The Politics of Discourse

The United Nations Secretariat and Genocide in Rwanda

Rosalie Bunnik

31 March 2015

Student No: s1448129
MA International Studies - Thesis
Supervisor: dr. Alanna O'Malley
Word Count: 10.715

We, the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save the succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind.

- United Nations Charter, 1945

We were witnessing the slaughter of human beings and that in itself would become a mandate for us.

- Roméo Dallaire, Force Commander of the United Nations Peacekeeping Mission for Rwanda, 1994

Contents

Introduction

As a three-year-old girl seated in front of the television, I remember seeing excerpts of an evening newsreel. Before my mum could snatch the remote, something filmed from great distance but barely noticeable came into view; it looked like trash and clothes piled up on a muddy street, the scorching sun causing the flies and rotten air around it to seem to emanate from the screen. As I found out when I was older, the supposed trash had been dead bodies, and the muddy street had been in Rwanda, where at the time the massacre of hundreds of thousands of people took place in a matter of a hundred days. It was May 1994. The news network had finally shown the reality of what had happened in Rwanda during the two-month carnage. During the Rwandan genocide, as the event became known only after the killing spree was largely over, soldiers of the United Nations Peacekeeping Operation for Rwanda (UNAMIR) were told to stand by and watch as nearly half of the total Tutsi population was hacked to death by extremist Hutu militias. Even though the Force Commander of UNAMIR and his remaining soldiers managed to save hundreds, if not thousands of lives with the limited means they had, the United Nations itself mainly remained a bystander to the genocide.

This study seeks to answer how the United Nations Secretariat, and mainly the Secretary-General and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), framed and legitimized their actions when they were confronted with the massacre in Rwanda. What discourse allows UN staff to authorize inaction while working for an organization set up to save the people in the world from the harm that war brings? The purpose here is to criticize the representation of the United Nations identity by its own Secretariat in the face of powerful member states and other external constraints, to expose the discursive framing of the meanings and limits of peacekeeping and subsequently, to show the policies that derived from the discourse UN staff propounded. This is important because, as will be argued here, their discourse limits the Secretariat's understanding of the world and their own role in it and in turn, restricts their available policy options. A lack of independence and unwillingness to confront the status quo caused a discourse that created policy detrimental to the UN's goals formulated in the Charter. Their discourse allowed United Nations staff to legitimize the UN's peacekeeping policies in Rwanda and ignored the fact that there were alternative modes of thinking, ones that avoided the illusions of this discourse. An alternative conception of the

role of the UN and its civil servants would have delegitimized their role as bystanders and provided different policy options than the ones set forth during the Rwandan genocide.

Methodology

It is impossible to represent Rwanda as it truly happened. This study does not intend to provide the one 'true' narrative on the Rwandan genocide. Nevertheless, creating a narrative on a perceived reality is how human beings define their world and their own role in it. To establish order and boundaries is to give meaning to a particular event or subject. This practice establishes a defined set of actors, influences and possible options and outcomes. There is no external position of certainty; no universal understanding that is beyond history and society (Rabinow 4). It is impossible for stories to present an external position of reality; they constitute reality. There is no truth; there are only perspectives. There is no grand metanarrative of universal wisdom; only competing interpretations. This means in fact that no object or event is outside particular modes of thinking and representation; there is nothing outside discourse. Thus, discourse is not only a device to make sense of the world; it is what constitutes the real world. This study does not pretend to provide a position of certainty on the events in Rwanda; it provides a particular narrative on Rwanda while acknowledging that it is not, and could never be, the definitive version of events. This position serves to show that policy is predicated upon one particular interpretation of events and will be implemented by analysing the discourse at the UN Secretariat.

When foreign policy is concerned, the "need to ascribe meaning to the situation and to construct the objects within it" (Hansen 6) creates a framework of specific possibilities and policy options while others will be silenced. Understanding foreign policy as a discursive practice, the research agenda of discourse analysis includes the broader process by which bureaucratic institutions such as for example the United Nations construct and legitimize their own reality. Representations, bearing similar messages and ideas, have been put forward time and again so that they have become institutionalized or 'normalized' (Neumann 61). Discourse analysis sets out to expose these representations and their reality as constructions. As a methodology, it allows the researcher to pay attention to particular representations of reality, the way in which policy makers construct their world, and how this influences their choice of policy. The purpose of discourse analysis here is to pinpoint how UN staff in New York interpreted particular events in such a way that it limited what they perceived as viable

policy options for Rwanda. Analysing their discourse offers a look at how the interpretation of events Rwanda shut out particular policy decisions. Thus, this study is not about who is to blame, but rather about exposing a discourse that caused a structural legitimization of particular actions at the UN Secretariat. The central point here is because the Secretary-General and his officials at DPKO constructed a discourse around the limitations of peacekeeping, even though they had the discursive agency to influence policy outcomes, they helped prevent action from the international community to protect the Rwandan population during the first weeks of the genocide.

This combination of methodology and case study is relevant because much literature on the international community and the Rwandan genocide seeks an *explanation* of events; a narrative on who did what, when and where (Adelman & Suhrke 1996; Des Forges 1999; United Nations 1999; Power 2002; Dallaire 2003). Discourse has never been the focus of study in any scholarship on the United Nations and the Rwandan genocide. Michael N. Barnett's work is different from his predecessors, because it focuses on the UN's transcendental belief-system on peacekeeping, which, according to him, enables a "politics of indifference" (1996). In his later work, he shifts towards an "ethical history of the UN's indifference to genocide", where he identifies various strands of obligations and commitments Secretariat officials felt at the time, to derive what they thought as moral and proper behaviour – in the end, he identifies moral and individual responsibility (2002). As a constructivist, Barnett is preoccupied with the explanatory power of ideational factors as opposed to material ones at the United Nations. Barnett treats ideas as one, albeit very important, causal influence on UN Secretariat policies but sees part of their identity as non-discursively constituted. He does not go into the non-discursively constituted, which were, according to Klinghoffer, the material factors: "the UN's (military) capabilities to prevent or stop genocide" (983). For discourse studies, neither ideas nor materiality have a meaningful presence separate from each other (refer to Hansen 24). The point is not to disregard material facts but to study how these are situated and prioritized. For example, the death of thousands in Rwanda quickly became known to Western policymakers and the media and was, at some point, accepted as fact. But there was no immediate agreement on whether this constituted genocide, or was part of the civil war: a designation on which policy should be employed in response. For material facts to become politically salient there needs to be human and discursive agency (Hansen 32). Thus, this study builds upon earlier scholarship

but has at its core the methodological angle of discourse analysis and consequently, a different overall purpose.

