

Analysis of Terms and Expressions Related To the Genocide Perpetrated Against Tutsi in Rwanda in 1994

Author: BIMENYIMANA Valens

Abstract: The genocide, like any other subject area, has a specific vocabulary to express it. That set of terms and expressions either are drawn from general language and hence, get new meanings (contextual usages) or are simply and purposefully coined. Taking the example of the genocide perpetrated against Tutsi in Rwanda in 1994, this paper analyzed some of them in terms of their formation (birth/coinage), their semantic evolution, meaning and usage. A specific emphasis was put the period shortly before 1994, but also during the genocide itself between April-July 1994 as well as some terms and expressions created after that tragedy. The main assumption here stipulated that the genocide is a very complex phenomenon whose study requires an interdisciplinary approach. With this particular approach, it was intended to remove ambiguity and misinterpretation around those sensitive terms and to some extent, contribute to fighting against the occurrence of genocide acts. It is believed that well explained terms and expressions will help all types of audience.

Keywords: Genocide, Discourse Analysis, Contextual Meaning, Rwanda, Terms and Expressions.

1. Introduction and statement of the problem

The genocide perpetrated against Tutsi in Rwanda in 1994 was total (Kimonyo, 2008) as it decimated 1,074,017 Tutsi and moderate Hutu in less than one hundred days (MINALOC, 2004). It also destroyed all aspects of individual and national life. Any genocide is the result of a long and meticulously well-conceived plan (Stanton, 2008), and it is always prepared and committed by the political leadership in place where scholars, religious people, security organs, simple peasants and the international community get involved (Straub, 2015). Clearly, it should be stressed that from the early inception of the genocide process up to its denial that constitutes its last stage (Stanton, *ibid.*), there is specific speech (commonly termed as hate speech and propaganda, Tirrell,) or more precisely a set of terms and expressions that are explicitly or implicitly used to name, nickname and conceal the genocidal project. In many cases, commonly used terms and expressions get new meanings according to their context of usage, while the new ones are purposefully coined (Nkusi L. (2000), Ntakirutimana (2008, 2011), Ruzindana (2011).

Coming back to the genocide perpetrated against Tutsi in Rwanda in 1994, we realize that the same specific vocabulary was used before, during and after those intentional mass killings. Some terms and expressions are explicit whereas others are coded and euphemistic, thus, simply understood by Kinyarwanda (Ruzindana, s.d.) speakers or by people who well understand the genocide context or those who got accurate translations. Furthermore, given the extent and sensitivity of genocide matters, many people tend to conceal, minimize, trivialize or categorically deny it, either voluntarily or involuntarily (Charny, 2009). This

implies that there should be a clear communication around genocide matters in order to avoid ambiguity and misinterpretation. This is supported by Totten and Bartrop (2008) in their *Dictionary of Genocide* who stressed that when a term is defined or understood in various ways by different individuals, groups and/or organizations, it results in miscommunication. Furthermore, without a clear definition that is agreed upon by most, if not everyone, it is difficult, if not impossible, to discuss and analyze, let alone ameliorate an issue of problem in an effective manner.

As mentioned earlier, terms and expressions used before and during the genocide are drawn from daily language. Some of them had their initial meanings slightly changed while others were purposefully coined or created on spot. This normal and natural linguistic situation leaves an impression that, as time goes on, that specific vocabulary (or jargon) is likely to be minimized, altered or simply forgotten. This can also be justified by the worrying fact that, until now, no formal and official study has been conducted by an authoritative person/body to collect, analyze and translate (at least comprehensively) that ad hoc vocabulary. And this paper finds its reason for being in that gap and proposes how to overcome it.

As a matter of illustration, from 1994 up to recently, the debate about naming what really happened in Rwanda has been hot and endless and subject to controversy at both national and international level (UN, 2014), including within Kinyarwanda speaking spheres themselves. Most importantly, the same worries about ambiguous and equivocal naming genocide matters were raised during the 17th commemoration of the genocide perpetrated

against Tutsi in 2011 where even a recommendation was made to officials and researchers to compile and disseminate one well-searched and standardized set of vocabulary (CNLG, 2011).

