



Perspectives Series: Research Report

Lieux de mémoire, Commemorative
Initiatives and Memorials to
Burundi's Conflicts: Invisible and
Permanent Memories

Author & Editor: Benjamin Vanderlick

Co-Author: Aloys Batungwanayo

impunity 
watch

Lieux de mémoire,
Commemorative Initiatives
and Memorials to Burundi's
Conflicts: Invisible and
Permanent Memories

impunity 
watch

Research Team

Aloys Batungwanayo

Historian and political scientist by education with a career as journalist and producer living in Burundi. He has produced many items about the history of Burundian conflicts and the African Great Lakes region. He follows the socio-political evolution of Burundi with great interest, with a focus on understanding the origins of mass violence and the transformation of conflict. An active member of Burundian civil society, he is currently interested in transitional justice processes throughout the world with a particular focus on Burundi. A human rights activist, he is secretary-general of an association working for memory and protection against international crimes.

Benjamin Vanderlick

An ethnologist and photographer based in France, he has undertaken several ethnological studies on the development of sites of memory (*lieux de mémoire*). His interests focus on how history and local heritage take 'frustrated' memories into account: memories of conflicts, social struggles, immigration and minorities. He is author of several journal articles on memory, with a particular focus on migrant populations in France. A professional photographer, he regularly organises exhibitions and artistic projects which draw on his ethnological fieldwork.

Impunity Watch

Impunity Watch (IW) is a Netherlands-based, international non-profit organisation seeking to promote accountability for atrocities in countries emerging from a violent past. IW conducts systematic research into the root causes of impunity that includes the voices of affected communities to produce research-based policy advice on processes intended to enforce their rights to truth, justice, reparations and non-recurrence. IW works closely with civil society organisations to increase their influence on the creation and implementation of related policies. IW runs 'Country Programmes' in Guatemala and Burundi and a 'Perspectives Programme' involving comparative research in multiple post-conflict countries on specific thematic aspects of impunity. The present Research Report is published as part of IW's Memorialisation Project, within the wider Perspectives Programme.

Cover photo: Benjamin Vanderlick, 2011.

Translated from French into English by Annick Pijnenburg.

't Goylaan 15
3525 AA Utrecht
The Netherlands
Tel: +31.302.720.313
Email: info@impunitywatch.org

www.impunitywatch.org

©Impunity Watch 2012

Summary of the Research

This study offers a reflection on the different ways of remembering victims of the periods of violence that Burundi has suffered since independence.

Due to concerns about social cohesion and given the difficulties surrounding attempts to deal with the past in Burundi, including the setting up of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission, the study analyses a variety of places of memory demonstrating extremely heterogeneous forms of memory initiatives.

The examples aim to offer an overview of the diverse forms that conflict has taken in Burundi but also the interest given to memory work in the different territories of the country. Indeed, a plurality of strategies exist that have been put in place to remember loved ones and to mourn the past, but also to demand justice and recognition of the facts of a particular violent episode. The case studies selected by Impunity Watch enable better comprehension of this multiplicity of memorials and forms of involvement with sites of memory. The examples take on an emblematic character in order to analyse the processes of memorialisation in Burundi since independence.

The research paid particular attention to places where large-scale massacres of civilians took place. In three localities, interviews and focus groups were organised to build case studies of three communities. Political actors, associations and civil society mobilise around these three examples of memory initiatives in order to keep memories of the past alive. However, this type of initiative remains in the minority in Burundi. In fact, at nearly all of the hundreds of sites where massacres took place there are few indications of the crimes that were perpetrated making an examination and understanding of exactly what unfolded extremely difficult. Because of this, it became necessary to also research sites where there is an absence of memorialisation. This complement enables informal, private, intimate memory initiatives to be addressed, which survivors and families of victims develop (or not) at the margins of public memory initiatives.

This research, driven by Impunity Watch, attempts to look back on the emergence of identity tensions in order to then problematise the relationship between Burundians and their national history since independence, resulting in the expression of fragmented memories. Knowledge of these elements and tracking memory initiatives related to the periods of violence that Burundi has suffered have both served as a basis for setting up a working methodology suitable for the study. Confronting this state of affairs with the testimonies collected through interviews and focus groups but also having recourse to written sources (reports, books, articles, statements and declarations by the government, political formations and civil society) enables the evolution of memorial dynamics to be established, including how they are perceived by the population. It is along this methodological path that an analysis of the forms of memorialisation in Burundi is then carried out and conclusions and recommendations are adapted to the national context.

Abbreviations

ALM Buta :	Association Lumière du Monde de Buta
ABUBU :	Abana b’Uburundi buhire dukire
AMEPCI Gira Ubuntu :	Association pour la mémoire et la protection de l’humanité contre les crimes internationaux
APDH :	Association pour la Paix et les Droits de l’Homme
AVODE :	Association des veuves et orphelins pour la défense de leurs droits
BNUB :	Bureau des Nations Unies au Burundi (anciennement BINUB : Bureau intégré des Nations Unies au Burundi)
CENAP :	Centre d’alerte et de prévention des conflits
CICR :	Comité international de la Croix Rouge
CNDD :	Conseil national pour la défense de la démocratie
CNDD-FDD :	Conseil national pour la défense de la démocratie- Forces de défense de la démocratie
CVR :	Commission Vérité - Réconciliation
FDD :	Forces de défense de la démocratie
FNL :	Front national de libération
FORSC :	Forum pour le Renforcement de la Société Civile
FRODEBU :	Front pour la démocratie au Burundi
MIPAREC :	Ministry for Peace and Reconciliation under the Cross/ Ministère pour la Paix et la Réconciliation
ONG :	Organisation non gouvernementale
PALIPESHUTU FNL :	Parti pour la libération du peuple hutu- Front national de libération
RCN :	Réseau citoyens-citizens network
UPRONA :	Union pour le progrès national

Table of Contents

<i>Summary of the Research</i>	v
Abbreviations	vi
1. “Among Burundians, We Killed Each Other”	9
1.1. 1962-2008: GROWING ETHNICISATION OF POWER AND VIOLENCE.....	9
1.2. CRIMES UNPUNISHED TO THIS DAY	10
1.3. BURUNDI ON THE PATH OF RECONCILIATION	10
1.4. UNDERTAKING MEMORY WORK.....	12
2. “WE MUST TALK ABOUT EVERYONE, NOBODY MUST BE FORGOTTEN. AVOID 1993 ON ONE SIDE, 1972 ON THE OTHER”	13
2.1. THE PROGRESSIVE FRAGMENTATION OF NATIONAL HISTORY	13
2.2. THE DRAMATIC EVENTS: THE DEFAULT BASES OF AN INFORMAL NATIONAL NARRATIVE	13
2.3. SITES OF MEMORY: FROM AN APPARENT AMNESTY TO SUPPORT FOR REMEMBRANCE OF THE PAST.....	14
3. METHODOLOGY OF THE FIELDWORK	17
3.1. THE COMPARATIVE APPROACH: MAPPING AND DOCUMENTATION.....	17
3.2. SELECTION OF LOCATIONS FOR STUDY.....	23
3.3. INTERVIEW AND FOCUS GROUP METHODOLOGY	24
3.4. ADDITIONAL INTERVIEWS	24
4. A VARIETY OF MEMORY INITIATIVES IN BURUNDI	27
4.1. MEMORY AS A POLITICAL INSTRUMENT.....	27
4.1.1. “The governor [who received a dignified burial] is remembered but the ordinary Burundian has been thrown away”	27
4.1.2. From celebrating “Great men” to celebrating civilian casualties.....	27
4.1.3. “Monuments deal with feelings, not with reconciliation”	28
4.2. THE TERMS OF EMERGENCE OF MEMORY INITIATIVES REMEMBERING CIVILIANS.....	29
4.2.1. A delayed materialisation of civil society.....	29
4.2.2. The multiplication of spontaneous forms of lasting localised emotional mobilisations.....	29
4.2.3. Local conflict-resolution experiences which structure civil society	30
4.2.4. National-level militancy for the disappeared’s right to memory.....	30
4.2.5. A memorial dynamic highly controlled by the political authorities	30
4.3. THE PERCEPTION OF INITIATIVES BY SURROUNDING POPULATIONS	31
4.3.1. When memory initiatives were perceived as a political platform	31
4.3.2. Burundians feel unequal facing memory.....	31
4.3.3. “A minister told us to forget everything. We didn’t get support to stop mourning. This history has been abandoned”	32
4.3.4. Giving every Burundian who feels the legitimate need to commemorate the opportunity to do so.....	33
4.3.5. A memory duty to the detriment of a remembrance process.....	33
5. SYNTHESIS AND ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS OBTAINED	35
5.1. AN ANALYSIS OF THE LOCAL CONFLICT SITUATION COPIED FROM EXTERNAL MODELS	35
5.1.1. On the hasty comparison of the conflict with the Second World War	35
5.1.2. The gap between the foundations of the reconciliation process and social reality.....	36
5.2. PRECAUTIONS TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT WHEN UNDERTAKING MEMORY WORK.....	36
5.3. MEMORY SUPPORTS	37
5.3.1. Dates.....	38
5.3.2. Objects.....	38
5.3.3. The places: places of life, places of disappearance.....	38
5.4. AN INTERRUPTED MOURNING PROCESS.....	39
6. AT THE HEART OF MEMORY AND RECONCILIATION INITIATIVES - MEMORY WORK. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	41
Bibliography	43
ANNEX 1	44
ANNEX 2	45
MAP OF BURUNDI	47



1. “Among Burundians, We Killed Each Other”¹

1.1. 1962-2008: Growing Ethnicisation of Power and Violence

Burundi has emerged from a long period of violent cyclical conflicts since its independence in 1962. These conflicts have witnessed people falling back on their basic identity, organised around the two main ethnic groups in the population: Hutus and Tutsis. The number of direct victims of the violence is estimated at several hundred thousand, the majority of whom were civilians. Countless other civilians have been indirectly affected by the violence.

Since independence, a range of significant dates are often mentioned by both ethnic groups, reflecting the scale of conflict in Burundi. Beginning in 1961 with the assassination of Prince Louis Rwagasore, prime minister and architect of the country’s independence, the celebration and appreciation of this political figure is one of the few objects of consensus among the Burundian population. In the years that followed his assassination division of the new nation was witnessed, marked by the ethnicisation of power, institutions and rivalries between Burundians, inherited in part from the colonial administration. This feeling is tangible within the country, where one can speak of a ‘deep ethnic division within Burundian society and mutual distrust between the two ethnic groups’.²

Among the principal violent events that spread ‘racist-type logics’³ throughout the country, we can mention in particular:

- 1965 and the attempted *coup d’état* by Hutu civilians and military accompanied by the massacre of Tutsi populations in Muramvya province, which led to the implementation of ‘exceptional measures [which] allow the side which takes the upper hand to rapidly carry out executions’⁴ of Hutu military and politicians;
- 1969 and the arrest, ‘summary’⁵ trial and condemnation (to death for some) of around 60 senior army officials and Hutu political figures accused of fomenting the *coup d’état*;
- 1972 and the organised extermination of southern Tutsis by a rebellion of extremist Hutus followed by government repression of a genocidal character against educated Hutus and members of the Hutu elite⁶ which would turn ‘ethnic division into a political strategy’⁷;
- 1988 and the massacres of thousands of civilians at Ntega and Marangara in the north of the country during the attack mounted by a Hutu rebellion against Tutsis followed by the army’s reprisals against the population; and
- 1993-2008 and the civil war which took hold of the country (known locally as the “Crisis” or *la Crise* in French) following the murder of the first elected President of Burundi, Melchior Ndadaye (FRODEBU⁸): large-scale massacres of Tutsis by Hutu populations, repression and killings orchestrated by the Burundian army with the complicity of Tutsi paramilitary militias against

¹ Impunity Watch, Focus Group, Gitega, 30 June 2011.

² UN Security Council, KALOMOH Mission: Report of the assessment mission on the establishment of an international judicial commission of inquiry for Burundi (S/2000/185), March 2005, p. 19. The report aims to “[consider] the advisability and feasibility of establishing an international judicial commission of inquiry” (Kofi Annan).

³ Jean-Pierre Chrétien & Jean-François Dupaquier, *Burundi 1972. Au bord des génocides*, Paris, Khartala, 2008, p. 29.

⁴ Ligue des droits de la personne dans la région des Grands Lacs (LDGL), *Burundi : Quarante ans d’impunité*, juin 2005, 67p., p.16.

⁵ Jean Pierre Chrétien & Jean-François Dupaquier, *op.cit.*, p. 42.

⁶ Jean Pierre Chrétien & Jean-François Dupaquier, *op.cit.*, p.9.

⁷ Martin Ndayahoze, in JP Chrétien & JF Dupaquier, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

⁸ FRODEBU (ou FRODEBU): Front pour la démocratie du Burundi/ Front for Democracy in Burundi.



civilian Hutus, multiplication and dynamism of new armies (PALIPEHUTU-FLN, FDD, FNL⁹), the last one of which officially accepted the ceasefire in 2008.

1.2. Crimes Unpunished to this Day

As noted, several hundred thousand Burundians died directly as a result of the violence during *la Crise*. To this figure must be added the hundreds of thousands of deaths resulting from ethnic tensions of a sometimes genocidal character that have sporadically affected the country since 1961.

To a large extent the violence and the innumerable massacres that took place were perpetrated against a background of international indifference. These killings have been met with almost total impunity, with no criminal trials aside from an insignificant number of exceptions, themselves violating basic human rights and due process.¹⁰ The massacres organised by those in power thus continue to enjoy impunity. Although the foundations for recognition of some of these crimes have been laid over the past ten years, no investigations have taken place to shed light on the number of victims or to establish responsibility for these human rights violations. Continuing to this day, feelings of injustice have been progressively nurtured, especially as people are confronted with the fact that none of the persecutions that they suffered have been tried.¹¹

The signing on 28 August 2000 of the Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement in Tanzania put the country on a progressive path back towards peace and reconciliation. However, the fight against impunity from the lack of prosecutions has had a timid start in Burundi. We must recall that ‘the [Arusha] Agreement specifies that major crimes cannot be the object of provisional immunity measures or amnesty’, yet the December 2004 law on the formation of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC)¹² in order to shed light on past crimes related to Burundi’s various historical crises notes that ‘the Commission may determine the political crimes for which an amnesty law could be voted’ (article 4, § 1). In addition, until the latter TRC (yet to be established) provides its conclusions, provisional immunity is granted to all implicated political and military persons and no past crime related to the different crises may be tried. To date, the persons who had been imprisoned for these crimes and who are henceforth considered as political prisoners have been provisionally released. They can stand for election and occupy executive posts within the government as well as in the provinces.