The United Nations Secretariat

The *Report of the Independent Inquiry into the Actions of the United Nations during the 1994 Genocide in Rwanda* (1999) concluded that "while the presence of United Nations peacekeepers in Rwanda may have begun as a traditional peacekeeping operation to monitor the implementation of an existing peace agreement, the onslaught of the genocide should have led decision-makers in the United Nations – from the Secretary-General and the Security Council to Secretariat officials and the leadership of UNAMIR – to realize that the original mandate, and indeed the neutral mediating role of the United Nations, was no longer adequate and required a different, more assertive response, combined with the means necessary to take such action." (51). With this conclusion, the Inquiry leaves room whether a "more assertive response" from UN officials would have led to a different outcome in Rwanda. This study proposes that a different attitude from international civil servants would indeed have produced a different outcome. The UN Secretariat had discursive agency, which means that by their discourse they were able to influence UN Security Council decisions. Moreover, their discourse influenced their treatment of UNAMIR's requests.

Scholars have used different approaches to the UN Secretariat and their capabilities. Rather than showing the capability and influence of the Secretariat, Leon Gordenker focuses on the influence of external constraints on the Secretary-General and his civil servants. He is careful to note in his conclusion that, "the Secretary-General occasionally could initiate or significantly help design global policy" (97) and he calls the role of UN officials in peacekeeping one of "duties and opportunities that *substantially affected the immediate operations*" (98; emphasis mine). Nevertheless, the constraints on the Secretary-General and his Secretariat continue to be visible (97). He has "become a presence, if sometimes distant, in trying to cope with a long list of international issues. Nevertheless, the history of more than six decades leaves little doubt that on occasion his help, offered or requested, can be brushed aside by the member countries, especially the richest and strongest" (101). Thomas Weiss (2009) contends that "an independent group […] whose allegiance is to the welfare of the planet, not to their home countries, remains a lofty but disputed objective" (107). Nevertheless, he wants to stress that these "individuals matter, for good and for ill":

> The second UN does more than simply carry out marching orders from governments. I thus disagree with three analysts who dismiss "the curious notion that the United Nations is an autonomous actor in world affairs that can and does take action independent of the will and wishes of the member governments." This obviously is a truism for resolutions, but there is considerable more room for creativity and initiative in numerous activities than is commonly believed. UN officials present ideas to tackle problems, debate them formally and informally with governments, take initiatives, advocate for change, turn general decisions into specific programs, and implement them. […] [the] international civil service, properly constituted, can make a difference – not only in field operations but also in research and policy formulation (Weiss 2011 n.pag).

Gordenker unfortunately does not substantially go into the "opportunities that immediately affected the operations". Rather than emphasizing material realities and external constraints, like Gordenker, or try to convince readers of the Secretariat's creativity and initiative, like Weiss, this study will focus on the particular instances when the Secretariat had the discursive agency to, as Gordenker calls it, "substantially affect the immediate operations". Unfortunately, in the case of Rwanda, this had nothing to do with creativity or initiative. Officials, rather than acting independently, chose not to confront the status quo. The consequences for Rwanda were dire.

External constraints cause policymakers at the Secretariat to face numerous limitations on which policy can be promoted, and thus which representations of identities can be articulated (refer to Hansen 30). The UN Security Council has the authority to take the major decisions on peace operations. It is the 15 members of this powerful UN body that decide on whether a peace operation will be authorized, when this will happen, when and where troops will be deployed, and under what circumstances force is allowed. Operating under the mandate decided upon by the Security Council, a UN peace operation's military and civilian staff on the ground has to report back to their counterparts at the UN Secretariat in New York. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General reports directly back to the Secretary-General, whereas the force commander, responsible for all soldiers on the ground, reports back to and receives instructions from his military counterpart at DPKO. DPKO takes the final decision on specific orders and the use of force. If reports and questions from the

ground call for amending the mandate, for example extending the mission's duration or the withdrawal of troops, it is brought to the attention of the Security Council, which then takes the final decision. The Secretary-General has the exclusive authority to put an agenda item on the list to be discussed in the Security Council. UN Secretary-General in 1994, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, worded his role in the following terms: "I am only the Security Council's servant," he said, "though not always its humble one" (in Sciolino, Elaine and Paul Lewis). In this way he constructs his own agency by measuring his ability to act in connection to what the member states 'allow him to do'. It is a 'political reality' he has to deal with, namely the will of the powerful member states, which 'dictates' his capability to influence policy. It is true he is dependent upon the member states for troops, budget and, in many cases, intelligence. The UN has no standing army, which means that with every new mission, the Secretariat has to ask for volunteers. Western support for a mission is usually of crucial importance, not the least because their troops form the backbone of any mission since they have the best military capabilities. This was the case with Belgian support for the Rwanda mission. The UN does not have its own independent intelligence unit. In the case of UNAMIR, Dallaire had very limited intelligence resources and had to rely on information member states with major units in Rwanda (for example France, the US and Belgium) were willing to provide. Consequently, his reports to New York could not be backed up by trustworthy intelligence. These constraints did play their part in what the Secretariat could and could not do, and also influenced their ideas of what they could or could not do. However, for these facts to become politically significant, discursive agency was needed.

Firstly, the UN Secretariat has the ability to *put an item on the agenda of the Security Council and direct formal and informal discussion by providing their expertise, intelligence and reports*. As this research will show, the UN Secretariat's capability during the Rwandan genocide was to represent the circumstances in Rwanda to the Security Council and thus (re)produce discourse. The Secretariat did not convey to the Council the gravity of the tensions building up in Rwanda and it did not convey Dallaire's message that there were plans to exterminate Tutsi's. It also stayed silent during most of the discussion in the Council during the first weeks in April, instead of presenting policy options viewed viable by its men on the ground. When it did present a report, it misrepresented the situation in Rwanda and again failed to convey the seriousness of the extermination campaign against the Tutsis. Had the Security Council been informed differently by the mediator between its one and only independent source on the ground, policy might have been adjusted accordingly. The second

important aspect of their discursive agency was *assessing the events and giving direct orders to their force commander*, which immediately affected the situation on the ground. By insisting on staying within the limits of the mandate and ordering Dallaire to do so, which meant only using force in self-defence and sticking to neutrality, they severely limited options to protect civilians and save human lives.