On the other hand, nevertheless, some efforts by individuals and organizations should commend to explain linguistically and semantically key terms and expressions. In this regard, lists have been proposed to the public, media and courts (Center for Conflict Management, Media High Council, Kigali Genocide Memorial...). This paper aligns with those works and it selectively focuses on the concepts, steps, actors, victims, methods, places, mechanisms and consequences of the genocide perpetrated against Tutsi in 1994. It strives to answer the crucial question of how the genocide-related terms (speech) can be analyzed in terms of birth/formation/creation, denotative/connotative and contextual usages. We keep in mind the fact that removing language barriers in a communication allows delivering accurate and consistent message. That message, according to Ruzindana (Op.Cit.), can be qualified as constructive or lethal. Similarly, this argumentation departed from the hypothesis stating that each language (including Kinyarwanda) has or may have a way to designate a given concept to cater for its user's communication needs (Niyonsaba 2006:16). Finally, it should be clearly understood that terms and expressions hereby referred to frame with what is commonly labeled as "Language for Specific Purpose" (LSP) which is a set of lexical units (words, phrases or even syntax) that is peculiar to a specific subject area or particular activity(source).

2. Some theoretical considerations

This section highlights key concepts and theories any reader of this paper should be aware of in order to understand the discussions of our findings. In fact, three parts make up this section on theory, i.e. basic reflections on the genocide in general and the genocide perpetrated against Tutsi in particular, the discourse analysis around the genocide as well as the usage of terms and expressions in the context of genocide perpetrated against Tutsi in Rwanda in 1994. Lastly, few words are expressed on corpus building and analysis as the methodology to this study was mainly documentary and it relied on an ad hoc corpus.

2.1. Definition of genocide

Presently, the internationally accepted official definition of genocide is found in the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (UNCG, 1948) which was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 9th, 1948. This term had been first coined by Raphael Lemkin, a Polish-Jewish Jurist by combining the Greek word *genos* for kin, clan, race or tribe and the Latin suffix *caedere* for kill or murder. The UNCG defined genocide as any of the *acts*

committed with the intent¹ to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group as such: Killing members of the group, causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group, deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part, imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group, forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

So far, only the genocide perpetrated against Jews (Holocaust; 1939-1945), the genocide committed against Muslims in former Yugoslavia (1992) and that perpetrated against Tutsi in Rwanda in 1994 have been officially recognized by the United Nations. Other mass killings are still subject to debate within diplomatic and political spheres for official recognition (cases of Cambodia, Armenia, Sudan, Herero, Guatemala...).

2.2. The Genocide process

There might be differences in each of the genocide, but in general all genocides are prepared and executed with the full support of the regime in place. Whatever the circumstances or kind of killings or suffering inflicted to targeted people, the intention remains the core element to qualify what happens of genocide. The following lines come back to the 8 stages of the genocide process as developed by Gregory Stanton when he advocated for the prevention of that inhuman tragedy. For him, the prevention of genocide requires a structural understanding of the genocidal process, i.e. the eight stages or operational processes. The first stages precede later ones, or simply each stage reinforces the others. These eight stages of genocide are classification, symbolization, dehumanization organization, polarization, preparation, extermination and denial (Totten S. and Bartrop, 2009); (Mironko, 2012); (Stanton, Op.Cit.); (IRDP, 2006); (Morel, 2010); (Melvern, 2004); (Desforges, 1999); (Kangura, 1990-1994); (Charny, 2009); (Ntakirutimana, 2011), (Murwanashyaka, 2011).

2.3. The recognition of the Genocide perpetrated against Tutsi in 1994

That the genocide was perpetrated against Tutsi in Rwanda in 1994 remains an indubitable reality. The first and foremost initiative to officially recognize that tragedy has been the creation by the UN Security Council of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) on November 8, 1994, with an aim of "*putting on trial those responsible for genocide and other serious crimes against international humanitarian law*"(UNSC, 1994).

¹ To this point of intention, see Semelin J., (2003). Towards a vocabulary of massacre and genocide in *Journal of Genocide Research*: Carfax Publishing

In addition to the above international mechanism, it should be highlighted that even at national level; the genocide crimes have been recognized and severely punished by both the Gacaca tribunals and classic courts. The Rwandan Constitution (2015) has put the fight against the genocide and its ideology at the center of all efforts and national projects (Rwandan Constitution, 2015). The article 179 of this constitution establishes the Rwanda National Commission for the Fight against the Genocide (CNLG) whose mission consists in coordinating activities and efforts for the perpetuation of the genocide memory in Rwanda and outside. No need to mention several government and private institutions and local/international organizations which got involved in handling the genocide consequences and reconcile Rwandans. All of them proved the commitment to fight against and prevent the genocide crimes in Rwanda and anywhere they may occur in the World.