1.3. Burundi on the Path of Reconciliation

The signing of the Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement for Burundi declared the need for setting up a transitional justice process and contains the first principles towards that objective.¹³ In particular, this transitional justice process would aim to respond to victims’ right to know the truth about the painful past and also prioritise the fight against impunity in all its forms.

Additional progress in terms of recognition of past conflicts has taken place since 2000, with the announcement of the creation of a ‘Truth and Reconciliation Commission as well as a Special Tribunal for

⁹ PALIPEHUTU-FNL: Parti pour la libération du peuple hutu- Front national de libération / Party for the Liberation of the Hutu people – national liberation front. FDD: Forces pour la défense de la démocratie / forces for the Defence of Democracy. FNL: Front national de libération / national liberation front.

¹⁰ Only a few trials which concerned massacres committed in 1993 took place at the end of the 1990s.

¹¹ The convictions related to the conflict have above all taken the shape of violent reprisals organised by the army under some measure of government benevolence. However, during the civil war, before the signing of the Arusha Agreement, some Burundians were tried and executed for having taken part in the 1993 Tutsi massacres (following the murder of President Ndadaye). Moreover, some members of the rebellion have been convicted. In particular this is the case for the current president of Burundi, Pierre Nkurunziza, who was sentenced to death *in absentia* on 12 February 1998.

¹² « Law n°1/018 of 27 December 2004 on the mission, composition, organisation and functioning of the national truth and reconciliation commission », Republic of Burundi, office of the president, 2004, 7p.

¹³ Cf. Annex 1: ‘Evolution of the peace and transitional justice process in Burundi after the Arusha Agreement’.

Burundi¹⁴ in 2006 and the signing of a ‘Framework agreement’ between the government and the United Nations on the creation and definition of a ‘tripartite steering committee in charge of national consultations on transitional justice in Burundi’.¹⁵ These consultations, organised in 2009 and the results presented in a report published on 7 December 2010, effectively lay the foundations for the implementation of transitional justice mechanisms. The initiative aims, amongst other things, to:

- Set up a Truth and Reconciliation Commission;
- Share knowledge of the country’s tragic events with the whole of society;
- Identify victims and the circumstances, causes and dynamics of the acts against them in order to officially determine the truth;
- Open the way for prosecutions of those responsible and possible reparations for direct victims;
- Promote *vetting* and reform of the institutions representing obstacles to the fight against impunity in Burundi¹⁶;
- Enable the writing of a common national history; and
- Guarantee non-repetition of the crimes.

Today, the implementation of these recommendations has been declared as one of the priorities of the current term of the Burundian President.¹⁷ The international community, through the United Nations, is accompanying the process underway in Burundi through monitoring, input and advice. In particular the new mandate of the United Nations Office in Burundi (BNUB) mentions the fight against impunity and the creation of transitional justice mechanisms as key priorities.¹⁸

More recently, in May 2011, the government announced its commitment to the establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The report of the Technical Committee in charge of preparing the preliminary draft law on the TRC that followed this announcement – known as the ‘Kavakure Report’ (November 2011) – affirms the transitional justice principles noted above, formulating recommendations for an examination of the past in Burundi. As such the report reaffirms the recommendations already made since Arusha to help rewrite a history of Burundi shared by all.

Despite these official announcements, some Burundians, including elements within the government and the main political parties, fear the creation of an independent commission, capable of bringing to light their respective responsibilities in the conflicts which the country has suffered. Civil society and human rights defenders in Burundi remain attentive to the various developments surrounding the implementation of this process by the government in consultation with the UN¹⁹. Questions remain in particular about the place civil society should be accorded in the TRC, but problems also remain concerning the precise relationship between the TRC and the eventual Special Tribunal, as well as the independence of the eventual prosecutor of the Tribunal.

¹⁴ In a desire to consolidate peace and democratic governance and to promote and defend human rights and the fight against impunity, article 2.j) of Resolution 1719 of the United Nations Security Council of 25 October 2006 mandates the United Nations Integrated Office in Burundi to “Support [...] efforts to combat impunity, particularly through the establishment of transitional justice mechanisms, including a truth and reconciliation commission and a special tribunal”.

¹⁵ “Framework Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Burundi and the United Nations Organisation on the establishment of a Tripartite Steering Committee for National Consultations on Transitional Justice Mechanisms in Burundi”, Bujumbura, 2 November 2007.

¹⁶ The national consultations on implementing transitional justice mechanisms in Burundi, Republic of Burundi, report published on 7 December 2010, (119p), p.59-60 [in French].

¹⁷ Cf. « Discours de S.E. Pierre Nkurunziza à l’occasion des vœux de nouvel an 2011 », mis en ligne sur Burundi-info le lundi 3 janvier 2011: <http://burundi-info.com/spip.php?article1380> / ‘Speech of S. E. Pierre Nkurunziza on the occasion of new year wishes 2011’, online at Burundi-info on 3 January 2011.

¹⁸ Résolution 1959 of the UN Security Council of 16 December 2010.

¹⁹ For a good implementation of these mechanisms, civil society recommends a revision of law N°1/018 of 27 December 2004 on the creation of the TRC, so that it adapts its mandate, composition and bureau, cf. *Mémoire de la Société Civile pour la mise en place de la Commission Vérité et Réconciliation*, Bujumbura, December 2010.



1.4. Undertaking Memory Work

Since independence in Burundi strict control of information by those in power and silencing of discussion about the numerous massacres have largely prevailed, especially following the violence of 1972. In this respect, a commonly mentioned case of silencing took place under successive UPRONA governments²⁰ in place until the 1990s, where families of Hutu victims were strictly prohibited from recalling and publicly remembering their loved ones disappeared in 1972, who were then considered ‘traitors of the nation’.²¹

Moreover, like numerous other countries that have been subjected to self-proclaimed governments following a *coup d’état* or a long period of civil war, a large number of archives have deliberately been destroyed in Burundi. As Todorov noted about totalitarian regimes at a theoretical level, political decision-makers in Burundi at the time had ‘claimed the right to control the choice of elements to keep’²² among the information available. Other documents have also been eliminated in a massive rather than selective manner, which is the case for arsons at the offices or houses of territorial administrators.

The country’s contemporary history is therefore confronted with the conspicuous non-transmission of certain controversial events from its past and the elimination of archives as well as traces related to past conflicts. In a desire to work towards the reconciliation of Burundians, the Arusha Agreement declared the public utility of the implementation of memory initiatives in order to make up for these orchestrated omissions. It stipulates amongst other things:

- The erection of a national monument in memory of all victims of genocide, war crimes and other crimes against humanity from independence until 2000, bearing the words “NEVER AGAIN”;
- The institution of a ‘national day of remembrance for victims of genocide, war crimes and other crimes against humanity’; and
- Taking measures that would facilitate the identification of mass graves and ensure a dignified reburial of the victims.²³

The interest in memory work in the case of Burundi is considered fundamental to help the country to ‘recover the past’.²⁴

²⁰ UPRONA (or UPRONA): Union pour le progrès national / Union for National Progress, founded by Louis Rwagasore

²¹ Speech by president M. Micombero addressing the nation on 8 May 1972 published in the newspaper *Flash Infor* n°452 of 9 May 1972

²² Tzvetan Todorov, *Les abus de la mémoire*, Paris, éd. Arléa, 2004, p.15

²³ Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement for Burundi. Protocol I “Nature of the conflict, problems of genocide and exclusion and their solutions” Art. 6 “Principles and measures relating to genocide, war crimes and other crimes against humanity”/ Political principles and measures/ § 7 and 8. To date two monuments mentioning this sentence exist in Burundi in Gitega province. The first site was created in Kibimba in 1996 on the site where 74 Tutsi students were burnt to death in 1993. It was built when president Buyoya (UPRONA) returned to power. The other was built in Gitega in 2010 by the government of president Nkurunziza (CNDD-FDD). The latter is addressed to all the victims of the Burundian conflict since independence.

²⁴ Tzvetan Todorov, *Op. Cit.*, p.15.

2. “We Must Talk About Everyone, Nobody Must be Forgotten. Avoid ‘1993’ on One Side, ‘1972’ on the Other”²⁵

‘Privileged belonging can lead to crime. Crime can also create the feeling of belonging. Sometimes victims of persecution end up feeling they are members of the persecuted group, while before they had only weak links to it.’²⁶

2.1. The Progressive Fragmentation of National History

For centuries Burundi’s population has been predominantly rural, speaking the same language, occupying the same land, using the same agricultural techniques and recognising the same leadership. During the (pre-colonial) monarchy period, a princely line of descent, the Ganwa, from which Burundi’s kings descend, ruled over the population. At this time Burundians referred more often to localised clans in their region than to ethnic groups as formative of identity. These clans were not structured according to ethnicity and could, from one territory to the next, be indistinctly made up of Hutus or Tutsis. However, the country has inherited a history that has been largely written by its former colonial powers: Germany from 1890 to 1919 and then Belgium, which took over until 1962. Colonists, missionaries and later historians from this period tried until well into the 1980s to understand the country through the lens of simplistic ethnic and regional differences that included ethnic and racial stereotypes, some of which persist to this day.

Today, Burundi’s population is estimated at more than 8 million people²⁷ and remains essentially rural with approximately 290 inhabitants per square kilometre. It is largely defined by the cohabitation of three ethnic groups: Hutus, Tutsis and Twas. For Burundians who identify with these ethnic groupings,²⁸ it is estimated that the country’s ethnic distribution is composed of 84% Bahutus (Hutu ethnic group), 15% Batutsis (Tutsi ethnic group) and 1% Batwas (Twa ethnic group).

Following the country’s independence, the fact that the single party, Tutsi-dominated, UPRONA ruled without power-sharing for 30 years favoured the overrepresentation of Tutsis in all positions of power in society, under the pretence of a discourse abolishing ethnic belonging.²⁹

In an attempt to solve the problems of recurring racist violence, of policies of ethnic discrimination and the ousting of middle-class Hutus from positions of responsibility, the Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement set the principles for a new constitution for Burundi. The latter was adopted in February 2005 and henceforth recognised the existence of these three ‘historic’ ethnic groups (Hutu, Tutsi, Twa) whose representation is regulated by quotas in the country’s main institutions.³⁰ The Constitution sets the rule of equal proportion between Hutus and Tutsis within the defence and security institutions, with 50% Hutus and 50% Tutsis, and other quotas for other positions of responsibility.

2.2. Dramatic Events: The Default Bases of an Informal National Narrative

The administration of power in independent Burundi rapidly led to deteriorating social relations between members of the population. It is in this context of growing ethnicisation within political movements (overt

²⁵ Impunity Watch, Focus Group, Gitega, 30 June 2011.

²⁶ A. Grosser, *Le crime et la mémoire*, Paris, Flammarion, 1996, p.26.

²⁷ This is the figure from the 2008 national census.

²⁸ Some Burundian citizens are not taken into account in this representation. This is the case amongst others for Congolese and Asian immigrants, of fishermen and of ‘Muslim’ shopkeepers installed on the banks of Lake Tanganyika and whose language is Kiswahili.

²⁹ However, following massacres carried out by the army in 1988, President Buyoya introduced Hutu-Tutsi parity in the government. This configuration was very briefly modified when Melchior Ndadaye was elected president in 1993 through democratic elections. In October 1993, Ndadaye was assassinated and the country plunged into civil war.

³⁰ In Rwanda, on the contrary, following the 1994 genocide and in the context of a policy of fighting against ‘genocidal ideology’, the new 2003 constitution prohibits references to ethnicity in the functioning of society apart from the 1994 ‘Tutsi’ Genocide.



and clandestine) that the country witnessed purges and then massacres of an ethnic or even genocidal character in 1965, 1969, 1972, 1988, and 1991; and also during *la Crise* from 1993 to 2008.

Since the signing of the Arusha Agreement in 2000, the country's tragic events, which have long been progressively silenced, became the object of demands for recognition by civil society (displaced persons, survivors, refugees, victims' next of kin³¹). The emergence of these events in the public space in a country which does not teach its recent history (from independence to the present) has led to them becoming perceived as the main recognised landmarks in the construction of contemporary Burundian society. However, these events highlight a selective vision of Burundian post-colonial history, namely only conflict memories. Having failed to harmonise its modern history over the course of fifty years, the Burundian government, offering no teaching of this recent history, leaves younger generations to discover their national history for themselves. The oral transmission of the events within the private sphere to which younger generations must thus turn (when transmission takes place at all) has fostered the reinterpretation of the facts and a "lack of common understanding of the Burundi conflict"³² each largely based on ethnic interpretations. This phenomenon has favoured a simplified and subjective reading of the conflict, sometimes conducive to reprisals.³³

Due to preferential national policies and resentment which were manifested through violent reactions of hatred, the country witnessed the exacerbation of ethnicism and growing identity tensions. The tendency to interpret history according to one's own belonging to a particular ethnic group progressively took hold of Burundian society.

These memories linked to a tragic past, which have been cultivated and transmitted informally, are bearers of an important emotional load. They favoured the fabrication of a Hutu memory juxtaposed against (or even in opposition to) a Tutsi memory. Each of these collective memories is marked by the memory of a great number of victims whose deaths have yet to be established with certainty and therefore have not been recognised officially. The absence of debate and public recognition of the truth about these events at the national as well as the local level still persists and contributes to keeping alive the feeling of a troublesome, secular unity of the Burundian people.

