

. - Q3MQ\\Tâ\200\234~>SNB \u V Was)

FRONT P TRI TIQUE RWANDAIS

RWANDESE PATRIOTIC FRONT.

REPORT ON POLITICAL DIALOGUE BETWEEN RPF AND RWANDESE GOVERNMENT

FROM 15TH SEPTâ\200\22417TH SEP 1991

n--=8:E==B=====

SUMMARY OF THE MAIN POINTS

__â\200\224__â\200\224â\200\224_â\200\224__â\200\224__â\200\224__â\200\224â\200\224_._-â
_â\200\224â\200\224__

A. It was agreed by both parties that this particular articles
had to be modified following the recommendation-bf the
Gbadolite Summit of the 7th Sept 1991. It was ~emphasised
that the N'sele Agreement was still binding the two parties.

B. Points of cOntroversy thereof:

__._â\200\224__â\200\224_â\200\224__â\200\224_ â\200\224_.â\200\224_._â\200\224â\200\224-
â\200\224__ .â\200\224_...__ .â\200\224

w - '(i). The RPF insisted that the Secretary General of the OAU
exercises sole authority over the Commander of the
Monitoring Team. We thought this was a necessary step to
counter GOR'S past interference in the work of the
Monitoring Team. In addition, since the Commander of the
team is an Officer appointed by another authority other
than that of the OAU Secretary General still it_would
be important to avoid the interference of the appointing
authority. This was not the view of the GOR delegation.

(ii) - The RPF delegation insisted that the Monitoring Team ' 4
obeys the laws and regulations in Rwanda as long as this i
was not in contradiction to the terms of the N'sele
Agreement. Again this was not the view of the GOR
Delegation.

oh both positions. the views of the RPF prevailed.

'K;RPF bnsisted that to ensure security to the Monitoring Team
and make available conditions suitable for the execution of
their monitoring exercise it was necessary to sign a
tripartite Agreement between the two parties and the Secretary
General on behalf of the OAU. The GOR delegation clearly
f/rx stated that it was only accepting a bilateral agreement
? between the GOR and the OAU Secretary General. The GOR
delegation maintained that the RPF should sign a separate
5;; agreement with the OAU Secretary General.

I e two views were irreconcilable! The Mediator consequently
said that in the absence of an agreement in the Status of the
M06. the latter cannot start its work.

.â\200\224_.__â\200\224â\200\224'~_â\200\224â\200\224â\200\224â\200\224â\200\224
â\200\224â\200\224â\200\224_â\200\224â\200\224_â\200\224â\200\224_â\200\224â\200\224
the mediator to present a document
The two parties were asked by
erved the ceasefire and why the
on how each party had obs
ceasefire was violated.
osition was that it has always been on the
gainst the GOR's attacks. Therefore there would
-not be any problem on the implementation of the ceasefire
if the GOR ceases its attacks. Concerning the liberation
of POWs, RPF maintained that it is a Liberation Movement
and as such it is our policy to give those captured in war
an option of either remaining with us on their will or go
wherever they may wish to go. The Red Cross has been
requested since March 1991 to be in touch with these who
have joined us so as to verify that.
(i) The RPF's p
defensive a
(ii) The GOR delegation's position was that Rwanda achieved
military "victoryâ\200\235 over the RPF on the 30th October 1990;
that it signed the N'sele Agreement having succeeded in
pushing the RPF â\200\235invadersâ\200\235outside Rwanda. According to the
GOR what exists today is not a war situation but one of
â\200\235sporadic incursionsâ\200\235. a form of â\200\235insecurityâ\200\234. GOR
delegation clearly said that Rwandaï-\201s â\200\235victory" over RPF
was like the â\200\234VICTORY OF THE USA OVER IRAQâ\200\235. Therefore
Rwanda is defending the border and cannot thus violate the
Ceasefire. On the implementation of the other clauses of
the N'sele Agreement, the GOR delegation said that there is
a legal process for the implementation of the said clauses
and that the foreign troops â\200\231French troops) have recently
been withdrawn. To the GOR delegation the responsibility
of violating the ceasefire falls on the RPF* this includes
â\200\235abducting civiliansâ\200\235 and â\200\235taking them to Uganoa'. In very
clear terms all the above were refuted.
The GOR delegation in its written presentation asked the RPF to
state why it had started the war. The GOR delegation wanted to
exchange views with the RPF on this. The GOR delegation also
asked the RPF to state her demands.

a

-3.â\200\224

d to state that the previous Gbadolite Summit of

' It also went ahea

them. immediate

7th Sept 1991 had recommended, according to

political dialogue without preconditions.

~To begin with. the Mediator accepted Rwandese DelegationSâ\200\230 views

being made the agenda. RPF accepted the above as the 1st item on

the agenda and proposed the 2nd item to be the issue of GOR's

â\200\235victory" over RPF.

On the cause of the war, the RPF explained the usual

reasons: bad political system. In addition, the RPF

Political Programme was delivered to the GOR delegation.

As for.our demand, we explained that we want change of

the bad political system through the implementation of

the RPFâ\200\230s Political Programme. However, on our immediate

proposals as to how the question of war should be

resolved so as to move to the next step of the

implementation of our Political Programme, we presented

to the GOR delegation our document containing the

recommendetions (13â\200\2245â\200\22491).

(i)

We clearly stated that we did not give any preconditions for

Political dialogue since we were already involved in the same.

The Mediator introduced another question of National Unity since

it had been mentioned in our Political Programme. He demanded to

know from us how we think this could be achieved. We bounced

the question back to GOR delegation since we think it is the GOR

which has disunited the Rwandese people: On the part of GOR

delegation. there was national unity before the RPFâ\200\230s invasion

and therefore the war brought about the problem of disunity

amongst the Rwandese people. We refuted this point of view and

explained how national unity can be achieved using in particular

both our Political Programme and the Document of recommendations.

(ii) On GOR's â\200\234victory" over the RPF, the question of the

Ceasefire and negotiations:

The RPF position was that since Rwandaâ\200\230 claims it â\200\235wonâ\200\235 the war

then it should impose its conditions on the "defeated!â\200\235

Therefore; there is no need for negotiations. For this reason,

the Ceasefire Agreement on the side of GOR was just a game. The

RPF thought that it was totally unacceptable to have dialogue

with a party which claims to have â\200\235wonâ\200\235 the war, and that what it

s is aa problem of â\200\235incursion" by â\200\235bandit groupsâ\200\234

t

Butâ\200\231to safeguard the Regional process, the RPF gave a

contained in our question to the Mediator seeking a solution.

proposal

The meeting on this note;