The UN Secretariat's agency is both constituted within and constructed by their own discourse on their capabilities. This does not mean that the above-mentioned external (material) factors and constraints do not limit the Secretariat's options to do as it pleases. However, "external constraints are not objective material factors constituted outside of discourse but situated within, or products of, older and competing discourses" (Hansen 30). It is the research agenda of discourse analysis to inquire into the *construction* of particular material realities *within* discourse, by showing how Somalia became part and parcel of the discourse of peacekeeping at the Secretariat, and thereby influenced decisions at DPKO and their orders to the force commander on the ground. It will be argued that because Rwanda was treated from within this framework, the situation was termed a civil war instead of genocide, and subsequently handled thus by the UN Secretary-General in his report to the Council. As a consequence, members without independent sources on the ground voted on the withdrawal of UNAMIR on the basis of misrepresented information. With his report, the Secretary-General had impact on their interpretation of the events and thereby their voting behaviour.

The 'Limits' of Peacekeeping

Somalia

Peacekeeping operations had been steadily expanding in number since the end of the Cold War. By 1994, a hopelessly undermanned DPKO managed 73.000 peacekeepers in 17 UN operations (Barnett 2002, 29). In the post-Cold War era the UN Security Council approved mission after mission to relieve war stricken countries from their misery. For the UN's civil servants, the feeling that they were finally carrying out their obligations under the UN Charter predominated (28). Then UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali worded this newfound confidence in the following terms:

> In these past months a conviction has grown, among nations large and small, that an opportunity has been regained to achieve the great objectives of the Charter - a United

> Nations capable of maintaining international peace and security, of securing justice and human rights and of promoting, in the words of the Charter, "social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom (Report A/47/277 - S/24111, 31 January 1992)

This confidence would prove unrealistic (Murray 3). In October 1993, the UN mandated and United States led intervention in Somalia went terribly wrong and changed the US administration's policy towards the UN beyond repair. The Somalian exercise had originally been set up to distribute aid to starving Somalis who suffered from the ongoing civil war between several militias. Once this task was well under way, the UN and the US started to think about how to solve the political problems underlying the humanitarian crisis and decided that the key was to create a safe political environment and disarm the militias. Disgruntled about the intervention, militiamen killed twenty-four Pakistani peacekeepers on the fifth of June. But the mounting tension reached its limit on the third of October, when two American helicopters were shot down, 18 American soldiers were killed and another 78 wounded. Not only did Somalia come to stand for the death of these soldiers, it also referred to the perceived failure of the UN (Barnett 39; Durch 353). Peace operations would never be the same again, because the US was simply not prepared to fight a war in Africa and see their dead soldiers dragged through the streets of Mogadishu, surrounded by cheering Somali's they had originally set out to save from hunger and poverty. Thus, the events in Somalia changed the US policy towards the UN for good. The government had been, during most of 1993, quite straightforward about its newfound confidence in the UN and its peacekeeping operations and the US role in this. In his presidential address to the UN General Assembly in September 1993, one month before the ill-fated operation, President Clinton proclaimed that peacekeeping efforts were strategic and to protect American interests. He also stressed the role of the United Nations to put an end to war:

> U.N. peacekeeping holds the promise to resolve many of this era's conflicts. The reason we have supported such missions is not, as some critics in the United States have charged, to subcontract American foreign policy but to strengthen our security, protect our interests, and to share among nations the costs and effort of pursuing peace. Peacekeeping cannot be a substitute for our own national defense efforts, but it can strongly supplement them.

He also recalled US and UN efforts in Somalia and stressed the importance of saving lives, developing secure conditions and making sure that anarchy does not return:

> In Somalia, the United States and the United Nations have worked together to achieve a stunning humanitarian rescue, saving literally hundreds of thousands of lives and restoring the conditions of security for almost the entire country. U.N. peacekeepers from over two dozen nations remain in Somalia today. And some, including brave Americans, have lost their lives to ensure that we complete our mission and to ensure that anarchy and starvation do not return just as quickly as they were abolished.

During a meeting in the Security Council on June 7th 1993, Madeleine Albright, at the time US ambassador to the UN, pledged that "[Factional violence] can and will be stopped." She also reaffirmed America's promise to bring security and peace to Somalia, using all necessary means - including forceful actions - towards this goal:

> Today's draft resolution reaffirms the existing authority of UNOSOM II to take strong and forceful action to safeguard international forces, to punish those who attack them and to restore security. Appropriate measures include the disarming and detention of persons posing a threat to United Nations forces or obstructing their operations. Those who would challenge the authority of this body to enforce its resolutions must know that we stand firm in our resolve to bring peace and reconciliation to Somalia and that they will pay a heavy price for ignoring the Council (S/PV.3229).

The Administration's policy towards peacekeeping in general and Somalia in particular took a sudden shift after the October events. Albright would never again argue for the use of force to restore security. Clinton's speech after the death of the American soldiers on October the 7th, 1993, was primarily about why the US is was there in the first place and whether it was in fact the United States' job to rebuild Somalian institutions, a purpose he had applauded only weeks earlier:

> These tragic events raise hard questions about our effort in Somalia. Why are we still there? What are we trying to accomplish? […] It is not our job to rebuild Somalia's society or even to create a political process that can allow Somalia's clans to live and work in peace. The Somalis must do that for themselves.

The US was no longer responsible for Somalian security - the Somali's had the responsibility to fend for themselves, Clinton decided. With new instructions in her pocket, Albright went to the Security Council with a different message:

> The sacrifices were too great […] the United Nations can only help. The Somali people must show the will and the courage to bring about true national reconciliation. […] But if they cannot work together to solve their own problems, they cannot expect the United Nations to do it for them. (S/PV.3317)

Conveniently forgetting that it had been the United States – and not the United Nations - who had primarily led the effort in Somalia, the Clinton administration suddenly went from representing the duty of the US to help starving Somalis, to a stance that stressed their own responsibility. They further concluded that the US would have a restricted role in Somalia from now on and that the UN was not suitable or meant to bring peace and security to country unwilling to work towards peace.

With this newfound strategy towards the UN, the US antagonized the Secretary-General. The administrations' representation of events tarnished the UN's good name and its efforts in peacekeeping operations. Boutros-Ghali worried about the UN's reputation and accused the US of using the UN as a scapegoat for the failed raid. He also "complained that the United States could not invent its own rules for serving in the United Nations peacekeeping force", "the United Nations exists to help countries solve their problems," he said, "if it helps the Americans solve theirs by blaming me, I'll be a scapegoat" (in Sciolino & Lewis). But Boutros-Ghali knew it would be no use to go against the most powerful member of the UN:

> To put it bluntly, I have no power, no independence. You are free to send the troops or not to send the troops. You are free to pay the money or not to pay the money. So unless I obtain your good will, I will not be able to do your work (in Sciolino & Lewis).

Boutros-Ghali was right. The UN relied heavily on US money and troops for its peacekeeping operations, and he knew that UN peace operations could not exist without US support. William J. Durch explains that, "by using its veto, the United States can stop any

security-related UN action contrary to US interests before it even starts, and by withholding financial contributions it can cripple ongoing UN actions" (3).