2.3. Sites of Memory: From an Apparent Amnesty to Support for Remembrance of the Past

Following the Arusha Agreement, the just recognition of the tragedies of Burundi's past and the implementation of a public debate on the Burundian conflicts are now presented as a major social issue. To this end the Burundian government built a national monument in 2010 dedicated to all victims of violence, as stipulated at Arusha. The monument is located in the town of Gitega in the centre of the country bearing the words, "Never again!". And yet, given the countless massacres that have been perpetrated in Burundi there are few monuments and commemorations of an institutional character. Some local memory initiatives are now emerging, but to this day the Burundian government shows great reluctance towards accepting the creation of victims' associations. Thus, whilst it lacks any specific ministry or secretariat dedicated to victims, the government systematically blocks new claims by groups

³¹ Given the numerous deaths in the country, the study uses the term 'victims' above all to refer to persons who died during the conflict. Although being orphaned or widowed during the conflict is a ground for being considered a direct victim, we mainly use the expression 'victims' next of kin' to define this category of Burundians. We speak of 'survivors' when persons escaped death or were injured. However, we are aware that the way things developed may lead us to consider as 'survivors' the whole of the Burundian population still alive today and who lived in Burundi on territories marked by conflicts.

³² Grace Ineza, *National Debate on Memorialisation in Burundi, "Reducing Impunity or Dividing Communities?"*, Impunity Watch, Bujumbura, 20 December 2011, p. 29.

³³ "There is also a mass grave in the Kibira forest [...] we would also like these people to know why their next of kin were killed. They lost like we did. There are people behind these crimes. We know them. In 93 I was ten. I know what happened. We know who did it. Those who killed the Tutsis in 93 are the orphans of 72. It has been acknowledged. Shall we, today's orphans or victims, go back in time again, kill others to avenge the death of our beloved ones?" Individual interview in Kivuyuka, 4 July 2011.

of victims and refuses to accredit new associations using the terms ‘victim’ or ‘massacre’ who request approval. Organising new ceremonies in memory of victims is likewise subjected to government authorisations which are granted only very sparingly.

The current context in Burundi marked by declarations about the creation of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, forebodes a multiplication of these memory claims by victims. As the landscape bears few visible traces of the conflict, places of memory such as mass graves which bear witness to this tragic past constitute the only elements of proof of a history that has not been written. These sites now bear the tangible dimension of the country’s conflict narrative.

Despite the recommendations of the Burundian government and the UN to clarify these events, their implementation remains extremely sensitive. Indeed, there is a risk of escalation and competition of this type of memory which may lead to a reinforcement of society’s divisions rather than unification.³⁴ The government recalls its desire to install only one monument to commemorate all victims of the conflicts that the country suffered. However, interrogating these places where massacres took place may be a factor which triggers the demand to build memorials, monuments and other memory initiatives throughout the country.

More sensitive still, bringing up this past and creating these places of memory may increase public tensions about local histories, particularly since they may refer to events in more detail that had previously only been hinted at. The risk is that obstacles will be created to mending the local social fabric. In addition, as part of the transitional justice process, this work of remembrance implies a conciliation between, on the one hand the various private demands of victims, especially to recognise the facts, localise and bury the victims in dignity, hold official ‘end of mourning’ ceremonies, not forget, keep a trace of the events, and demand justice and reparation, and on the other hand a certain public interest which would drive local authorities to place these types of events in a civic manner in the present towards a public utility. Equally, these types of demands also require the search for documentation, a confrontation of sources, witnesses and actors, and the creation of places of memory. This process is necessary to re-adjust the truth and encourage the fight against impunity. The narratives transmitted (when they are transmitted, and in whatever way) by local authorities as well as by survivors and witnesses have indeed often been subjected to adaptations in the face of a more complex reality.

³⁴ Cf. « Régis Debray craint la concurrence des mémoires », Interview with Régis Debray by Jean-Marie Guesnois, in newspaper *La Croix* (France), 18 February 2008.



3. Methodology of the Fieldwork

The research methodology is part of an *Impunity Watch* project run simultaneously in five post-conflict countries on four continents.³⁵ The chosen ethnological approach is comparative and interpretative. The central question of this research is: ‘Do Memory initiatives have a role (positive or negative) in addressing cultures of silence that perpetuate impunity?’.³⁶ This transnational research programme focuses in particular on:

- The representation of various actors in memory initiatives;
- The relevance of memory initiatives for truth-telling in a manner that is acceptable to the Burundian population; and
- The impact these memory initiatives have on the future and upon younger generations.

As with the other research contexts, the research question has been adapted to the Burundian context. Indeed research into memorialisation and the reduction of impunity in Burundi must face the reality that processes for transmitting the country’s history remain extremely limited and the initiation of memory is equally recent and limited. Moreover, elaborating successful memory initiatives would require the involvement of Burundian civil society alongside the victims of the conflicts, supported by successive governments. However, this form of citizen organisation is still relatively recent in the country, with civil society still sometimes considered as affiliated with political parties or at other times judged by the government as representing a form of political opposition. Civil society struggles to find a legitimate place and thereby a tension exists with the government, which otherwise prevents cooperation in bringing about lasting peace in Burundi. The impact of these associations in terms of changing society also remains minimal because they are not sufficiently in touch with the whole of the Burundian population and of the victims of the various conflicts. The research was also confronted with the difficulty that it was too early to include a reflection on the impact of memory initiatives on future generations given the infancy of such initiatives.

The study therefore aims to:

- Show the different forms of memory initiatives and commemorations in the country related to the respective conflicts;
- Observe, in certain relatively heterogeneous locations, the possibilities for plural memories to express themselves with a view to elaborating a shared story; and
- Analyse the diversity of dynamics at work in society keeping memory alive and accompanying memory demands, amongst others by Burundian civil society (neighbours, survivors, associations, groups of individuals), political parties, and NGOs.

3.1. The Comparative Approach: Mapping and Documentation

According to the definition given by Impunity Watch, a memory initiative is ‘any activity which aims to enhance the understanding of a past characterised by conflict, including the operation of museums and exhibits, the erection and maintenance of memorials and monuments, the creation and observance of remembrance days, musical and theatre workshops and performances on relevant topics, the creation of associations of victims, their relatives, their communities and those who sympathise with and support them, the running of educational, awareness-raising and remembrance programmes, and the gathering of information and campaigning in relation to all of these approaches’.³⁷

³⁵ The project is run simultaneously in South Africa, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia and Guatemala.

³⁶ Cf. Annex 2.

³⁷ Impunity Watch, *Memorialisation Research Guidelines*.



Mapping and documentation of memory initiatives linked to the country's conflicts was carried out in the whole of Burundi. The study is based on this mapping.³⁸

The list presented below refers to monuments, ceremonies, associations and projects. Since historical truth work about these events suffers from severe drawbacks, this mapping must be considered as a narrative of a subjective and partial view of local conflicts. It represents the state of affairs of these national and local memory dynamics in independent Burundi and bears witness to the public celebrations which were possible at certain points in the country's history.

Presented in chronological order according to the date upon which the particular memory initiative emerged, the list provides succinct overview of the various initiatives. The study aims to document the evolution of memorial demands in Burundi by contextualising them within the country's social and political situation:

- 1961: Commemoration of the death of Prince Louis Rwagasore and construction of a mausoleum in his honour in 1967 on the hills above Bujumbura. Assassinated on 13 October 1961, Rwagasore is referred to as the 'hero of the Independence' among Burundians, officially designated in 1965. In the years thereafter, Rwagasore's memory gradually faded into national history until the late 1980s when President Buyoya reinstated the memory by the establishment of the Foundation of the Institute Rwagasore. Every year on 13 October a ceremony is held on the government's initiative which brings together 'the nation's driving forces' and the international community. This memory initiative enjoys general consensus among the population.
- 1967: Construction of a monument to Pierre Ngendandumwe, the Prime Minister of Burundi murdered on 15 January 1965. The monument is situated close to the Rwagasore mausoleum in Bujumbura. No official commemoration is organised. This political figure is claimed by the Inkinko party. Mourning takes place within this party and his family.
- 1973: The 'Monument to the Unknown Soldier' in Bujumbura, who died in an assassination attempt against President Michel Micombero. Commemorations of the soldier are political, beginning in 1973. Today the ceremonies are sporadic and observed only by a few associations who joined as the 'Framework decision for the restoration of the rule of law in Burundi' (*Accord-cadre pour la restauration d'un Etat de droit au Burundi*). However, on 29 April – the anniversary of the 1972 Tutsi massacres – the associations, Puissance d'autodéfense-Amasekanya and AC Génocide-Cirimoso, sometimes lay flowers to honour this soldier admired for his 'patriotism' and 'unforgettable sacrifice'.³⁹ The monument is regularly defaced. In July 2011, the plaque referring to the 'Monument to the Unknown Soldier' was removed.
- 6 December 1993: Funeral and creation in Bujumbura of a cemetery to President Melchior Ndadaye, his close collaborators murdered in 1993 and an 'Unknown Martyr of the events of 21 October 1993' symbolising all victims of the conflict in 1993. The remains of the governors of Bubanza and Kirundo provinces (murdered in 1993) have been added to this burial site as well as the remains of President Cyprien Ntaryamira and his entourage, who died in the plane attack over Kigali on 6 April 1994. In 2010, a monument with the bust of President Melchior Ndadaye was erected on the site upon the initiative of the CNDD-FDD government.⁴⁰ Every 21 October, members of the government, families of victims, political parties, Burundians and the international community gather on this site for a commemoration day after a mass in their memory. The Sahwanya-FRODEBU party and victims' families use this ceremony as a day to demand that the authors be

³⁸ The mapping and documentation was carried out by Aloys Batungwanayo.

³⁹ Bujumbura, 29 April 2003. Source: Net Press: www.netpress.bi.

⁴⁰ Conseil national pour la défense de la démocratie- Forces pour la défense de la démocratie / National Council for the Defence of Democracy – Forces for the Defence of Democracy.

brought to justice and punished and that reparations be made to the victims' families. This day is also organised throughout the country by the administration.

21 October 1994: Inauguration of a national holiday to remember the beginning of *la Crise* and the victims of that year's massacres. The commemoration takes place every year throughout the country.

1994: Creation of the association, AC Génocide-Cirimoso, approved by the Ministry of the Interior in 1996. The association was created in particular for recognition of the 1993 Tutsi massacres as genocide. The association, which considers that 'the duty of memory is sacred',⁴¹ organises and participates in numerous commemorations throughout the country. Since 1995 it has organised commemoration activities every 21st of the month in memory of the Tutsis who died in 1993. This initiative now takes place once a year on 21 October. AC Génocide also campaigns 'against negation and for the recognition of the 1972 Tutsi genocide'. It is in this respect that it occasionally lays flowers on the 'Monument to the Unknown Soldier'. This association participates every year in the commemorations of the immolation of the Kibimba students (1993), the massacres attributed to the CNDD-FDD rebellion against the displaced persons of Bugendana (1996) and the 'Fraternity Martyrs' of the Buta small seminary (1997).

1995: Erection of a monument in memory of 72 Hutus burnt alive at the Ruyigi bishopric in 1993. It was erected in memory of the victims who are buried in the town's cemetery. The monument was constructed at the initiative of the organisation, Maison Shalom. The commemoration takes place every 25 October. This celebration is organised by a media figure known both in Burundi and abroad, Marguerite Barankitse, known as 'Maggy'.

1995-1997: Organisation by the administration throughout the territory of symbolic 'end of mourning' ceremonies (*levées de deuil*) at the communal level to honour the 1993 Tutsi victims. These local initiatives have been supported by the association, AC Génocide- Cirimoso.

23 July 1996: Creation of a cemetery in Bugendana (Gitega province) and organisation of funerals following the massacre three days earlier (attributed to the CNDD-FDD rebellion) of 341 civilians from the displaced persons' site of Bugendana. Two days after this event, major Pierre Buyoya (UPRONA) returned to power after a *coup d'état*. Since 1996, a commemoration is observed every year around 23 July at the initiative of survivors and victims' families. The UPRONA party and the association AC Génocide associate themselves with victims' families to co-organise the commemoration of the tragedy every year.

1997: Monument in memory of the governor of Muyinga province, Fidèle Muhizi, murdered on 26 January 1995. The monument was erected after demands by UPRONA in the capital of Muyinga province. There is no public commemoration.

1998: Celebration of the massacre on 30 April 1997 of 40 students from the small seminary of Buta (Bururi province). This commemoration was carried out in a religious and political manner for ten years. In 2008, an association was formed in order to grant victims more space. Set up as the 'Association of the Buta Martyrs', it was approved in 2009 as the 'Association Lumière du Monde de Buta/ALM Buta' ('Buta Association Light of the World'). A chapel in memory of the victims was also built in 2009 next to the sepulchre and tombs where the students have been laid to rest. Every 30 April, a mass is held and flowers are laid. The ceremony gathers victims' families, survivors, members of the clergy, and sometimes the political party, UPRONA.

