa: A History of Fifty Years of Independence.*, London: Simon and Schuster Uk Ltd., 487-489.
- African Right Reports, 1994.
- Lemarchand, R (1995) *Rwanda: The Rationality of Genocide*, London: Pall Mall Press.
- Tor Sellstrom and Lennart Wohlgenuth, *The International Response to Conflict and Genocide: Lessons from the Rwanda Experience*, Uppsala, Sweden: The Nordic Africa Institute. Pp.47-55
- Macquet J. J (1954) “The Kingdom of Rwanda” in Fonder, D. (eds) *African Worlds. Studies in the Cosmological Ideas and Social Values of African Peoples*. London: Oxford University Press, 1954
- Leme, A (1993) *African Divided: The Creation of Ethnic Groups*, Lund: Lund University Press.
- Alison Desforges. (1999) *Leave None to Tell the Story: Genocide in Rwanda* New York: Human Rights Watch, 191.
- Festus Adedayo (2019) “Time to Drag Buhari, El-Rufai and Others to Kigali.” Available at Premiumtimesng.com. , accessed on 6 october.
- M.Mandari (2001) *When Victims Become Killers*, New York: Princeton University Press, 36.
- Terence McNamee (2021) “Such a Long Journey: Peacebuilding After Genocide in Rwanda” in T. McNamee and M. Muyangwa (eds.), *The State of Peacebuilding in Africa*, Washington, DC, Global Fellow, Woodrow Wilson International Center, Africa Program.
- Kimenyi, Felly, (2022) “Use Fewer Resources to achieve better results-RPF cadres told” *The New Times*, Retrieved June.
- Jean Paul Kimonyo (2019) *Transforming Rwanda: Challenges on the Road to Reconstruction*, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, p.146
- L. Udeagbala, and J.Uko (2017) “Nationalism and Nation Building in Nigeria: Centrifugal and the Centripetal Forces” *Journal of Defence, Security, Economic, and Development in Nigeria*, Nigerian Defence Academy, Kaduna, Vol.2, 707.
- Christopher von Dyck, “DDR and SSR in War-to-Peace Transition,” SSR Paper 14 (Geneva

- Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, 2016).
- The World Bank, “New Beginnings for Ex-Combatants in Rwanda,” World Bank report, January 28, 2019, <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2019/01/28/new-beginnings-for-ex-combatants-in-rwanda>.
- Toba Alabi, “The Open Letters of Col. Abubakar Dangiwa Umar and Chief Edwin Clark to President Muhammadu Buhari: Towards a Panacea to Nigeria’s Contradictions.” Available on facebook.com, accessed on 14 June, 2020.
- Laura Blackie and Nicki Hitchcott, “‘I am Rwandan’: Unity and Reconciliation in Post-Genocide Rwanda,”
- Christopher von Dyck, “DDR and SSR in War-to-Peace Transition,”
- A. R. Bizoza and A. Simons (2019) “Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction in Rwanda,” Working Paper, Chronic Poverty Advisory Network.
- Paul Banoba, “A Redefining Moment for Africa,” Transparency International regional analysis, February 21, 2018.
- John Mutamba and Jeanne Izabiliza, *The Role of Women in Reconciliation and Peace Building in Rwanda: Ten Years After Genocide* (Kigali, Rwanda: National Unity and Reconciliation Commission [NURC], 2005).
- Morag Goodwin, (2019) “Becoming Rwandan? The Impact of Two Decades of Unity Policies on the Batwa,” unpublished paper.