Clinton's revised strategy made UN officials all the more aware of the limits of peace operations, and they started to revise their peacekeeping strategies accordingly. Peacekeeping operations were to be judged by a defined set of rules both in the interest of the US and the UN, whose staffers were now interested in upholding the UN's good reputation. A year later, Kofi Annan, head of DPKO at the time, echoed Clinton and Albright in an interview:

> Peacekeeping works where you have a clear mandate, a will on the part of the people to make peace. The inspiration for acceptable and viable peace can only spring from the leaders and the people in the country (in Crossette).

The Clinton administration decided that peace operations were no longer to *enforce* peace but would only be approved if there actually was a 'peace to keep'. UN Security Council statements and subsequent UN documents suggested an operation was justified as long as the parties demonstrated the will to work towards peace (Barnett 2002, 47; see for example resolution S/RES/872 on the establishment of UNAMIR). Ending peace enforcement and returning to traditional peacekeeping rules supported by a clear-cut mandate restrictive in its conditions, became the new discourse at UN headquarters in New York (43). Anxious to maintain its credibility, the UN sought to abide by their standards formulated in the Charter while at the same time upholding a very restrictive set of conditions on where it would send its peacekeepers. Operations had to cost less and bring about success, or, so many UN officials feared, another 'Somalia' would mean the end of the UN. Then came Rwanda.

Rwanda

Rwanda had been embroiled in civil war until the 4th of August 1993, when the opposing parties signed the Arusha Accords, a peace agreement between the government forces of the Hutu president Juvénal Habyarimana and the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF – children of Tutsi refugees from Uganda). The Arusha Accords established a Broad-Based Transitional Government (BBTG), which included various political parties in anticipation of elections. On the 5th of October 1993, the UN Security Council established UNAMIR, which was to oversee the peace agreement and a smooth transition. The international force was to be led by the Special Representative of the Secretary General (SRSG) Jacques Roger Booh-Booh, and its

Force Commander, Lieutenant-General Roméo Dallaire. The mandate's most important provisions were to contribute to the security of the city of Kigali, to monitor observance of the cease-fire agreement, to oversee the security situation during the final period of the transitional government's mandate, to assist with mine clearance and to investigate at the request of the parties or on its own initiative instances of alleged non-compliance with the provisions of the Arusha Peace agreement (S/RES/872). Although the situation seemed quite straightforward judging by the language in the mandate, Booh-Booh and Dallaire would soon find out that tensions in Rwanda would not magically disappear after the peace agreement was signed (Dallaire 79). Much of this tension fell along ethnic lines. Belgian colonizers had favoured the Tutsi minority until independence in 1961. In 1973, Habyarimana came to power and imposed rules favouring the Hutu (Des Forges 36-38; Barnett 52-53). Many Rwandans in 1994 still believed that the Tutsis were intent on bringing Hutu rule to an end (Barnett 54-55). On the 11th of January 1994, Dallaire sent an alarming fax to UN headquarters, in which he revealed intelligence he had obtained from an insider in the Interahamwe militia, an extremist Hutu group connected to the government forces of President Habyarimana. This person shared information about men being trained in militia camps and the locations of weapon caches meant to help the militia carry out their plans. He also notified UNAMIR of the recent registering of Tutsi in Kigali, which he suspected to be "for their extermination". Dallaire notified DPKO of his plans to raid the arms caches and thus nip violence in the bud. He received an answer from Annan, signed by Iqbal Riza, then deputy to Annan. Riza ordered Dallaire not to act. When the president's airplane was shot down on the 6th of April, chaos ensued. Killings aimed at key Tutsi and moderate Hutu leaders were among the first signs; methodical killing of Tutsis became obvious to Dallaire on the 8th of April (Dallaire 280). Along with the downfall of the airplane came the peace agreement; RPF forces inside Kigali reorganized and started an offensive against the government forces and the militias carrying out the slaughter. After the murder of 10 Belgian peacekeepers, the Belgian government decided to withdraw its forces from UNAMIR. Subsequently, the UN Security Council voted to withdraw all but 270 soldiers on the 21st of April. Dallaire continued to try to save lives. Even though he managed to save thousands with his tiny force, by the end of the slaughter about 800.000 Tutsi's and moderate Hutu's were killed. When the Security Council finally realized the extent of the killing in late April, several (non) permanent members of the Council started arguing for an intervention force authorised to enforce peace. Operation Turquoise, led by the French, was authorised under Resolution 929 on the 22nd of June. By then, the genocide was largely over (Kuperman 44).

After the Somalia debacle, not many countries were willing to provide troops. Belgium, as the former colonial power, was the only Western country deploying its troops in Rwanda. Developing countries deployed the other contingents, but these were ill-equipped, badly organized and often left to fend for themselves when it came to supplies from their home countries (Dallaire 100). Dallaire consistently complained to UN headquarters about this situation but he always received the same reply; there was no political will and therefore no budget to solve these problems. Somalia had taught the member states that peace operations would often prove costly and futile. “Under these circumstances the Security Council members, and the United States in particular, were reluctant to undertake yet another commitment in a conflict-ridden, failing state” (Durch 401). Rwanda needed to be a cheap, easy winner. UN officials, too, were “increasingly of the view that the organization should “discreetly withdraw to its traditional, impartial role of tending sleepy, cease-fire lines in international conflicts” (Preston, qtd in Barnett 2002, 46) a perspective that eerily echoed US statements about Somalia. During the first weeks of the genocide, policymakers continued to represent Rwanda as a second Somalia and UNAMIR as a peacekeeping force in continuous danger of crossing the ‘Mogadishu line’. Dallaire envisaged UNAMIR to be able to do the job with about 5000 troops under his command; while setting up UNAMIR, his counterpart at DPKO, Maurice Baril, told him to lower his expectations and ask for less, or his mission would not be approved by the Security Council (Dallaire 55). In this way, the Secretariat prepared to confront external constraints before they even emerged. They mediated between what Dallaire asked and what the member states were prepared to give.

Traditional peacekeeping missions are positioned between former enemies and tasked to monitor a cease-fire, conducted with the full consent of the parties involved and only after a cease-fire has been achieved. Use of force is only allowed in self-defence or in defence of the mission (Durch 3). General Dallaire notes how Rwanda started out as a traditional chapter six peacekeeping mission:

> I was certain that Rwanda was a place that could benefit from a classic chapter-six peacekeeping mission, if we could invest it with a sense of urgency. The operation would referee the ex-belligerents to ensure that the peace agreement was being implemented and that everybody was playing by the rules (71).