23 October 1997: Laying of the first stone of the monument in memory of the 74 Kibimba students in the presence of President Buyoya (UPRONA). The monument is built on the site where the

⁴¹ Cf. Site of AC Génocide: http://acgenocide.com/main/page_commmoration_mensuelle.html.



municipality's inhabitants burnt the students alive on 21 October 1993. Constructed by the Ministry of Solidarity and Human Rights, it was finished in 1999. At first it held the words, 'Never again' (*plus jamais*), which after the Arusha Agreement became 'Never again!' (*plus jamais ça!*). The Kibimba tragedy represents a materialisation and physical trace of the beginning of the massacres of the Tutsi population. On 21 October 1995, an official commemoration ceremony for the victims was held in Kibimba, attended by President Sylvestre Ntibantunganya (FRODEBU). Today, the association of Kibimba survivors (created in 1994, but not yet approved) and AC Génocide co-organise the ceremony. The start of the memorial's construction occurred three months after the execution of the ex-director of the Kibimba secondary school who had been found responsible for the killing, sentenced to death and hanged on 31 July 1997.⁴²

- 1998: Memorial to his lordship, Joachim Ruhuna, archbishop of Gitega killed on 9 September 1996 by rebels after having condemned the authors of the Bugendana massacre in July 1996. This monument is situated on a roundabout on the edge of Gitega. His lordship Ruhuna was buried by the rebels and laid to rest by the Catholic Church a week after his death. Since 1996 he rests in a cathedral of the Gitega archdiocese. The association, 'Association His Lordship Joachim Ruhuna, Good Priest' was created and approved in 1999, and in 2003 it became the 'Foundation His Lordship Joachim Ruhuna, Good Priest' (approved in 2005). This foundation seeks to continue the archbishop's work especially for underprivileged children (including orphans and victims of conflict) as well as for peace education.⁴³ The foundation is in charge of maintaining the memorial. Every year, on 9 September, it organises a mass in memory of his lordship Ruhuna and lays flowers on his tomb and by the monument.
- 2001: *Inkingi z'ubuntu* ('The Heroes of Humanity') radio programme was realised by the international NGO, Search for Common Ground and broadcast from 2001 to 2005 on Radio Isanganiro and Radio Bonesha FM. A series of reports in Kirundi were broadcast throughout the country in order to show acts of solidarity across the ethnic divide that saved numerous lives. In 2005 these 'heroes of humanity' were decorated by Domitien Ndayizeye's government, represented by his vice-president. Later, from 2007 to 2010, Radio Isanganiro and Search for Common Ground co-produced *Ukuri gutegura kazoza* ('Truth Prepares the Future'), a radio programme which aims to give a voice to all Burundians so as to offer elements of understanding about transitional justice. It was also broadcast by Radio Bonesha FM and Radio Isanganiro.
- 2002: Approval of the Widows and Orphans Association for the Defence of their Rights (*Association des veuves et orphelins pour la défense de leurs droits*) (AVODE). Following the signing of the Arusha Agreement in 2000, wives and orphans of politicians murdered during the 1993 crisis took the initiative to form an association to defend their rights. AVODE campaigns for the recognition of their rights as well as for rehabilitation after justice and organises awareness-raising workshops about their rights. In 2010 and 2011, AVODE initiated the exhumation and dignified reburial of the governors of Gitega and Karuzi, as well as the ex-administrator and head of the Busoni zone in Kirundo, all of which were murdered in 1993.
- 2005: Construction, with the authorisation of the governor of Gitega, in Itaba of a monument in memory of approximately 200 civilian victims⁴⁴ killed by the army in the municipality of Itaba on 9 September 2002. Its construction under the Sahwanya-FRODEBU government occurred after the temporary immunity granted to all Burundian political prisoners and the liberation of the presumed authors of the massacre. The monument is situated near a Tutsi site of displaced

⁴² Amnesty international, *Burundi: Justice on trial*, ref. AFR 16/13/98, report of 30 July 1998, 51p., p.31.

⁴³ « Fondation Mgr Ruhuna, Bon Pasteur » / Fondation His Lordship Joachim Ruhuna, www.fondationruhuna.org.

⁴⁴ According to Amnesty International between 173 and 267 civilians died in this massacre.

persons. The families of victims sporadically commemorate the massacre to demand reparation and condemnation of the authors.

16 November 2005 : Construction of a memorial to ‘Freedom fighters’ next to the main road between Bubanza and Bujumbura (Mpanda municipality), in memory of 14 combatants of the CNDD-FDD movement, killed in Kibira on 8 January 1997 by a secessionist branch of the CNDD, the CNDD-Nyangoma. This monument was erected a few months after the CNDD-FDD came to power. The site is composed of a cross mentioning the date the monument was built (16 November 2005) and the slogan *Ntihica Ubwoko, hica ubutegetsu ubi* (‘It is not ethnicity that kills, it is bad leadership’). Commemoration took place in the first two years after its construction but has now ceased.

2005-2008: *Si Ayo Guhora* (‘It mustn’t be kept silent’) / *Habuze Iki?* (‘What was missing?’) / *Burundi simba imanga* (‘Burundi, get over the rift’). Participative theatre plays set up by the international NGO, RCN Justice et Démocratie). Involving some 20 Burundian actors, the plays were performed in the national language (Kirundi) throughout Burundi on public squares, municipalities, hills and prisons.

2006: Creation of the association, *Abana b’Uburundi buhire dukire* (ABUBU) (‘Association of Burundian victims of the Dictatorship for the localisation and exhumation of mass graves in Burundi’). Approved in 2007, ABUBU finds its origins in the recommendations of the Arusha Agreement. The association notably runs the project ‘We Want to Heal’ which aims to defend the rights to community healing of disappeared persons and families of victims of collective massacres. Since 2010, it organises the commemoration in Burundi of the International Day of the Disappeared on 30 August.

2009: End of Mourning by President Pierre Nkurunziza for his father who disappeared in 1972 as well as six other families from the Buye hill (Mwumba municipality, Ngozi province). These ceremonies were held nearby the parish after a mass in memory of the disappeared which was attended by their families and numerous key figures invited for the occasion. The event was broadcast on television, radio and in newspapers.

2010: Creation of the association, *AMEPCI Gira Ubuntu* (‘Association pour la mémoire et la protection de l’humanité contre les crimes internationaux’) (‘Association for the memory and protection of humanity against international crimes’), approved in January 2011. The association is constituted of Tutsi and Hutu youth who want to know the truth about the history of the Burundian conflict out of concern for justice, truth and reconciliation. It supports activities based on memory, such as commemorations and reparation and seeks to transcend the ethnic divide. In 2010 and 2011m the association organised a week of activities on collective commemoration around the events of 1972. In 2011, it also co-organised the mass and commemoration ceremony of the massacre of the students of Buta and the university of Burundi (Bujumbura).

2010: Production of the documentary, ‘Traiter du passé et construire l’avenir’ (‘Dealing with the past and constructing the future’) by the Burundian NGO, CENAP (‘Centre d’Alerte et de prévention des conflits’) (‘Centre for the Alert and Prevention of conflicts’). This documentary was produced based on interviews held throughout the country and with the Burundian diaspora. These testimonies examine the Burundian conflict from the perspective of lasting reconciliation. The film was broadcast by national television channels in 2010 and 2011.

July 2010: Dignified burial ceremony for the governor of Karuzi, Anglebert Sentamo and his two children, and the governor of Gitega, Joachim Nurwakera, murdered on 22 October 1993 in the house of the Karuzi governor. One was Hutu, the other Tutsi, while both were members of the FRODEBU

party. Their assassination is attributed to survivors of the massacres of the Tutsi population in Karuzi (on 21 October 1993). Four tombs were created in the yard of the governor's house upon the initiative of the victims' families and AVODE. This ceremony was held after the government authorised the exhumation of the bodies. Like many victims of the 1993 massacres, they had been dumped in latrines. The government, represented by the Minister for Human Rights, Gender and National Solidarity, a plurality of political parties and some associations participated in the burial ceremony.

October 2010: Local mobilisation in Kivyuka (Musigati municipality, Bubanza province) around a mass grave at risk of being destroyed by the construction of the Bubanza-Ndora road. Creation of an association first named, 'Association of the survivors of the Kivyuka massacres', where approximately 400 civilians were killed by the army at the Kivyuka market on 3 May 1996. The association was denied accreditation and was renamed, 'Association for solidarity and respect of human dignity' (awaiting approval). Since 2010, the association has documented testimonies of survivors and has campaigned for a public commemoration to be held. In May 2011, the firm constructing the road agreed to bypass the mass grave. However in January 2012, during the accidental unearthing of remains, the local association of victims of the massacre supported by AMEPCI, organised a local event and asked the press to challenge the provincial and national government about this massacre. For one of the first times in Burundi, the remains from a mass grave were presented by the Burundian people, photographed and widely reported in the press.

2010: National monument in memory of all the victims of the Burundian conflicts since independence. Built close to the city centre of Gitega on the road from Karuzi, this site comprises a large park and a monument which bears the words 'Never again!'. The various weapons and arms responsible for the massacres are depicted at its summit, including a Kalashnikov, machete, bamboo spear, bow, arrow and bludgeon. Its erection corresponds to the provisions of the Arusha Agreement (2000) and it was built upon the government's initiative and completed in 2010. However, the monument is yet to be officially unveiled. No ceremony or commemoration has yet taken place at the site.

Numerous Burundian organisations also exist whose respective projects deal with memorialisation:

- APDH (Association pour la Paix et les Droits de l'Homme ('Association for Peace and Human Rights'), created in 1995 in Ngozi and approved in 1998. Since 2006 APDH coordinates projects for the reestablishment of community dialogue and offers its expertise in the field of action research.
- MIPAREC (Ministère pour la Paix et la Réconciliation) (Ministry for Peace and Reconciliation under the Cross), created in 1996 in Gitega and approved in 2000, the organisation is committed to changing passive behaviour regarding Burundi's conflicts by promoting exchange, reflection and the values of peace, restorative justice and development. In particular, between 2000 and 2003, it held truth and reconciliation sessions between victims and perpetrators based on confessions of mutual wrongs during the 1993 crisis and the massacres that followed.
- CENAP (Centre d'Alerte et de prévention des conflits) ('Centre for the Alert and Prevention of conflicts') approved in 2001. An independent, Burundian research centre that undertakes research and carries out audio-visual projects on the evolution of Burundi's conflicts.

A number of memory initiatives from this list were selected as case studies for the research. Focus groups and individual interviews were held around these initiatives.

3.2. Selection of Locations for Study

Out of concern for representation and in light of the issues that exist concerning the implementation of a truth and reconciliation process in Burundi, the locations selected for the research have in common that they remember large-scale civilian massacres. The study chose to analyse places where memory initiatives, demands for justice and memory projects are still active. Moreover, the research examined locations where a plurality of trigger elements (proximate causes) of violence and actors were involved. The following initiatives were thus examined:

- The creation of the cemetery and commemorations since 1996 of the victims of the Bugendana displaced persons' site by their next of kin, with the involvement of the political authorities in place during *la Crise*;
- The emergence in 2010 of the mobilisation and organisation of an association in Kivyuka to prevent the destruction of mass graves and to document and remember the massacre at the Kivyuka market on 3 May 1996; and
- The construction in 2010 in Gitega of the national monument in memory of all the victims of the Burundi's conflicts by the Burundian government.

Each initiative was chosen according to its interest in representing a large diversity of issues and the implications of the method of memorialisation. In addition, atrocities committed against the civilian population by the army as well as the rebels are represented. These three examples also question the possible definition of a place of memory, since they denote mass graves and a displaced persons' site to a market square, cemetery or a place created *ex nihilo*. These three examples further question which forms of commemoration are possible, the degree of involvement of the Burundian population around an initiative, the involvement of civil society and the role of political authorities. They offer a diversified interpretative framework in order to propose an analysis of memory processes of the Burundian conflicts since independence.

Beyond these experiences, which are definite manifestations of memorialisation, a multitude of locations around Burundi can take on a symbolic character as places of memory although no memory initiatives exists at these sites. Questioning this type of territory enables the analysis to be infuse with greater comprehension that is necessary in the context of this research. Indeed, throughout the territory, the implementation of the recommendations set out in the Arusha Agreement, such as the TRC, may well lead to new localised groups who wish to mourn and reclaim truth, justice and even reparations. Therefore it is important to understand the various memorialisation dynamics.

Interviews were therefore held on Kizi hill and in the municipality of Gasorwe (Muyinga province) as a representation of this absence of a tangible memory initiative. On this territory, mass killings in 1995 had been reported by the international media.⁴⁵ The inhabitants remember these tragic events which nonetheless descended into oblivion once the cameras had left. No commemoration are held but the memory of the conflict and especially of this massacre is still alive. Like numerous other Burundians heavily affected by massacres perpetrated on the numerous *collines*, the context of promoting reconciliation could lead these survivors and victims' next of kin to resurrect this past. The commemoration of local events is thus a possible entry point.

⁴⁵ Peter Smerdon: "400 Reported Massacred in Burundi", in *The Moscow Times*, 5 April 1995; AFP dispatch: "L'Ambassadeur américain à Bujumbura témoigne: quelque 400 Hutus massacrés au Burundi ces dernier jours" in *Le Soir*, Bruxelles, 4 April 1995: [http://archives.lesoir.be/l-ambassadeur-americain-a-bujumbura-temoigne-quelque-40_t-19950404-Z09CDK.html]; Reuter Dispatch: "Kizi, nord du Burundi", 4 April 1995.



3.3. Interview and Focus Group Methodology

For each site, information was gathered in advance of the on-site and fieldwork. The fieldwork in the locations chosen for in-depth study was carried out in the form of individual interviews and focus groups both proceeding according to a semi-structured methodology. This methodology was developed by *Impunity Watch* in order to ensure comparativeness of the findings across the five research countries that form part of the wider project, but the adapted to the Burundian context. Respondents were asked to define and express their understanding, needs and expectations regarding key notions including truth, justice, memory of the past, memory initiatives and the construction of a shared story.

Each focus group brought together a maximum of twelve participants, inhabitants of the respective localities, selected according to their membership of target groups previously defined by *Impunity Watch*. To the extent possible, survivors and victims' families, persons living in close proximity to the sites of memory, representatives of displaced persons' sites, demobilised persons and community leaders were represented (when this diversity existed in the particular locality). Moreover, attention was paid to ensuring that, insofar as possible, a mixed audience in terms of profession, social background, age, ethnic group and gender were brought together. With respect to local administrators and official representatives of at the *colline* and municipality levels, individual interviews were favoured. Some individual interviews were also held following the focus groups with participants whose particular contributions were of interest to the study.

In the focus groups, the perception of and involvement in memory initiatives, the different victims in the locality and the different discourses existing about each of the places selected for the fieldwork were extensively questioned. The discussions sought to understand the relation of each inhabitant with memory initiatives to remember events which affected them closely or remotely, such as places, objects, dates and seasons. The purpose was also to question the processes of recognition of this violence, whether undertaken by victims' groups, associations, NGOs, different governments or representatives of those in power.

3.4. Additional Interviews

As a complement to the documentation and fieldwork, the research and analysis were supported by interviews with representatives of certain Burundian associations and researchers involved in memory and reconciliation issues. The following persons were thus interviewed:

Nairi Arzoumanian, Doctor of public law and consultant currently based in Burundi.⁴⁶

Godefroid Manirankunda, leader of the Burundian association *Abana b'Uburundi buhire dukire* (ABUBU), which works to locate and towards the exhumation of mass graves.

René Claude Niyonkuru, consultant and founding member of the Association for peace and human rights (Association pour la paix et les droits de l'homme - APDH).