2.4. Usage of languages (especially Kinyarwanda) before, during and after the Genocide perpetrated against Tutsi

a) Linguistic and social-linguistic viewpoints

We start this section by agreeing with Ruzindana Mathias who, talking about 'criminal words', stated that *"Language is a double-edged sword. It can heal or kill. In the case of the 1994 genocide in Rwanda, the effect of language was lethal."*(Ibid.) The popular statement also argues that words are charged pistols that can produce death. The same views are shared by Gregory S. Goldon (s.d.) who categorized the speech into salutary, neutral and inimical speech. The last type which corresponds to hate speech is also divided into general statements, harassment and incitement. In this respect, the infamous Bikindi's song 'Nanga Abahutu' (I hate Hutu) as well as the Ten Hutu Commandments by Ngeze Hassan (Kangura, 1990) fall in this last subcategory of incitement, while the Mugesera's call (Fletcher, 2014) to send back Tutsi to their origin, Abyssinia via the Nyabarongo River constitutes a case of harassment (Goldon, 2015).

Hate speech and propaganda, incitement, media and dehumanizing language in the context of the genocide perpetrated against Tutsi in 1994 have been subject to few studies (in particular by Rwandans) as compared to legal and social studies. Without intending enumerating all of them and the content of each one, this dissertation borrowed ideas from the existing sociolinguistic studies such as the probably first study on media language which was conducted in 1998 by a team of Rwandan eminent linguists upon the request of ICTR (Nkusi et alii.,1998). Furthermore and later on, the works by Gamariel Mboniyimana and Jean de Dieu Karangwa (s.d.), Evariste Ntakirutimana (2008, 2011), Lynne Tirrell (s.d.), Laurent Nkusi (2000) have contributed greatly to the understanding of this specific field of study, among others.

In the light of the views of the above scholars, the sociolinguistic analysis takes into account the following elements:

- Semantics, which is the representation of the meaning of statements. The word *meaning* has many distinct meaning such as:
 - ✓ The explicit content, i.e. the denotation, the stable or objective meaning
 - ✓ The implicit content, i.e. the connotation made of subjective and variable elements according to users and contexts
 - ✓ The contextual meaning
- The sociolinguistic codes made of cultural norms (social) working selectively on who said, what is said, when and how, to whom, with which effect (Ntakirutimana, 2008:7)
- The partners of communication (speaker and interlocutor), their relationships, their social distances and their intentions.
- The choice of vocabulary which depends of the message to deliver, the speaker's intention and the social and political environment.
- The choice of the style which also depends on the message, the speaker's intention and on the general context
- Different language variants (regional, social).

The above statements were strengthened by Ruzindana (Ibid.) commenting on the ICTR judgments:

The Kinyarwanda language resorts much to polysemy. Words which have more than one meaning are said to be polysemous. There are many ways in which words broaden their meaning, one of them being generalization. The extended meaning of the polysemous Kinyarwanda terms under study shares at least one semantic or functional feature with the basic meaning. They include code words, double meaning, true meaning, implicit or tacit meaning, figurative meaning, underlying meaning, veiled reference...

The context here is to be understood in the broader sense. It includes all the environment surrounding the speech act, including the specific words used, the speaker, the addressee, the language used, the tone of voice, the physical setting, the social, political, historical and cultural aspects, etc. Therefore, in ascertaining the specific meaning of the genocide-related vocabulary, it is necessary to place them contextually, both in time and in space.

b) Elements of discourse analysis

By definition, discourse analysis is an interdisciplinary field, and is basically the study of the language in use, and/or language in social contexts. In other words, discourse analysis consists in

studying linguistic characteristics of a message in their respective conditions of production and the reasons which have led to the existence of the texts. In this regard, the meaning of communication content will not only be determined by the "direct meaning" of the words used, but also by the social aspect of the texts. This is because the significance of a text lies in the relationship between characteristics, occurrences, meanings and the wider context in which the communication takes place.

With the case of the genocide perpetrated against Tutsi in 1994, the discourse analysis needs to go back to the end 1950s and early 1960s when hate speech and dehumanizing language started to be used by officials in public. This followed the discrimination politics against Tutsi minority group which was supported by the successive regimes. Between 1990 and 1994, there was ingenious creation of incendiary vocabulary and it's overt and widespread, with a clear aim of instilling hatred and fear between Hutu and Tutsi and incites Hutu to exterminate Tutsi when time would come. A strong campaign of dehumanization through media, official speeches, and meetings... targeted Tutsi mainly with Kangura, RTLM² broadcasts and CDR³ ideologists and extremists. For instance, the analysis made by Mbonimana & Karangwa (ibidem, p. 8) on the songs by Bikindi Simon showed that his style was characterized by a simple vocabulary likely to be understood by all categories of Rwandans through he resorted sometimes to syntactic and stylistic techniques such as repetitions, proverbs, anaphors, leitmotiv, alliterations, ellipsis, digressions, padding, allusions. These songs are defined as having been major intentional triggers of hatred and incitement to the extermination of more than one million Tutsi and moderate Hutu who were savagely murdered during the 1994 genocide between April and July 1994.