Nevertheless, at that time “no nation would be prepared to contribute to a chapter-seven mission to a country where there were no strategic national or international interests and no major threat to international peace and security” (71). When Rwanda’s mission statement was being written, the Secretariat was busy constructing a policy that needed to be consistent with the newfound identity of the UN in relation to peacekeeping after Somalia; policy was constructed in connection with the objective of tending to cease-fire lines and negotiating the settlement of disputes, strict adherence to the neutrality and impartiality objectives of the mission. Peace enforcement was out. The Secretariat needed this internal construction of a strict peacekeeping policy because they needed to adjust to and be consistent with the broader political context and changed US-UN relations. Instead of asking what the situation required from the UN, they defined the situation by using the strict rules attached to a peacekeeping mission (Adelman & Suhrke 300). Conversations in New York were about the conditions under which the Security Council would authorize an operation, instead of what an operation needed to succeed (Dallaire 55). Secretariat members abided by these rules about when and where the UN would have a role, which meant generally only when they thought there was a ‘peace to keep’ (Barnett 2002, 46). Richard Betts suggests “the UN’s efforts in Rwanda failed because of a “destructive misconception” that these types of limited and impartial peacekeeping operations can keep peace where none exists” (in Taras & Ganguly 92).

Warning signs

Examples of this can be found in their treatment of the fax Dallaire sent on the 11th of January, 1994. The ‘after-Somalia’ peacekeeping discourse dominated when DPKO staff decided that Dallaire’s plan to raid arms caches on the 11th of January was impermissible; reminiscent of the attempts to confiscate weapons that caused the onslaught and subsequent failure of the operation in Somalia, Riza wrote to Dallaire his plan clearly went “beyond the mandate of UNAMIR under resolution 872” and warned him of “the need to avoid entering into a course of action that might lead to the use of force and unanticipated repercussions” (L0001702). Riza recalls his reasons for ordering Dallaire not to act years later in an interview:

> *When the force commander wanted to go on arms raid in those circumstances, how did you react?*
>
> We said, "Not Somalia, again." We have to go by the mandate that we are given by the Security Council. It's not up to the Secretary-General or the Secretariat to decide whether they're going to run off in other directions (interview on *PBS Frontline*).

Moreover, the infamous ‘genocide fax’ is also a crucial moment when the Secretariat had the capability to influence the actions of the Security Council. When Dallaire wrote to DPKO that “in 20 minutes [the informant’s] personnel could kill up to 1000 Tutsis.” (Cable L0016678), DPKO had at its disposal information about a planned murder campaign on an ethnic minority. A few weeks earlier, an authoritative report prepared for the United Nations Commission on Human Rights suggested that the violence was of a more “radical and comprehensive design that foreshadowed events to come” (Adelman & Suhrke 298). With their ability to present intelligence and its interpretation to the UN Security Council, the Secretary-General and his Secretariat could have provided the members of the Security Council with information on a planned campaign designed to eradicate the Tutsi population months before the killings started. They failed to do so (Adelman & Suhrke 299; Des Forges 203-211). This had to do with the fact that the Secretariat wanted a diplomatic approach (Des Forges 213), but also because they did not fully trust Dallaire’s informant (Adelman & Suhrke 299), caused by UNAMIR’s limited intelligence capabilities. Barnett argues that in the case of Rwanda, the Secretariat’s “ability [to inform the Security Council] was heightened because few if any member states had independent sources of intelligence on the conditions on the ground and had come to rely on UNAMIR” (Barnett 1996, 143). According to the Belgian ambassador in Kigali, Boutros-Ghali prohibited the operation because he was afraid an escalation “would force UNAMIR into a peacemaking rather than a peacekeeping role” (Des Forges 209). Recently declassified documents that circulated in the Security Council at the time show that Madeleine Albright discussed Rwanda with DPKO’s Hédi Annabi (Director of the Africa Division) on the 24th of January. She relayed the meeting in a cable to Washington and African embassies and said, “Annabi is concerned that the combination of increasing covert activities and a stalemated political process could produce a potentially explosive atmosphere. He has already communicated these fears to both France and Belgium, has solicited their participation in defusing the emerging crisis, and is now making a similar request of the US” (Cable 00312). This shows that Annabi had informed the powerful members of the Security Council of tensions that could produce an ‘explosive atmosphere’. The cable does not mention extermination plans with an ethnic dimension. Moreover, France, Belgium and the US probably already knew of the tensions building up from their own intelligence reports. The non-permanent members of the Security Council however, who did not have their own intelligence capabilities, never heard from the Secretariat about the authoritative reports, nor on the gravity of the warnings by Dallaire. Colin Keating, New

Zealand's ambassador to the UN and president of the UN Security Council during the genocide in April 1994, later claimed he was unaware of the tensions building up in Rwanda until the week before he was to assume his presidency, when he decided to do some background reading on the topic. This implies his voting behaviour might have been different if he had known from the start the tensions and difficulties Rwanda and UNAMIR were facing (Barnett 2002, 58-59). But the Security Council was never informed of the fax. The information never reached the Security Council until it was too late.

Genocide

After the crash of the presidential plane, Dallaire stationed peacekeepers at the homes of prominent Rwandan politicians. When the peacekeepers started being threatened by violent mobs, the force commander asked Riza whether he was allowed to protect the politicians. Riza ordered Dallaire not to fire unless fired upon (Dallaire 233). The next day, Annan explained to Dallaire he could only help them if this "did not entail increased risk". "Whatever was done must be governed by the Rules of Engagement and the peacekeepers could not use armed force to save Belgians if they themselves were not threatened" (Des Forges 909). Dallaire's soldiers were not going to be able to protect human beings from violent mobs carrying weapons without taking risks and without using force. After peacekeepers tried to negotiate in vain, they left the politicians and their family to their fate, resulting in a bloodbath. Almost all moderate politicians were killed during the first week after the plane crash. Sticking to the mandate became a mantra for the Secretariat and the legitimization of the failure to do anything about the killing until late April. According to the mandate, Dallaire's options were to negotiate a cease-fire, to keep monitoring the security situation and to protect its own forces. Dallaire had a different conception of the mandate. He wanted to use force to protect Rwandans instead of only his own troops and expats. But again, when he raised the issue with Annan, Riza and Annabi, they said he "was not to take sides, and it was up to the Rwandans to sort things out for themselves" (Dallaire 260). To Dallaire, after chaos broke out and he had tried in vain to maintain a dialogue while thousands of Tutsi were killed every hour, UNAMIR no longer had a mandate that fitted the situation. Dallaire's cry to save human lives fell on deaf ears. "A member of the Secretariat even suggested that protection of civilians might not be an appropriate activity for a peacekeeping operation" (Des Forges 22 – this was Riza, refer to Des Forges, 953). Peacekeeping rules allowed UN staff to define what responsibilities they had towards the Rwandan population and the mandate was used to legitimize their direct orders to Dallaire. A few years after the events, "one U.N. staff

member concluded that the peacekeeping office had failed to respond to Dallaire's calls for support and that it was "too conservative in meeting the challenge" (Des Forges 247). The discourse, instigated and institutionalized by the US only a few months earlier, left no room for interpretation of events that were beyond the mandate. External constraints, such as the political will on the part of the US and other powerful members, were part and parcel of their broader discourse on peacekeeping. Material realities, such as limited intelligence capabilities, were produced and reproduced through the same discourse. The discourse of peacekeeping left no room for saving human lives.