It should be acknowledged that certain discourse during the research and which was raised during the focus groups - and sometimes the individual interviews - are likely influenced by some fifteen years of emergency programmes, assistance and development aid, as well as reconciliation projects undertaken by various international humanitarian organisations in Burundi. These initiatives have disrupted relations between the population and NGOs, for example whereby certain answers given by participants are grounded in the representations and aspirations which the Burundian population projects onto outside actors. This feeling is reinforced by the fact that it is now becoming nearly impossible to hold interviews with the population on the ground without offering financial compensation to those interviewed.

⁴⁶ Nairi Arzoumanian has in particular carried out a study in 2011 for the International Committee of the Red Cross in Burundi on the medical-legal context of the discovery of 'unidentified mortal remains' in Burundi.

Therefore one must clearly understand how NGOs are perceived. This perception can be summed up in the following way: “He came because of his work. He didn’t come because of our misfortune”.⁴⁷ Indeed, it seems that it is not simply the population that demands work towards the truth in Burundi but rather also international and local organisations. The latter of course seek to realise the declarations of the Burundian government and the international community agreed upon since Arusha.

⁴⁷ Interview with René Claude Niyonkuru, Bujumbura, July 2011.

4. A Variety of Memory Initiatives in Burundi

4.1. Memory as a Political Instrument

4.1.1. “The governor [who received a dignified burial] is remembered but the ordinary Burundian has been thrown away”⁴⁸

A chronological reading of the initiatives identified in Burundi reveals a certain degree of diversity in the tensions and the issues dealt with by memory initiatives, but also certain identifiable phases of memorialisation.

The first phase took place in the context of independence and establishment of monuments to heroes to strengthen the young nation. The ‘great men’ are thus celebrated through mausoleums: Prince Rwagasore and Prime minister Ngendandumwe but also, in 1973, president Micombero, victim of a failed assassination attempt which killed one soldier. With the erection of the ‘Monument to the Unknown Soldier’, the government chose, one year after the 1972 massacres committed by the army, not to mention the soldier’s name so as to only have his this body symbolically representing the nation’s defence, henceforth celebrated for his courage and dedication in the face of threats of public unrest to which he fell victim. As noted, the monument is however highly politicised.

The revival of memory initiatives after a period during which few new initiatives were established began in 1993 following the murder of the first democratically elected president. Directly inspired by previous initiatives, a cemetery-mausoleum was created where President Ndaye, members of the government and an ‘unknown martyr of the events of 21 October 1993’ who were victims of the violence that marked the commencement of *La crise* (civil war) are laid to rest. No mention is made of ethnic affiliation and the Burundian people are again anonymously represented.

During the civil war, a few burials, the placing of plaques and the erection of monuments paying tribute to political figures and religious victims of the conflict were undertaken. These initiatives are extremely rare and take place only when the victim’s body or remains are discovered and identified. This is the case for his lordship Joachim Ruhuna in Gitega, President Cyprien Ntaryamira and the governor of Muyinga province, Fidèle Muhizi. These victim initiatives, to be compared with that of Prime Minister Ngendandumwe, seem to take place within a context of a certain indifference by the Burundian population which is nevertheless of course personally affected by the deadly events.

4.1.2. From celebrating “Great men” to commemorating civilian casualties

In the context of the civil war, scattered initiatives were also implemented with the evident aim of offering a context for the remembrance of certain mass civilian massacres. These initiatives were approved by successive governments from 1995, who demonstrated greater propensity for memorialisation and condemnation when their own responsibility was not engaged. In view of the number of massacres of this kind that the country has witnessed, these initiatives are nonetheless extremely limited. The following massacres have nevertheless been officially recognised through memory initiatives:

- The Kibimba massacre on 21 October 1993;
- The initiative to the survivors of the Tutsi massacre in the diocese of Ruyigi on 21 October 1993;
- The initiative to inhabitants of the displaced persons’ site of Bugendana in 1996 and students of the Buta seminary in 1997; and

⁴⁸ Impunity Watch, Focus Group, Gitega, 30 June 2011.

- The massacre of villagers in Itaba in 2002 for which the government dissociates itself from the atrocity committed by the army.

4.1.3. “Monuments deal with feelings, not with reconciliation”⁴⁹

In the 2010 report on the ‘National Consultations on the establishment of transitional justice mechanisms in Burundi’, only 3.96% of Burundians were opposed to the ‘construction of monuments to the victims.’ However, victim monuments will likely become very quickly the source of local conflict.

Political changes are favourable contexts for the organisation of new commemorations and the construction of new monuments, with the incumbent authorities keen to leave behind tangible traces of its term in power - material (monuments) as well as immaterial (commemorations). Only very few monuments succeed in signifying the unification of Burundians in the eyes of the people. In this sense, the ‘Monument of National Unity’, built at the beginning of the 1990s at the time of the policy of national unity and reconciliation implemented by President Buyoya, still faces much reluctance among the population, relayed by former and current political opponents of UPRONA.⁵⁰ In the same way, the project for a national monument to all victims in Gitega,⁵¹ established before the end of the CNDD-FDD’s first presidential term in 2010, led to debates and criticism from the political opposition and civil society. Although it complies with the recommendations contained in the Arusha Agreement and a desire shared by the majority of Burundians, the monument is widely criticised by the Burundian population who consider the monument too impersonal and in no way enabling them to mourn the dead. The pedagogical team from a nearby school has its doubts about the message carried by the monument, stating that “it is a monument with only weapons”.⁵² Representing violence rather than the victims and reconciliation, its detractors sarcastically refer to the monument as the “CNDD-FDD party office”.⁵³

Since the civil war victims and martyrs are memorialised through the creation of places of memory (monuments, graves, plaques, cemeteries, crosses) or by organising commemorative gatherings, as well as an implicit condemnation of the perpetrators of violence. The memory initiatives in which successive governments take part face difficulties in overcoming the ethnic divide which took hold of society. In addition, the celebration of victims is subject to manipulation, local and family dramas used by the regime to consolidate popular support. The monuments testify to murderous acts rooted in their conflictive contexts. They are expositions (impositions) of a permanent truth within a local population. This way of celebrating the dead encounters problems shared by the relatives of victims and their neighbours. These initiatives are not intended to bring people together, to stimulate debate and to provide space for meeting with the Other. Moreover, the celebration of victims is instrumentalised and hijacked by those in power in order to consolidate their popular support. We thus see:

- The laying of the first stone of the memorial dedicated to the victims of the Kibimba school massacre on 23 October 1997 by President Buyoya;
- Collective ‘end of mourning’ ceremonies organised by the government for the victims of 1993 in several displaced persons’ sites;
- The hostile welcome of President Sylvestre Ntibantunganya (FRODEBU, predominantly Hutu) in July 1996 by the survivors of the Bugendana displaced persons’ site (of 1993) when he went to the site three days after the tragedy to condemn the rebel attack and offer his condolences;

⁴⁹ Impunity Watch, Focus Group, Gitega, 30 June 2011.

⁵⁰ The Monument of Unity is built on a site now protected. However, today other actors regularly cast covetous glances at this space. It is encroached upon by construction projects: www.iwacu-burundi.org/spip.php?article282.

⁵¹ The monument bears the sentence “Never again!” as provided in the Arusha Agreement.

⁵² Interview with the civics professor of the social school Ecoso of Gitega, 30 June 2010.

⁵³ Impunity Watch, Focus Group, Gitega, 30 June 2010.

- The construction in 2005 by the Gitega provincial administration of a monument in Itaba, nearby the municipality's (Tutsi) displaced persons' site, as a tribute to the civilian victims of 2002.⁵⁴ This initiative took place after the liberation of the presumed authors of the massacre; and
- The construction in Mpanda, when the CNDD-FDD came to power in 2005, of a monument paying tribute to the 'Freedom Fighter' victims of a deadly internal power struggle between different CNDD sections.

4.2. The Terms of Emergence of Memory Initiatives Remembering Civilians

4.2.1. A delayed materialisation of civil society

The prohibition imposed on families against remembering the victims of 1972 on the ground that the deceased were traitors prevented any mobilisation of civil society until the arrival of democracy in 1993. Structured initiatives coming from civil society appear in this complex context of freedom of expression but also of civil war, with weakened authorities in power (transitional governments succeeded one another after Ndadaye's death and the Tutsi massacres). From 1993, some non-governmental actors were gradually allowed to organise or associate themselves with initiatives commemorating dramatic events recognised and condemned by the authorities.

The list of identified initiatives cited above shows a multiplication of institutional commemorations of civilian victims which gather representatives from the authorities, non-governmental associations, survivor groups, victims' families and next of kin, but at times also religious congregations who fell victim to the violence.

4.2.2. The multiplication of spontaneous forms of localised emotional mobilisations

The ethnic identity dimension of the massacres favoured the creation of civilian associations whose gatherings took place in a reassuring manner, among victims' next of kin who shared the same tragedies, ethnic belonging and similar tormentors. The discourses these associations developed present a simplified, ethnicised and inaccurate view of the massacres, victims and authors. This unconscious strategy of remembering one's next of kin in closed circles represents an obstacle to reconciliation within a village community whose members killed each other. This manner of organising memory initiatives perpetuated to a large extent the feeling that society is divided, sharing an ethnic destiny, where the custodians of this memory would indistinctly be survivors, families and friends of victims, and by extension the political and members of the ethnic group affected by the tragedy. The inhabitant who has not been affected by the massacre then becomes excluded: "I never go where people commemorate in Bugendana. It was never explained to me. With the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, we'll be more at ease to talk about this".⁵⁵ This form of structuring is therefore favourable to the consolidation of ethnic cohesion and bolstering some measure of dependence by the population on the political groups without whom no demands seem possible. In reality what may prevail at commemorations is intimately "staying among ourselves". Indeed, a Kibimba survivor indicates that, "in Kibimba, we commemorate 21 October. It's allowed. It's being done. We commemorate in an isolated manner, amongst ourselves. Some don't have this chance because they don't know where their next of kin are buried."⁵⁶ Until the end of the civil war, for the rare civilian massacres for which commemorations are held, relatively intimate ceremonies were thus organised, although not devoid of a strong political dimension and in a symmetric manner (according to political alternations). As the conflict is barely coming to an end, victims' demands, asking for recognition of the facts, reparations, trial of the perpetrators and construction of monuments, therefore also appear premature to the government.

⁵⁴ This concerns a massacre committed by the army against the Hutu population which had previously been presented as rebels.

⁵⁵ Impunity Watch, Focus Group, Bugendana, 29 June 2011.

⁵⁶ Impunity Watch, Focus Group, Gitega, 30 June 2011.

Ethnic massacres affecting religious institutions do not quite fit this configuration. The latter, which also advocate the notion of pardon, benefit from symbolic authority and some measure of independence from power. In Ruyigi, Buta and Gitega, they could thus claim freedom of action to organise funerals and ceremonies for their victims.

The public recognition of a few rare massacres resulted in the authorisation for victims' next of kin and survivors to gather to commemorate the particular tragedy, remember their next of kin who died and build monuments. This is the case for the Buta seminarians, the Gitega archdiocese, survivors and next of kin of victims from the Kibimba secondary school, the Ruyigi diocese, the Bugendana displaced persons' site and the village of Itaba.

4.2.3. Local conflict-resolution experiences which structure civil society

This institutional recognition of certain events also offered favourable conditions for creating associations working for pacific conflict resolution and assisting Burundians in situations of vulnerability (victims of violence, widows, orphans, refugees). Thus, in parallel to associations of victims' next of kin, new public actors are constituted who question, with some distance, the country's divisions. Each one finds its origins in an event, a local or personal experience during the civil war. Their humanist approach, their taking into account of the country's history, the reflection, collection of testimonies and public character of their initiatives lead us to consider these actions as participating in the country's memory dynamic. This is the case for the dialogue club of students from the Ngozi Don Bosco secondary school which gave birth to the Association for Peace and Human Rights (l'Association pour la Paix et les Droits de l'Homme – APDH), the Ministry for Peace and Reconciliation and the association which became the His lordship Joachim Ruhuna Foundation for underprivileged children and peace education.

Within this dynamic favouring reconciliation by writing a common history, projects which mobilise mediation and communication widely accessible to the population also emerge. This is the case for the Radio Isanganiro and theatre projects organised with the international NGOs, Search for Common Ground and RCN-Justice and Democracy in 2000 and, recently, of the movie 'Dealing with the past and constructing the future' by CENAP.

4.2.4. National-level militancy for right to memory of the disappeared

It is the same institutional recognition of a few massacres and dramatic events of Burundian contemporary history which enables certain associations to associate themselves with official ceremonies and organise commemorations, such as AC-Génocide, AVODE, ABUBU and AMEPCI Gira Ubuntu. An evolution can be observed here in the organisation of commemorations. The different reconciliation initiatives engaged since the civil war serve as basis for less militant and more scientific claims.

4.2.5. A memorial dynamic highly controlled by the political authorities

However, dealing with the country's conflictive and extremely violent past is a sensitive issue for the government which demonstrates reluctance towards the setting up of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The deadly and instable political context of the civil war led to the creation, in a highly emotional context, of some isolated memory initiatives. In this respect political changes have been propitious moments for creating new memory initiatives based on collectives of massacre survivors and victims' next of kin. The Kibimba memorial and ceremonies and the Itaba commemoration are examples of these policies. The national monument for all victims of the conflict built in 2010 in Gitega by the CNDD-FDD government seeks to offer an alternative to the monument-cemeteries restricted to one massacre and one ethnic group. Nevertheless, by building this initiative, it reproduces the tradition of its predecessors' by imposing yet another monument on the country's territory.

Today, faced with the scale of the massacres in the country, it is difficult and contrary to the government's policies to see the multiplication of initiatives for all the forgotten victims of violence. The memory

dynamic coming from civil society is met with apprehension by the Burundian authorities. Indeed, through one of their representatives, the authorities declared that in future “associations which bear victims’ names will never again be [approved] because [the authorities] don’t know how to handle them. These names do not concur with the current government’s objectives, which include reconciliation”.⁵⁷ Currently, demands from civil society to ‘end mourning’ and exhume mass graves are thus deemed too “emotive”⁵⁸ and are systematically denied. Civil society is aware of the current political orientation and hardly seeks to structure itself around these issues. Some events may however trigger the sudden emergence of civil society mobilisation, such as imminent threats of destruction of known mass grave sites since such destruction would forever preclude a traditional end of mourning as they take place in Burundi. This was the case for the community of Kivyuka in 2010 where the population alerted the authorities and civil society to the modernisation project of the Bubanza-Ndora road which would have destroyed a 1996 mass grave. The request to avert the construction received a negative response from the government. Nonetheless, the inhabitants created an association, undertook the identification of victims and addressed the public construction firm which listened to them and decided to modify its original route and thus preserve the site.