The mass slaughter that followed throughout April was attributed to a civil war and represented as war casualties by the UN Secretariat. The discursive framing of the killings as part of the civil war had profound political effects; UN Security Council members without their own intelligence sources in Rwanda had to seek information from other sources beside the UN Secretariat to realize that what was happening in Rwanda was genocide. Unfortunately, by then, the UN Security Council had already decided to withdraw most of UNAMIR's troops – a decision in large part influenced by a report from the Secretary-General, in which he misrepresented the situation as civil war without clear victim or aggressor. In the Genocide Convention adopted by the General Assembly in 1948, genocide is defined in short as "acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group". The Convention also stipulates that genocide should be prevented and punished by the contracting parties. In Rwanda, the murdering of politicians seemed to suggest that the government forces had decided to eliminate their political enemies. However, "the major international actors – policymakers in Belgium, the US, France, and the UN – all understood the gravity of the crisis within the first twenty-four hours even if they could not have predicted the massive toll that the slaughter would eventually take" (Des Forges 899). The Secretariat knew what was going on. Dallaire send numerous reports during the first few days of the crisis, among which a report on a slaughter at a church, where around 150 Tutsis were rounded up by checking their identity cards, and subsequently hacked to death by militiamen (Dallaire 283-83). Nevertheless, UN staffers kept telling Dallaire to negotiate a cease-fire, even though to Dallaire that goal was unattainable and clearly not as important as stopping the killings (Des Forges 21; Dallaire 271, 284). Des Forges notes:

> Foreign policymakers treated the genocide as a tragic by-product of the war rather than as an evil to be attacked directly. Accustomed to dealing with wars, not with

> genocides, diplomats addressed the familiar part of the problem in the usual way, by promoting a dialogue between the belligerents and seeking a cease-fire (21).

On the 20th of April, two weeks after the plane crash, Boutros-Ghali sent a Special Report on Rwanda to the Security Council. The Secretary-General does not mention the killings of hundreds of Tutsis all over the country. Instead, the UNSG's report suggests "the violence appears to have both political and ethnic dimensions" (S/1994/470). Nowhere does he mention the assailants: in the report, the parties are equal and the UN is determined to remain committed to neutrality and impartiality. The most urgent of tasks, Boutros-Ghali notes, is "the securing of an agreement on a cease-fire, to be followed by political negotiations between the two sides to restore the Peace Process under the Arusha Agreement". By then almost all important Tutsi and moderate Hutu politicians in Kigali had either been killed, were missing or in hiding at UNAMIR's safe havens; the President who had signed the peace agreement was dead and the former clique of powerful Hutu politicians around him was giving orders to carry out the genocide. Hundreds of thousands of Tutsis had already been killed. This was information the UN had at its disposal through UNAMIR and General Dallaire's extensive reports (Dallaire 263-327). Boutros-Ghali wrote about Rwanda as if it were a "natural disaster" and that the UN should now decide on whether it would "maintain its efforts to help a people who have fallen into calamitous circumstances" (S/1994/470; Des Forges 19-20). The Hutus and the Tutsis were still represented as equal parties; nowhere in his report does the Secretary-General mention the killings to be genocidal or does he propose it as a problem to be addressed apart from the power struggle at hand in Rwanda. He presents a few options to the Security Council. The first alternative notes that the situation could "only be changed by the immediate and massive reinforcement of UNAMIR and a change in its mandate so that it would be equipped and authorized to coerce the opposing forces into a cease-fire, and to attempt to restore law and order and put an end to the killings. […] This scenario would require several thousand additional troops and UNAMIR may have to be given enforcement powers under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. The second alternative presents the option to retain "a small group headed by the force commander, with necessary staff, would remain in Kigali to act as intermediary between the two parties in an attempt to bring them to an agreement on a cease-fire". And then there was the third alternative which, the Secretary-General specifically notes, he did not favour: the complete withdrawal of UNAMIR. In conclusion, he writes "it is only the parties who signed the Arusha agreement, namely the Government of Rwanda (or its successor) and RPF, who

must bear the responsibility for deciding whether their country and people find peace or continue to suffer violence". The Security Council voted for the second option. On the same day, the Czech Mission to the UN, at that time a non-permanent member to the UN Security Council, noted that, "further alarming information arrived from Human Rights Watch according to which some 100.000 people have been murdered; interpreting the fighting as strictly tribal is a terrible simplification." (Cable 2603). Des Forges explains:

> The Secretariat staff failed to convey to the council the gravity of the warnings of crisis and the urgency of Dallaire's requests. This meant little to the US and France, who were well-informed in any case, but it led other council members with no sources of information in Rwanda to misjudge the gravity of the crisis. "Instead of strengthening the mandate and sending reinforcements, the Security Council made only small changes in the rate of troop deployment, measures too limited to affect the development of the situation (18-19).

On April 25, New Zealand, also a non-permanent member, sent a cable reporting on the discussions in the Security Council days after the decision to withdraw. It notes "genocide reported by Médecins Sans Frontières" (Cable C04362). On the same day, the Czech mission writes:

> A clear genocide is taking place, of the governmental and presidential guard Hutu units against the Tutsi. […] striving for a cease-fire holds both parties on the same level. Is this not as though we wanted Hitler to reach a cease-fire with the Jews? (Sure the comparison is wanting but the proportions are the same). The CZ Delegation will talk to some colleagues from among the "non-non", to see whether we couldn't react in some other way than by withdrawing UNAMIR, of which only 450 men remain in the country (Cable 2657).

Calling the events in Rwanda genocide was something only a few Security Council members were willing to do, since it created the (moral) imperative under the Genocide Convention to take action. Three weeks after the 6th of April, the international press really grasped the magnitude of the killings (Tebbs 150). Feeling the pressure from the media, cries for intervention grew louder in the Council (Barnett 136). Keating, on his last day as president of the Council, tried to include genocide in a draft statement. Anxious the discursive ability of

the word genocide would demand more forceful action, the US still refused to go along (Power 351). When the evidence of genocide became impossible to ignore the Council formally requested plans for a humanitarian mission, but it was only on June 10th that Secretary of State Warren Christopher admitted Rwanda was genocide. Four days later, France offered to lead Operation Turquoise.