The government nevertheless sometimes authorises some new events by associations (AMEPCI, AVODE) in which it is represented. In parallel, certain members of the government have obtained an exceptional authorisation to hold end of mourning ceremonies.

Thus, today commemoration and memory initiatives continue to be organised only with the approval of the highest political authorities.

4.3. The Perception of Initiatives by Surrounding Populations

4.3.1. When memory initiatives were perceived as a political platform

Since the civil war, memory initiatives for massacre victims have led to some local burial ceremonies. For the next of kin of those who disappeared and survivors, the possibility to undertake this act enables them to give the dead a dignified burial as would be the case for persons dying in ‘normal’ circumstances. In the rare cases where such ceremonies take place, there exists a gap between paying attention primarily to the dead and the effective form they take. Given their dramatic character, political forces and the government (amongst others) are often present to show their compassion, when survivors and victims’ next of kin accept them. The coming to Bugendana of the Hutu-affiliated Burundian President to express his solidarity and emotion and offer his condolences to Tutsi survivors and next of kin was felt as a provocation. The Director of the Gitega social school thus notes that “an end of mourning is something intimate, for the family. A monument, however, is public by definition”.⁵⁹ The ceremonies mapped in this study show that the simple context of remembrance is frequently exceeded and that memory initiatives are charged with a public and political dimension where the ethnic divide and divisions within the village community are in effect reinforced.

4.3.2. Burundians feel unequal facing memory

Thus, whether in Bugendana since 1996, in Kibimba since 1997, or in Itaba since 2005, the official ceremonies paying tribute to victims are not perceived as reconciliatory initiatives by the population. On the contrary, commemoration is understood as a reminder to the population living nearby the massacre site of its non-intervention or even complicity with the perpetrators. What is remembered are the local

⁵⁷ Interview with Evariste Nsabayumva, chief of staff of the Minister of the Interior, February 2011.

⁵⁸ The director of territorial administration of the Ministry of the Interior declared at the “Workshop on mortal remains and forces disappearances” organised at Bujumbura by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) on 5 July 2011: “There are demands [...] If we could wait a little for this TRC, we might be able to get out of this situation. As regards mass graves, there are too many passions, so we have to freeze [demands], it’s better”.

⁵⁹ Interview with Jean-Berchmans Ntezahorirwa, Director of the Gitega social school (Ecoso), 30 June 2011.



tensions which made it possible for the inhabitants of the same territory to turn their backs on each other and turn to violence. Indeed, the massacre narratives highlight the presence, alongside the army or rebellion, of civilian populations living on the territory who contributed to the atrocities.

Large-scale killings moreover highlight the vicious circle in which Burundi found itself. Some killings were carried out as a response to violent acts on a smaller scale, others led to reprisal actions against the presumed perpetrators among close neighbours, assimilated with the authors, namely the members of the other ethnic group present on the territory. This phenomenon is repeated both in the short- and long-term. Some Burundians explain the 1993 Tutsi massacres as the 1972 survivors' and orphans' revenge. Other testimonies mention that during the military operations which sought to neutralise the rebellion in the hills during the civil war, survivors of the 1993 Tutsi massacres, organised in militias, participated in the massacres as revenge for their real or presumed tormentors. Immediate reprisals against civilians following the rebel attacks took place. This was the case after the Kibimba killings in 1993, with one survivor indeed retelling that, "People think only we are victims. In Kibimba there are also mass graves with 180 people. But recalling that, it's not allowed".⁶⁰ Likewise, the construction of the monument in memory of the massacre of the Itaba villagers in front of the displaced persons' site is considered a provocation for the 1993 Tutsi survivors who live there without any monument dedicated to them. The reprisals against the population that remained after the Bugendana massacre of 20 July 1996 or the sabotage of a mast in Kivyuka (triggering the killings of 3 May 1996) have therefore not been the object of any form of recognition.

Agreeing to the celebration of the pain suffered by some is perceived as a downgrading of the tragedy suffered by others. It can be observed that some territories where memory initiatives do not seem possible cast covetous glances at other territories where initiatives have been established. Inequality as regards memory processes arouses the feeling among certain communities that their claims as victims have been relegated, their territory seeming less important than other where ceremonies can be held and a monument has been erected.

4.3.3. "A minister told us to forget everything. We didn't get support to stop mourning. This history has been abandoned"⁶¹

Whereas the Burundian conflicts affected the civilian population according to ethnicity, we observe a deadlock in terms of reconciliation when memory initiatives are proposed according to this categorisation. While it appears essential and legitimate for next of kin to be able to mourn, the authorities have often limited themselves to authorising these actions and participating in them rather than proposing alternative initiatives as part of a national reconciliation strategy.

There are numerous criticisms of existing memory initiatives and emerging demands. In this respect, the exhumations of politicians currently carried out by AVODE are criticised as possibly hampering the transitional justice mechanisms Burundians are waiting for. Indeed, the president of the Forum for the Reinforcement of Civil Society (FORCS) signals that "such a gesture may nevertheless be synonymous with other frustrations".⁶²

The memory initiatives may be seen and perceived as a palliative for justice that has not yet been forthcoming and with which disillusion is growing as to its likely effectiveness. Interviewees resort to metaphors to refer to the unequal treatment of the Burundian people by the whole of its ruling class: "I do not expect anything from politicians. They protect each other. Only the *small fish* are blamed". The work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission appears titanic if it aims to render an account of all the

⁶⁰ Impunity Watch, Focus Group, Gitega, 30 June 2011.

⁶¹ Interview with the head of Kizi hill, 1 June 2011.

⁶² Ijambo Info, « AVODE va déterrer et enterrer dignement ce samedi Augustin Ntabyabandi, ancien administrateur de la commune Busoni tué en octobre 1993 », Bujumbura, 7 January 2011 : www.ijambo-info.com.

atrocities of an ethnic character committed in Burundi since independence. The population appears ready and willingly to participate but fears are considerable that the politicians will ensure that they themselves cannot be threatened by the process. By proposing the implementation of a transitional justice process in Burundi it is feared that people will only search for those responsible at the local level, who still live there and who have learnt to live again in apparent harmony with their neighbours. More than a culture of silence, it would be more appropriate to talk of resignation in the vast majority of survivors as a result of decades of conflict. Indeed, while twelve years have passed since the recommendations of the Arusha Agreement, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission is still not in place.

This context, dominated by impunity and judicial inertia leads part of the Burundian population to consider that memory initiatives “are here to recall scars that seemed healed”.⁶³ The metaphor of the wound was used repeatedly in the research to refer to the risks of infection. The conflict’s legacy thus remains present. In light of the criticisms which reach the population about certain monuments in the country, the desire not to reproduce past mistakes is obvious. Thus, although the head of Kizi hill in the Gasorwe municipality remains scarred by the massacre of over 200 villagers who stayed behind and of refugees fleeing the military operations in the neighbouring hills (on 29 March 1995), he considers that if monuments were to be erected, “we must make monuments with Hutus and Tutsis together and not one Hutu monument and one Tutsi monument”.⁶⁴

4.3.4. Giving every Burundian who feels the legitimate need to commemorate the opportunity to do so

It is in part because of difficulties in holding reconciliatory memory initiatives that many Burundians have chosen to try to forget the past. Several associations, on the other hand, work to obtain authorisation to commemorate. Mobilisation may then be centred around a massacre with the creation of plaques or monuments or the holding of a mass as a possibility to reduce suffering. Associations with a national dimension provide a listening ear and are interested in and support this type of memory demands. This multiplication of initiatives for everyone, everywhere in the country is admittedly a juxtaposition of memories one next to the other, but also makes it possible to progressively establish some sort of inventory of all victims. These forms of setting up memory initiatives enable the country to advance towards what is as yet still a timid recognition of the violence that took place. They make it possible to break with the resignation that is widespread in the country and reinforce the importance of civil society in order for it to bear more weight against the government in view of the implementation of transitional justice mechanisms.

4.3.5. A memory duty to the detriment of a remembrance process

Today, Burundi still seeks to differentiate itself from neighbouring Rwanda, also victim of interethnic violence. In the field of memorialisation, Burundians widely show their hostility towards memory initiatives in the form that they occur in Rwanda: “In Rwanda, people flee in the run-up to ceremony days. We do not want that here”.⁶⁵ This is explained according to Klaas de Jonge by the “manipulation of memorialisation by the Rwandan government”. Nevertheless, for the majority of Burundian memory initiatives, we observe that building monuments or holding ceremonies does not lead to progress in reconciliation, nor to equal impunity for all the perpetrators. How to perceive memory initiatives is extremely personal and subjective. The view is coloured according to one’s experience, proximity to the victims and / or the perpetrators, age, regional location, social, political, ethnic identity, but also recognition (or not) of the particular event by the government. Indeed, the initiatives studied and the reactions they provoke reveal that these initiatives are based to a large extent on the notion of ‘memory

⁶³ Impunity Watch, Focus Group, Bugendana, 29 June 2011.

⁶⁴ Interview with the head of Kizi Hill, 1 July 2011.

⁶⁵ Impunity Watch, Focus Group, Gitega, 30 June 2011.



duty'. This formulation highlights that we are dealing with a history mainly imposed upon the population and whose character is similar to a lesson that must be learnt as such, from Rwanda. This way of organising memory initiatives, so as not to forget, legitimate as it may be, may furthermore be saddled with the leitmotiv, 'never again' which reinforces its unquestionable dimension.

This form of action then takes place to the detriment of a real 'remembrance process', which remains to be done in Burundi. Rather than mandatory commemorations (imposed memory or a memory duty) this approach would call for the establishment and restorations of a more complex truth about the facts. Above all, the term implies the goal of a continuous process that must be done with the general population, the authorities and the scientific community. The work of memory (a remembrance *process*) through memory initiatives, prior to any public event, is intended to build a narrative shared by all together with local and national actors and accessible to younger generations.

5. Synthesis and Analysis of the Results Obtained

5.1. An Analysis of the Local Conflict Situation Copied from External Models

5.1.1. On the hasty comparison of the conflict with the Second World War

The forms of public memory present on Burundi's territory as well as a great proportion of memory claims go beyond the national vision. The forms of action refer in several respects to a conflict, the Second World War, characterised amongst others by:

- The process of concentration and/or extermination of 'undesirable persons' (communists, foreigners, Freemasons, homosexuals, Jews, Roma);
- The creation of cemeteries and monuments dedicated to 'our' soldiers and 'our' members of the resistance who died in combat or deportation during the conflict;
- The creation of places of memory by placing plaques and building monumental sculptures recalling the tragedies; and
- The organisation of summary trials of the defeated and collaborators.

Today, we witness an evolution in how world conflicts are analysed. International researchers challenge the Manichean character of the actors of reconstruction in the immediate post-war period. Indeed, 'historians' work has been very difficult in the face of confusion and partial amnesia. The memories, opening of archives, and cross-checking of sources did not always correspond to the doxa.⁶⁶ They also distance themselves from comparing contemporary conflicts with the peculiar character of the Second World War. Nevertheless, Burundian barbarity against the designated adversary, committed indistinctly by both sides, has often been compared by Europeans - and later Burundians - with the Nazi horrors.⁶⁷ Even today the temptation remains great for victims' representatives and survivors who mobilise in an organised manner to demand, as at the end of the Second World War, the punishment of suspects rather than only those with direct responsibility.⁶⁸ Indeed, as François Mauriac recalled in 1947, "witnesses must sit in the witness box, [...] They must not become judges".⁶⁹ As Emmanuel Terray mentions, under the pretence of memory duty, the mobilisation of victims' representatives and survivors against those who went astray, bigger in numbers than those responsible, may infringe the road to "reconciliation, the only way towards a return to civil peace and national unity".⁷⁰

The recommendation from the 2000 Arusha Agreement requiring the erection of a national monument to victims bearing the words 'Never Again' and the transformation of the sentence on the Kibimba memorial so as to bear these words also places the Burundian conflict in this context. Moreover, the fact that the internet site of the newspaper Iwacu mentions that readers' comments of an "anti-Semitic" character⁷¹ will not be published reveals a discrepancy with national reality.

Beyond difficulties in setting up a framework for discussion between association actors, researchers, and NGOs in Burundi, there is also a conspicuous and total absence of communication between Rwandans and

⁶⁶ Jean-Pierre Besse, « Les associations d'anciens résistants dans l'Oise et la mémoire de guerre » (pp.29-33), in Gilles VERGNON & Michèle BATESTTI (dir.) *Les associations d'anciens résistants et la fabrication de la mémoire de la Seconde Guerre mondiale*, Paris, 2006, Cahiers du CEHD n°28, p.33.

⁶⁷ In 1972 Bernard Aupens (alias Jean-Pierre Chrétien) wrote 'Nazism had *proved* the existence of *Aryan* and *semitic* racism. Rwanda's and Burundi's contemporary history has likewise *proved* the existence of the *Bantu* and *Hamitic* races. This engages Europeans' responsibility' in « Burundi: le massacre érigé en politique », *Revue française d'études politiques africaines*, n°78, juin 1972, pp.7-11.

⁶⁸ Emmanuel Terray, *Face aux abus de la mémoire*, Arles, éd. Actes Sud, 2006, p. 57.

⁶⁹ François Mauriac, « La cour sans justice », June 1947, cité dans Emmanuel Terray, *Face aux abus de la mémoire*, op. cit., p.58.

⁷⁰ Emmanuel Terray, *Face aux abus de mémoire*, op. cit., p.57.

⁷¹ "The content of commentaries must not contravene applicable laws and regulations. Racist, anti-Semitic, slanderous or offensive comments, calling for ethnic or regionalist divisions, disclosing information concerning a person's private life, and using works protected by copyright contravene the law", www.iwacu-burundi.org.



Burundians on relatively successful experiences and obstacles in the process of memory and reconciliation. More broadly speaking, the national conflict remains little discussed alongside other political-identity conflicts which unfolded in the second half of the 20th century within countries with little geopolitical influence on the international scene, especially the one that tore apart the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s.