Because of misrepresentation by the UN Secretariat, member states without their own sources on the ground had to seek information from other sources such as Human Rights Watch and Médecins Sans Frontières, to find out that genocide was taking place. The Czech mission, as shown above, immediately started to reconsider their decision to withdraw most of UNAMIR's troops. This decision had been, in large part, influenced by the information these non-permanent members gained from the report by the Secretary-General. By misrepresenting the events in his report, the Secretary-General had influenced their perspective on the events and thereby their voting behaviour. Because facts are dependent upon agency and discourses for their production, they do not carry with them automatic political responses; they need to be located inside a discourse to have a particular effect on policy. For poststructuralism, material facts are produced by and inserted into foreign policy discourses (refer to Hansen 32). For these facts to become politically relevant there needs to be discursive agency. Whether the killings in Rwanda were specified as genocide partly depended on the above explained "structuring of a discursive field" by the Secretary-General (refer to Campbell 9). By recommending certain policy options and condemning others, the Secretariat had the ability to structure the debate in the Security Council and point to elements of an operation that were overlooked by the member states. The discursive framing of the killings as part of the civil war instead of genocide, and the construction of the subsequent available policy options, was in part responsible for the voting behaviour of the non-permanent member states of the Security Council.

Was it inability or unwillingness to look beyond Somalia and to set out to save civilians? Peacekeeping rules are there to protect the UN from threats and instability; Somalia had shown that a loosely defined mission goal had led to military exercises far beyond the purposes of the mission. Therefore, the United Nations started to define itself against these threats. However, threats and instability are not merely there; they appear through the UN's own discursive formulation of the peacekeeping logic. The decision to label Rwanda as an easy operation, – which legitimized the take on peacekeeping and the mandate of UNAMIR –

required a specific articulation of the status of the conflict. This position is enacted by the institution itself and its key officials, which in turn produces and legitimizes the United Nations existence. In this way, keeping to specific peacekeeping rules is a strategic calculation, designed to keep the UN away from trouble. Doing nothing could have been believed to be less dangerous for the UN's reputation than a second failed attempt at enforcing peace in a highly volatile situation. Ironically, this calculation eventually had the opposite effect. The Rwandan genocide came to stand for the failure of the United Nations to fulfil the Charter and the Genocide convention, the failure to prevent and punish the worst crimes against humanity.

Conclusion

The line of thought presented here cannot be satisfactorily addressed by a study of this length, nor can it inquire fully into the complex interplay between different discourses and contestations to the official discourse. For the sake of argument, the discourse at the UN has been presented as stable here whereas any discourse is per definition always unstable and contested on different fronts. I do not wish to imply that other constellations of the mandate and the genocide were not present at the UN Secretariat. The process of representation and discursive framing is per definition open-ended and not uniform. There was no perfect correspondence between the official representation of the UN Secretariat's thinking and their policies; while they are related, the connection is more complicated than assumed by the simpler model above. Nevertheless, this essay hopes to lift a corner of the veil on the different constructions present at the time.

It is an important political task to distinguish between various discourses while making sense of external constraints limiting the policy options in which this discourse can be promoted. Nevertheless, the functioning and representation of these constraints, and therefore subsequent policy, is entirely discursively constituted. UN staff dealing with Rwanda were confronted with a tense political atmosphere after the operation in Somalia wreaked havoc on the UN's former policy on peace operations. Somalia served as an example to juxtapose the peacekeeping mission in Rwanda and was the articulation of the reason why certain policies should be enacted and others not. Somalia was also (re)produced through these very policy discourses; Somalia was simultaneously discursive foundation and product (refer to Hansen 21). Consequently, orders given to civilian and military personnel on the ground in Rwanda

were intoxicated with the Mogadishu virus. A fear that the use of force would muster the same failure it did in Somalia caused UN policymakers to stick to a very restrictive interpretation of the mandate, often even when another, more loosely interpreted stance could have sent a warning to the militiamen and to the international community. The traditional view of peacekeeping prescribed a peace accord, cease-fire lines, use of force only in self-defence and maintaining neutrality. When Rwanda proved unwilling to respect these rules, the UN Secretariat stuck to what they knew and kept insisting on the non-use of force in giving out orders to Dallaire. In return, Dallaire's peacekeepers, often after having failed in their negotiations, never presented a viable counterforce against the armed militiamen and left the Rwandans they were supposed to protect. The Secretariat's role as informant of the Security Council proved influential during the Rwandan genocide. They failed to inform the Security Council of the tensions in Rwanda and ignored early warning signs such as Dallaire's fax and the report for the Commission on Human Rights. During the first weeks of April, the Secretariat was silent about the mass slaughter reported to them by UNAMIR and, more specifically, about the genocidal character of the killings. When they released a report on Rwanda, two whole weeks after the downing of the presidential plane, they misrepresented the violence as part of the civil war instead of genocide and failed to distinguish victim from aggressor. After the report the Council voted to withdraw all but 270 soldiers from UNAMIR. The failure to inform Council members of the situation became apparent only hours after the final vote. Non-permanent members such as New Zealand and the Czech Republic changed their minds about the withdrawal after they were informed of genocide by Médecins Sans Frontières and Human Rights Watch. This strongly implies their voting behaviour might have been different had the Secretary-General presented the genocide and the belligerents in this report.

The United Nations has shown it is capable of a considerable amount of self-criticism. The *Inquiry into the Actions of the United Nations during the 1994 genocide in Rwanda* and the *Brahimi Report* (2000) are examples of studies that sought to discern the flaws of peacekeeping after the disasters of the 1990s. Peace operations have since moved away from neutrality and towards prevention and sustainable peace. Early warning has become an important term in UN vocabulary. In 1999, the UN authorized its first peacekeeping mission with an explicit protection of civilians mandate (Schütte 217). This study seeks to have paid particular attention to the powers of the UN Secretariat; power relevant to be researched and used in today's peacekeeping operations. As an entity able to steer policy in the world's most

dangerous places, independence of the Secretariat is crucial. As this study has shown, with its discourse on the possible and the impossible, the UN Secretariat has the capability to decide where the limits of their own action lie. Discourse both limits and enables people to define their world and thus need not function as a prison; while there are no ultimate foundations to count upon, it is an important and crucial political task to prioritize particular narratives over others. Even for the international civil servant, the rules of peacekeeping are a political decision. Their decisions, structured within this discourse, wielded some dire consequences in Rwanda. UN officials thought they understood the limits of what they could do in the face of extreme political tension and exploding violence. This discourse of limitations however, caused a structural lack of independence from the discourse propounded by powerful member states and constrained the interpretation of events in Rwanda, which in turn restricted the UN's available policy options. An alternative discourse might have instigated the definition of genocide much earlier into the crisis. It would have opened up possibilities of treating the situation not in danger of becoming a second 'Somalia' or as a civil war that warranted the withdrawal of troops of the peacekeeping force. UN officials were acutely self-aware of the limits of peace operations. Indeed, so self-aware this led them away from the goals of the Charter. Their discourse allowed the UN Secretariat to legitimize a particular view of their peacekeeping options, whereas an alternative conception of their own discursive agency would have delegitimized their orders to UNAMIR; orders that effectively gave Dallaire little choice but to remain a bystander. International civil servants have an important role to fulfil as being autonomous from any government and having the possibility for independent agency. Even if there are limits to the UN's capabilities, an open-minded, independent voice from the Secretariat is crucial in the treatment of any crisis. Even if they were acutely self-aware of their role, this did not acquit them of their responsibilities bestowed upon them by the Charter.

References

UN Documents

United Nations. *Charter of the United Nations*. 24 October, 1945.

United Nations. Office of the Secretary General. *An Agenda For Peace*. A/47/277 - S/24111. 17 June 1992. Access date: 24 February 2015.

United Nations. Security Council. *Resolution on the establishment of UNAMIR*. S/RES/872, 1993. Access date: 15 February 2015.

United Nations. Office of the Secretary-General. *Special Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Assistance mission for Rwanda*. S/1994/470. 20 April 1994. Access date: 17 February 2015.

United Nations. *Report of the Independent Inquiry into the Actions of the United Nations during the 1994 genocide in Rwanda*. S/1999/1257. 15 December 1999. Access date: 20 March 2015.

United Nations Security Council. *Provisional verbatim record of the three thousand two hundred and twenty-ninth meeting*. S/PV.3229. 6 June 1993. Access date: 24 March 2015.

United Nations Security Council. *Provisional verbatim record of the three thousand three hundred and seventeenth meeting.* S/PV.3317. 18 November 1993. Access date: 24 March 2015.

Cables

Albright, Madeleine. *UN Concern over Rwanda*. Cable 00312. 24 January 1994. Access date: 24 March 2015.

Annan, Kofi. Signed by Iqbal Riza. Outgoing Code Cable on "Contacts with informant". L0001702, 11 January 1994. Access date: 20 March 2015.

Czech Mission to the UN. '*Human Rights Watch report*'. Cable 2603. April 25, 1994. Access date: 27 February 2015.

Dallaire, Roméo. Outgoing Code Cable on "Request for Protection for Informant". L0016678, 11 January 1994. Access date: 15 February 2015.

New Zealand Mission to the UN. 'Security Council: Rwanda [issue of genocide]'. Cable C04362. April 25, 1994. Access date: 27 March 2015.

Interviews

Interview with Iqbal Riza. *PBS Frontline*. No date, no interviewer listed. Access date: 17 February 2015.

Crossette, Barbara. "UN Falters in Post-Cold-War Peacekeeping, but Sees Role as Essential." *New York Times*. December 5, 1994. Access date: 16 March 2015.

Sciolino, Elaine and Paul Lewis. "Mission in Somalia: Secretary Besieged – A special report; UN Chief Has to Direct Peace Efforts at US, Too." *New York Times*. October 16, 1993. Access date: 16 March 2015.

Speeches

Address by President Bill Clinton to the UN General Assembly. 27 September, 1993. Access date: 25 March 2015.

"The Somalia Mission; Clinton's Word on Somalia: 'The Responsibilities of American Leadership". Transcript of statement by President Clinton about the United States military mission in Somalia in the *New York Times*. 8 October, 1993. Access date: 25 March 2015.

Scholarly sources

Adelman, Howard & Astri Suhrke. "Early Warning and Response: Why the International Community Failed to Prevent the Genocide". *Disasters* 20(4), 1996: 295-304.

Barnett, Michael N. *Eyewitness to a Genocide: The United Nations and Rwanda*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 2002.

Barnett, Michael N. "The Politics of Indifference at the United Nations and Genocide in Rwanda and Bosnia." *This Time We Knew: Western Responses to Genocide in Bosnia*. Ed.

Thomas Cushman and Stjepan G. Mestrovic. New York and London: New York University Press, 1996: 128-162.

Campbell, David. *Politics Without Principle: Sovereignty, Ethics, and the Narratives of the Gulf War.* Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1993.

Dallaire, Roméo. *Shake Hands with the Devil: the Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*. New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, 2004.

Des Forges, Alison. *"Leave None To Tell The Story" Genocide in Rwanda.* New York, Washington, London, Brussels: Human Rights Watch, 1999.

Durch, William J, et al. *UN Peacekeeping, American Policy, and the Uncivil Wars of the 1990s*. London: Macmillan Press, 1997.

Gordenker, Leon. *The UN Secretary-General and Secretariat*. Second edition. New York and Manchester: Routledge Global Institutions, 2010.

Hansen, Lene. *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. London & New York: Routledge, 2006.

Klinghoffer, Arthur Jay. "Review of Eyewitness to A Genocide: the United Nations and Rwanda by Michael Barnett". *International History Review* 24(4), December 2002: 983-85.

Kuperman, Alan J. *The Limits of Humanitarian Intervention: Genocide in Rwanda*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2001.

Murray, Leonie G. *Clinton, Peacekeeping and Humanitarian Interventionism: Rise and Fall of a Policy.* Oxon & New York: Routledge, 2008.

Neumann, Iver B. "Discourse Analysis." *Qualitative methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide.* Ed. Klotz, Audie & Deepa Prakash. New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Power, Samantha. *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide*. New York: Basic Books, 2002.

Rabinow, Paul (ed). *The Foucault Reader: An Introduction to Foucault's Thought.* London: Penguin, 1991.

Schütte, Raymond. *Civilian Protection in Armed Conflicts: Evolution, challenges and Implementation*. Springer VS, 2015.

Taras, Raymond C. & Rajat Ganguly. *Understanding Ethnic Conflict: The International Dimension*. New York: Longman, 2006.

Tebbs, J. *Rwanda, War and Peace?!* Nijmegen: Global Law Association, 1999.

Weiss, Thomas G. "Reinvigorating the international civil service". *Thinking about Global Governance: Why People and Ideas Matter.* New York: Routledge, 2011. Access date: 23 March 2015.

Weiss, Thomas. G. *What's Wrong With The United Nations And How To Fix It*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009.