5.1.2. The gap between the foundations of the reconciliation process and social reality

The reconciliation process, in turn, remains to a large extent influenced by the country which facilitated it: South Africa. However it is problematic in this truth and reconciliation process to copy and adapt the social division between a dominant minority and a dominated majority. Indeed, this premise represents validation at the international level of an erroneous analysis of local reality in Burundi, especially within the village communities where Hutus and Tutsis shared and continue to share similar living conditions. The Burundian population is thus presented antagonistically, with their representation dictated by ethnic affiliation. But part of the population expresses the feeling that the tide may soon turn, expressing a degree of hope that they may finally receive recognition for their tragedies and reparations. Thus, by declaring that “for these events of 1972, 1988, 1991, 2002 etc., there are demands [to exhume mass graves]”⁷², the Ministry of the Interior’s Director of territorial administration highlights the dates of massacres committed predominantly against Hutus. This choice and explicit mention of particular dates (associated with Hutus) may simply be a personal approach, but such enumeration may also correspond to the reality of the demands that are made today and the population’s persuasion that roles are being reversed whereby Hutu demands are now free to take form.

Similarly, memory initiatives undertaken by AC Génocide and emergence of memory initiatives with the authorisation of the government show to a great extent a balancing of memory. While the latter is essential, it is observed that the process of truth-seeking undertaken by memory initiatives is grounded in the recognition or juxtaposition of one side against the other, where ethnic affiliation prevails. Preparing the country for reconciliation and identification with a common history are thus still wanting. In this context, it is understandable that Burundians today struggle to identify with the project of the Gitega national monument dedicated to all victims.

5.2. Precautions to be Taken into Account When Undertaking Memory Work

The population’s memory work regarding Burundi’s conflicts is understood above all as the possibility to carry out mourning and truth-seeking processes. To date this remains extremely limited. The knowledge of Burundian associations dealing with the conflict and the diversity of Burundians met during this study reveal an interest in understanding the past and knowing the truth only if it concerns them and if they feel represented. Although the country is desperately short of archives, the relatively contemporaneity of the conflict makes it possible to turn to numerous witnesses who survived and are still alive to deal with the conflict in its entirety.

Moreover, transmitting the narrative in private circles, even inaccurately, represents a form of memory initiative for the population. It enables them to alleviate a pain that must be expressed, but the absence of an established, impartial collective history at the national level reproduces a partial and emotional vision at the local, private level. Only very few frameworks exist to nuance the events transmitted through such informal narratives, in order to gradually diminish the otherwise fragmentation of national history that affects society. In Bugendana, a reconciliation process was undertaken after the massacre in the displaced persons’ site in 1996. It made it possible to recall the acts of reprisals (which were also blind to ethnic affiliation) which had subsequently taken place on the territory, thereby revealing a territory which

⁷² Intervention during the debate of the Ministry of the Interior’s director of territorial administration at the ‘Workshop on mortal remains and enforced disappearances’ organised in Bujumbura by the ICRC on 5 July 2011.

is indistinctly damaged. Paradoxically, it is on territories like these where inhabitants had the chance to undertake initiatives of truth-seeking and peaceful conflict resolution, that hostility towards the repetition of memory work is openly expressed.⁷³

On the other hand, in Kivuyuka the 1996 Hutu massacre and exile of survivors led to the current collective discourse negating the presence of Tutsis in the area before this date. In individual interviews some people are more willing to contradict this dominant discourse, but they also believe that there will be less reluctance to bringing up the past of the local history among the population than among the former as well as current political authorities.

One must therefore bear in mind that undertaking an ethnographic study on such sensitive questions often remains difficult. Indeed, “an objective ethnographic survey is always a complex undertaking. There may have been too many instrumentalised surveys beforehand, and very often direct words are then completely reconstructed and influenced by what came out the first time, for those who are still willing to play the game.”⁷⁴ The work undertaken by some associations and radio projects highlight the importance that contradictory dialogue and mutual understanding can bring. Devoid of any lasting physical materialisation, these memory initiatives face less difficulty in uniting Burundians than the current commemorations and monuments.

5.3. Memory Supports

Beyond the call by external actors of these memories, all Burundians, individually or within the family or close circle, recall certain tragedies which affect them and for which they feel a sense of solitude regarding disclosure, as their personal experience seems so unique to them. This remembrance and transmission are brought about by various triggers.

Whether in the home or social spaces, at gatherings in small groups (bars, front of a shop where people chat), or by moving away from one’s locality, memories of violence express themselves. This occurs especially when the triggering element occurs after a relatively long period of time or indeed unexpectedly. This is the case for:

- Questions asked by children or cousins about the family or local history;
- A birthday celebration recalling the disappearance of certain family members;
- A person considered as a former murderer passing in the street;
- A speech on television or the radio by a politician who held one or more positions of responsibility during past conflicts;
- A displaced person’s return to the village he has not returned to for a long time;
- The presentation or mentioning of a special dish which the deceased person liked or knew how to prepare;
- The return of the season linked to specific agricultural activities recalling a massacre which occurred at the exact moment that activity was being carried out;
- Passing near a path or road where one very nearly died or which a next of kin took before disappearing forever;

⁷³ “Here the reconciliation process took place in 1998 with an association [Miparec]. People got together to bury this. Later an administrator wanted to revive resentments. Nobody wanted that anymore. Now, people here say: we have had enough of these meetings that are convened”, “The tribunals got together to protect the tormentors”. Focus Group, Bugendana, 29 June 2011.

⁷⁴ Interview with Philippe Peyre, director of the Musée de la Mine de Saint Etienne, on miners’ memories, in Benjamin Vanderlick & Mustapha Najmi (ARALIS), *Mémoires et présent des territoires de Rhône Alpes. Etude-action*, Lyon, rapport établi pour la DRAC Rhone-Alpes et la Région Rhône-Alpes, juin 2006, p.163.



- Passing near a place where a next of kin is thought or known to have been buried or disappeared;
or
- The accidental exhumation of one or more bodies buried at construction sites.

5.3.1. Dates

Dates are elements which Burundians find the most difficult to share, as massacres are spread over many years, all seasons, and the whole calendar. Moreover, on the hills it is rare that people remember the exact day of a massacre or the death of a next of kin. This was reinforced by the fact that archived documents often do not mention the dates of murders and massacres of civilians which were rarely written down. Moreover, the rare written traces of events have often been destroyed. This is the case for the register held by the Gasorwe municipal administrator, living in Kizi, which meticulously reported the number of inhabitants (birth and death) on the territory but which disappeared after an arson attack.⁷⁵ Moreover, as regards authorised ceremonies, discrepancies of a few days may occur. Thus, whereas the 21 October is a public holiday in memory of Ndadaye's assassination, the date of the ceremony in memory of the Kibimba students killed that same day can be shifted a few days to concur with a weekend. The same holds for the ceremony in memory of the victims massacred in the displaced persons' site in Bugendana.

The interviews also revealed frequent mistakes regarding the years cited. The territorial claims based on demands for the commemoration of a date can be associated with the discourse of local authorities rather than the actual date of an event in order to obtain recognition. This does not correspond to the personal ways of remembering of the Burundian population, which is mainly rural and largely illiterate.

5.3.2. Objects

Objects are sometimes used symbols of massacres, including certain objects that have pride of place on the top of the Gitega national monument. However the selection of these objects at the national memorial is problematic. The machete, for example, remains a daily object for agricultural in most developing countries, especially in the Southern hemisphere. The AK-47 assault rifle (Kalashnikov), in turn, is probably the most widespread weapon among the Burundian police and military, also much used by rebel movements in the Great Lakes Region. It is also the automatic rifle par excellence for many armies around the world, including in times of peace.

5.3.3. The places: places of life, places of disappearance

Beyond memory initiatives, in the course of discussions some places of memory were repeatedly mentioned by witnesses. Memory work could be based on these places. It is extremely difficult to find traces of the violence which the country suffered without knowledge of the narratives about the conflicts. The spatial reorganisation of housing at the municipal or even provincial level, the construction of displaced persons' sites and the continuing important presence of Tutsis in these new environments may however hint towards the degree of tension which continues between displaced villagers and those who 'stayed on the hill' (known as 'residents'). Nonetheless, they represent to a greater extent places of life, for life to continue, in the same way as the grounds cultivated by Burundians under which bodies are still buried. The places where some isolated victims, killed during the civil war or massacres, are buried, include fields and areas around houses. With very few exceptions, no signs of possible remembrance can be seen above these bodies. Agriculture has frequently taken over or banana trees planted. Thus, "when they are buried in the field we cultivate daily, we don't think about it anymore. We cultivate on top of

⁷⁵ Interview with Father Jonathan Bayaga, Muyinga, 1 July 2011.

it.”⁷⁶ It is sometimes possible to see unearthed remains after heavy rains, but in these cases only orally transmitted narratives will enable one to know if this is a direct consequence of the civil war.

More than living spaces, narratives mention places of disappearance, suspected or known, where deceased persons are buried. Mentioning these places is thus associated with the need to know the circumstances surrounding the death, mourning that cannot yet be ended according to Burundian traditions and possible dignified burial in the future.

While the places have a very personal and intimate character, they are nevertheless relatively universal. The narratives refer widely to mass graves, latrines, rivers, military positions and sometimes also the surroundings of army positions as displaced persons’ sites. Given the possibility to recall the 1972 massacres, it is often mentioned that there is a very high probability that there are mass graves in closed locations controlled by the authorities in power at the time, such as military barracks and prisons but also sports facilities. There are strong presumptions that the Prince Louis Rwagasore stadium in Bujumbura, used in 1972 as gathering and execution site for the so-called ‘traitors’ of the nation by the Micombero government, contains mass graves. Equally, the interviews carried out in Kivyuka mention the use of the Kibira forest for disappearances and the digging of mass graves.

5.4. An Interrupted Mourning Process

The government’s refusal to exhume bodies thrown in latrines or mass graves known by their next of kin freezes any possibility of ending mourning according to Burundian tradition. Today a sense of inequality in the face of mourning is highlighted by society as some dignified burial ceremonies are authorised for former political leaders. The current impossibility to exhume places where it is known that bodies are buried can however be considered as an opportunity to prepare a rigorous preliminary memory work in advance of a hypothetical exhumation. This can prevent the increase of frustrations within the territory between crimes which benefit from recognition by the authorities and crimes which have yet to be recognised.

The circumstances surrounding the deaths of Burundians during the conflict look likely to be made known in the coming years. Indeed, regarding the bodies thrown in latrines or buried in mass graves, victims’ next of kin hope that they may find their loved ones and eventually end mourning in this way. As to the Burundians thrown in rivers and mass graves destroyed by construction projects, finding the bodies is no longer possible.

These places of memory have in common that they are places which make a mourning process possible by explaining the dramatic events and recognising the truth, which is necessary for reconciliation. Therefore they are an issue and a support for the traditional ending of mourning only for some Burundians. New memory initiatives are however experimented with in order to find a possible alternative for ending mourning, which could be adapted to a conflict situation. This was the case for the 1993 Tutsi massacres, where the government organised a campaign of collective end of mourning in displaced persons’ sites. Despite this symbolic form, survivors and victims’ next of kin are not content with having truly ended their mourning. On the other hand, for part of the civilian Hutu population, this campaign was perceived as reinforcing inequalities between Burundians facing mourning in times of war. Recently, the end of mourning ceremony organised by president Pierre Nkurunziza in 2009 for his father who disappeared in 1972, followed by a similar ceremony by the governor of Bubanza province for his father who also disappeared in 1972, can be signs of an exceptional form of ending mourning corresponding only to an exceptional event.

⁷⁶ Interview with Father Jonathan Bayaga, Muyinga, 1 July 2011.



6. At the Heart of Memory and Reconciliation Initiatives - Memory Work: Conclusions and Recommendations

In Burundi, reflection on the country's conflictive past within the framework of lasting reconciliation remains limited. Nevertheless, the population unconsciously and sporadically manifests private and informal memory initiatives by calling upon a variety of memory supports. The government's refusal to undertake an objective remembrance process thus gives free rein to these personal forms favourable to reinterpreting the past marked by identity tensions.

The possibility for the Burundian population to find serenity in their neighbourhood relations and regarding their personal experience is confronted with the difficulty of knowing the complete truth. The analysis of memory initiatives is nonetheless presented within the limits of the field of ethnological research dealing with memory issues.

Indeed, the purpose of memory is not to infringe on justice and demands for reparations and for bringing authors to justice. In this context and given the elements highlighted by this study, a series of steps can be proposed to enable Burundi to advance towards a common history favourable to the future reconciliation of its inhabitants:

- Establish complete lists common to all victims at the local level (sub-hill, hill, zone, and even municipality) on the extent of the conflict with the authorities' consent and the involvement of local administrations. Support initiatives that create lists of victims on a territory by bringing rigour and methodology to the local actors;
- Favour networking and the formation of memory associations by proposing seminars throughout the territory where each case defended by an association would be debated by all. Pooling means among NGOs, associations and communities (supplying a vehicle, overhead projector, or premises) would make it possible to propose a constructive project at little cost. In this context, the organisation of a study seminar at the Kigali Memorial Centre in Rwanda on different places of memory with a number of victims' associations is an example which could be debated by the network of Burundian actors;
- Design and propose theoretical and practical training for hill advisors on engaging with and accompanying memory work in the context of the implementation of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission at the local level;
- Accompany municipalities in identifying all the victims on their territory;
- Like the initiatives to identify mass graves undertaken in other conflict zones, propose a pilot locality in preparation for the process of localising burial places and identifying the bodies. This work could be undertaken with the ICRC which has considerable expertise at the international level on this topic;
- Enable the creation of a research group working together with memory associations, victims' associations and pedagogical and cultural actors. Work in partnership with local actors who set up reconciliation initiatives on affected territories;
- Monitor militant approaches and contradict them, share people's reluctance to avoid pitfalls and political-memorial opportunism. Implement preparatory memory projects of a temporary nature. This approach would avoid perennial monumental forms of localised memory initiatives (stones, monuments) as long as a complete narrative of the local conflict has not been achieved; and

- Favour the implementation of a commission guaranteeing the anonymity of testimonies for the identification of mass graves and of victims, as first step of the medical-legal work of identifying victims.

This work would represent numerous essential aspects of the victims' right to know the truth and to justice in the fight against impunity. This memory is designed to transmit knowledge of the facts to witnesses of the national conflict and the future generations.

Bibliography

A. Grosser, *Le crime et la mémoire*, Paris, Flammarion, 1996.

« Accord cadre entre le Gouvernement de la République du Burundi et l'Organisation des Nations Unies portant création et définition du mandat du Comité de pilotage tripartite en charge des Consultations nationales sur la justice au Burundi », Bujumbura, 2 novembre 2007.

Amnesty international, *Burundi: Justice on trial*, ref. AFR 16/13/98, rapport du 30 Juillet 1998, 51p.

Bernard Aupens (alias Jean-Pierre Chrétien), « Burundi: le massacre érigé en politique », *Revue française d'études politiques africaines*, n°78, juin 1972.

Conseil de sécurité des Nations Unies, Mission KALOMOH: Rapport de la mission d'évaluation concernant la création d'une commission d'enquête judiciaire internationale pour le Burundi, (S/2005/158), mars 2005, p.19. Le rapport a pour objectif "d'examiner l'opportunité et la possibilité de créer une commission d'enquête judiciaire internationale" (Koffi Annan).

Débat national sur la mémorialisation au Burundi, réduction de l'impunité ou division des communautés ?, Impunity Watch, Bujumbura, 20 déc. 2011.

Dépêche AFP: "L'Ambassadeur américain à Bujumbura témoigne: quelque 400 Hutus massacrés au Burundi ces derniers jours » in *Le Soir*, Bruxelles, mardi 4 avril 1995: http://archives.lesoir.be/l-ambassadeur-americain-a-bujumbura-temoigne-quelque-40_t-19950404-Z09CDK.html.

Dépêche Reuter: "Kizi, nord du Burundi", 4 avril 1995.

« Discours de S.E. Pierre Nkurunziza à l'occasion des vœux de nouvel an 2011 », mis en ligne sur Burundi-info le lundi 3 janvier 2011: <http://burundi-info.com/spip.php?article1380>.

Discours du président M. Micombero adressé à la nation le 8 mai 1972 paru dans le journal *Flash Infor* n°452 du 9 mai 1972.

Emmanuel Terray, *Face aux abus de la mémoire*, Arles, éd. Actes Sud, 2006.

Ijambo Info, « AVODE va déterrer et enterrer dignement ce samedi Augustin Ntayabandi, ancien administrateur de la commune Busoni tué en octobre 1993 », Bujumbura, 7 janvier 2011 : www.ijambo-info.com.

Jean-Pierre Besse, « Les associations d'anciens résistants dans l'Oise et la mémoire de guerre » (pp.29-33), in Gilles Vergnon & Michèle Battesti (dir.) *Les associations d'anciens résistants et la fabrication de la mémoire de la Seconde Guerre mondiale*, Paris, 2006, Cahiers du CEHD n°28.

Jean-Pierre Chrétien & Jean-François Dupaquier, *Burundi 1972. Au bord des génocides*, Paris, Khartala, 2008..

Ligue des droits de la personne dans la région des Grands Lacs (LDGL), *Burundi : Quarante ans d'impunité*, Juin 2005, 67p.

« Loi n°1/018 du 27 décembre 2004 portant missions, composition, organisation et fonctionnement de la commission nationale pour la vérité et la réconciliation », République du Burundi, Cabinet du président, 2004, 7p.

Les consultations nationales sur la mise en place des mécanismes de justice de transition au Burundi, République du Burundi, République du Burundi & Nations Unies, Bujumbura, 2010.

Mémoire de la Société Civile pour la mise en place de la Commission Vérité et Réconciliation, Bujumbura, décembre 2010.

Peter Smerdon: « 400 Reported Massacred in Burundi », in *The Moscow Times*, 5 avril 1995.

Résolution 1959 du Conseil de sécurité des Nations Unies en date du 16 décembre 2010.

Tzvetan Todorov, *Les abus de la mémoire*, Paris, éd. Arléa, 2004.

ANNEX 1

Evolution of the peace processes and transitional justice in Burundi after the Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement (in French).

CALENDRIER	EVOLUTION DU PROCESSUS DE PAIX DEPUIS ARUSHA	EVOLUTION DE LA JUSTICE DE TRANSITION
15 juin 1998	Début officiel des négociations d'Arusha.	
28 août 2000	Signature de l'Accord d'Arusha pour la Paix et la Réconciliation au Burundi.	
28 octobre 2001	Promulgation de la Constitution de transition.	
1er novembre 2001	Nomination du Gouvernement de transition.	
24 juillet 2002		Le Gouvernement demande aux Nations Unies la création d'une commission d'enquête judiciaire internationale.
8 mai 2003		Promulgation de la Loi n°1/004 portant prévention et répression du crime de génocide, des crimes contre l'humanité et des crimes de guerre.
22 septembre 2003		Promulgation de la Loi n°1/014 portant missions, composition, organisation et fonctionnement de l'Observatoire National pour la prévention et l'éradication du génocide, des crimes de guerre, des autres crimes contre l'humanité et de l'exclusion.
26 janvier 2004		Le Conseil de Sécurité décide d'envoyer une mission au Burundi en vue d'examiner l'opportunité et la faisabilité de créer une commission d'enquête judiciaire internationale.
16 au 24 mai 2004		Séjour de la mission au Burundi
27/12/2004		Promulgation de la Loi n°1/018 portant missions, composition, organisation et fonctionnement de la Commission Nationale pour la Vérité et la Réconciliation.
Juin - septembre 2005	Elections nationales et locales.	.
15 juin 2005		Le Conseil de Sécurité analyse le rapport de la mission
20 juin 2005		Le Conseil de Sécurité adopte la Résolution 1606 demandant d'engager des négociations avec le Gouvernement et des consultations avec les parties burundaises concernées.
26 août 2005	Prestation de serment du Président de la République issu des élections.	
mars 2006		Première session des négociations.
6 septembre 2006	Signature d'un Accord de cessez-le-feu avec le dernier mouvement armé.	
mars 2007		Deuxième série des négociations.
mai 2007		Visite de la Haut Commissaire aux Droits de l'Homme.
2 novembre 2007		Signature de l'Accord Cadre créant le Comité de pilotage Tripartite (CPT).
4 décembre 2008	Sommet régional sur la crise burundaise et levée des obstacles à la mise en œuvre du cessez-le-feu avec le dernier mouvement armé.	
juillet - décembre 2009		Consultations Nationales dans toutes les provinces.
14 au 21 mars 2010		Consultations des Burundais de l'étranger
mai 2010		Présentation officielle du rapport des Consultations.
31 décembre 2010		Annnonce de la mise en place de la Commission de Vérité et Réconciliation.
14 Mai 2011		Présentation à Genève d'un calendrier de mise en place de la CVR et le TS par la délégation gouvernementale
13 juin 2011		Nomination d'un comité technique pour préparer la mise en place de la CVR
27 juin 2011		Visite de la délégation du haut commissaire des droits de l'homme à Genève
27 juillet 2011		Lancement de la campagne gouvernementale de la mise en place de mécanismes de Justice Transitionnelle à Kayanza par Pierre Nkurunziza
novembre 2011		Présentation officielle du « Rapport Kavakure » sur les missions de la future CVR

ANNEX 2

RESUME DES QUESTIONNAIRES «ENTRETIENS INDIVIDUELS » & « FOCUS GROUPS DISCUSSIONS »

(ADAPTATION EN FRANÇAIS DU QUESTIONNAIRE GENERAL D'IMPUNITY WATCH, INITIALEMENT EN ANGLAIS)

PRESENTATION DU QUESTIONNAIRE DESTINE AUX ENTRETIENS INDIVIDUELS

DEFINITIONS :

- I. A VOTRE AVIS, QUELS SONT LES DROITS HUMAINS?
- II. QU'EST-CE QUE LA JUSTICE SIGNIFIE POUR VOUS?
- III. Y A T-IL UNE DIFFERENCE ENTRE LA MEMOIRE DU PASSE ET LA VERITE SUR LE PASSE DANS VOTRE PAYS?

MEMOIRE :

- IV. APRES LA VIOLENCE DANS VOTRE PAYS, QUELLE IMPORTANCE PENSEZ-VOUS QU'IL Y A POUR LA POPULATION DE SE SOUVENIR ET DE PRESERVER LA TRACE DE CE QUI LEUR EST ARRIVE? FAUT-IL RAPPELER LE PASSE COMME UNE EPREUVE INDIVIDUELLE OU COLLECTIVE? DEVRAIT-IL ETRE FORMEL OU INFORMEL?
- V. POUVEZ-VOUS DONNER DES EXEMPLES D'INITIATIVES DE MEMOIRE QUI VOUS ONT BENEFICIE, A VOUS ET VOTRE COMMUNAUTE. A L'OPPOSE, POUVEZ-VOUS DONNER DES EXEMPLES D'INITIATIVES QUI NE VOUS ONT PAS PROFITE, DONT VOUS N'AVEZ PAS BENEFICIE? QUEL(S) BENEFICE(S) RETIRER CONCRETEMENT DE CE TYPE DE DEMARCHE?
- VI. SI VOUS REGARDEZ EN ARRIERE DANS LE TEMPS, AVEZ-VOUS REMARQUE DES CHANGEMENTS DANS LA FAÇON DONT LE PASSE A ETE RAPPELE ET PRESENTE?

INTERVENANTS :

- VII. EST-IL POSSIBLE DE REPRESENTER/D'ASSOCIER A LA FOIS AUTEURS ET VICTIMES (AINSI QUE LA POPULATION BURUNDAISE DE MANIERE GENERALE) A UNE INITIATIVE DE MEMOIRE?
- VIII. LES INITIATIVES DE MEMOIRE PEUVENT-ELLES PRESENTER/REPRESENTER UNE VERSION DU PASSE QUI SATISFASSE TOUTES LES PARTIES PRENANTES? EST-IL PREFERABLE DE NE PAS EXPOSER LE PASSE? OU DE PRIVILEGIER UNE DEMARCHE MEMORIALE INDIVIDUELLE QUI SERAIT MOINS CONFLICTUELLE?

GENERATIONS FUTURES :

- IX. LES JEUNES GENERATIONS ET GENERATIONS FUTURES SONT-ELLES INTERESSES PAR LES INITIATIVES DE MEMOIRE?

COMMENT PERÇOIVENT-ELLES CES DEMARCHES ?

ETUDES DE CAS :

- X. PARMIS LES INITIATIVES DE LA MEMOIRE EXISTANT AU BURUNDI, CERTAINES ONT-ELLE EU UN IMPACT POSITIF SUR VOTRE VIE ET LA VIE DES AUTRES MEMBRES DANS VOTRE COMMUNAUTE ?

PRESENTATION DU QUESTIONNAIRE DESTINE AUX FOCUS GROUPS DISCUSSIONS

DEFINITIONS:

- I. A VOTRE AVIS, QUELS SONT LES DROITS HUMAINS?
- II. QUE SIGNIFIE LA JUSTICE POUR VOUS?
- III. Y A-T-IL UNE DIFFERENCE ENTRE LA MEMOIRE DU PASSE ET LA VERITE SUR LE PASSE?

CONTEXTE:

- IV. EST CE QUE LES INITIATIVES MEMORIELLES FONT PARTIE DU PROCESSUS DE TRAITEMENT DU PASSE?

LE PROCESSUS DE MEMOIRE:

- V. EST-CE LE PASSAGE DU TEMPS AFFECTE LA MANIERE DONT LE PASSE EST RAPPELE ET PRESENTE?

INTERVENANTS:

- VI. EST-IL POSSIBLE DE REPRESENTER A LA FOIS AUTEURS ET VICTIMES (AINSI QUE LA POPULATION BURUNDAISE DE MANIERE GENERALE) DANS UNE INITIATIVE DE MEMOIRE?

LA VERITE:

- VII. PENSEZ VOUS QUE LES INITIATIVES DE MEMOIRES PEUVENT PRESENTER/REPRESENTER UNE VERSION DU PASSE QUI SATISFASSE TOUTES LES PARTIES PRENANTES?

GENERATIONS FUTURES:

- VIII. PENSEZ-VOUS LES JEUNES GENERATIONS, QUI N'ONT PAS DIRECTEMENT ETE TEMOINS VIOLENCES, SONT INTERESSEES PAR LES INITIATIVES DE MEMOIRE? PENSEZ VOUS QU'IL EST IMPORTANT QUE CES JEUNES GENERATIONS ET LES GENERATIONS FUTURES S'INTERESSENT A CE PASSE CONFLICTUEL ET AUX INITIATIVES MEMORIELLES?

ÉTUDE DE CAS/ INITIATIVE(S):

- IX. PARMIS LES INITIATIVES DE LA MEMOIRE EXISTANT AU BURUNDI, CERTAINES ONT-ELLES EU UN IMPACT POSITIF SUR VOTRE VIE ET SUR LA VIE DES AUTRES MEMBRES DANS VOTRE COMMUNAUTE ? ONT ELLES CONTRIBUE POSITIVEMENT A REDUIRE L'IMPUNITE DANS VOTRE COMMUNAUTE?

MAP OF BURUNDI

The map shows the principal locations referred to in the research.



This publication has been made possible by

 OAK
FOUNDATION

 Hivos
people unlimited

Impunity Watch (IW) is a Netherlands-based, international non-profit organisation seeking to promote accountability for atrocities in countries emerging from a violent past. IW conducts systematic research into the root causes of impunity that includes the voices of affected communities to produce research-based policy advice on processes intended to enforce their rights to truth, justice, reparations and non-recurrence. IW works closely with civil society organisations to increase their influence on the creation and implementation of related policies. IW runs 'Country Programmes' in Guatemala and Burundi and a 'Perspectives Programme' involving comparative research in multiple post-conflict countries on specific thematic aspects of impunity. The present Research Report is published as part of IW's Memorialisation Project, within the wider Perspectives Programme.

Contact Us:

Impunity Watch

't Goylaan 15
3525 AA Utrecht
The Netherlands
Tel: +31.302.720.313
Email: info@impunitywatch.org

www.impunitywatch.org

©Impunity Watch 2012

 impunity watch