c) The role of media before and during the Tutsi genocide in 1994

It seems important to stress that, owing to the proliferation of print media between 1990 and 1994, the war between the then Rwandan government and the RPF⁴, and the introduction of multiparty democracy, a number of Kinyarwanda terms had acquired new extended or broader meanings in order to accommodate numerous new realities. This explains why some of the extended meanings of the key words being analyzed in this paper cannot be found in pre-1994 Kinyarwanda dictionaries and other reference documents (Ruzindana, Ibid).

The role of media during the 1994 genocide against Tutsi was also highlighted by Carlyn Jorgensen (online) who, based on the analysis of RTLM broadcasts and Kangura issues, explained their dehumanizing language such as calling Tutsi and political leaders dogs, cows, goats, hyenas, lions, monkeys, pigs, cockroaches, snakes. Calling someone a hyena was highly insulting as the name hyena is used to label a dirt person and wish him/her dead; calling a person or group of people cockroaches was akin to sentencing someone to death (p.2).

According to the above author, various types of language were used in media, namely high-context and low-context communication. High-context communication is the communication that tends to be indirect, ambiguous, cautious and subtle; low-context communication, on the other hand, tends towards directness, self-disclosure and confrontation. In high context, what is 'what you hear is what you get' and there is generally directness in communication. While communication in Rwanda tends to be high-context, the media used a mix of both, though low-context communication tended to occur more often after the genocide started. In addition to the inflammatory language, the RTLM and Kangura also used the fear language to try and convince Hutu to exterminate Tutsi as a self-defense measure; that they were in a 'kill or be killed situation'.

The Rwandan popular wisdom is embedded with proverbs that are used by wise and intelligent people. Those proverbs are meant to convey strong messages. Obviously, to incite as many people as possible to adhere to the criminal project of genocide, it requires resorting to all possible stylistic and rhetoric methods, including proverbs and idioms which are more convincing (Ntakirutimana, 2008:8). In their effort to dehumanize Tutsi using lot of terms and expressions (for instance equating them to all kinds of animals and insects), the speakers also resorted much to the use of proverbs and set expressions which were more meaningful for illiterate addressees with whom oral tradition prevails. Proverbs and set expressions refer to the kind of popular wisdom accepted by all, an appropriate technique in convincing and persuading.

The rhetoric of hatred has been largely documented by the Rwanda Media High Council (2011:29-31) where the emphasis has been put on the usage of proverbs, metaphors and euphemisms throughout hate speech, Kangura issues and RTLM broadcasts. Lastly, as shown selected terms and expressions, Rwandans largely use coded vocabulary where common terms and expressions acquire new meanings depending on the context of usage. Hence they are easily and simply understood by Kinyarwanda speakers. This method has been of large use during the whole genocide process.

² Radio Television Libre des Mille Collines

³ Coalition for the Defense of the Republic and Democracy

⁴ Rwandese Patriotic Front

In sum, between 1990 and 1994, people assisted in the proliferation of terms and expressions about hate speech and propaganda as highlighted by media and language experts. War and political campaigns exacerbated tensions between Hutu and Tutsi through a more virulent language in official speeches as well as in informal communications. The RTLM broadcasts were mainly characterized by the use of simple and understandable register for all categories of Rwandans, mainly peasants and the youth who were manipulated by the regime in place. Messages were repeated with an aim of insisting on delivered facts and persuade people that they are true (example of incessant repetition of Hutu Power in the gatherings to galvanize the crowds). The language also often resorted to the metaphors⁵, hyperboles⁶ and exaggeration of facts. The irony and humor were also used through caricatures in written press with an aim of dehumanizing the opposed group and incite to its hatred (examples of all Kangura issues). In some cases, hatred is passed through jokes and humors indeed, though insults, rudeness and vulgar expressions were also increasing used to *demean the enemy*. This has strong impact when expressed by officials or intellectuals and have no effect on their authors.

d) Importance of explaining genocide-related terms and expressions

Efficient communication plays a paramount role in the success of any business or activity. For this particular reason, specialists or all participants within a specific subject area must agree on the use of terms describing the concepts they deal with. Here comes is the role of terminology as a powerful means of terms standardization through the production of specialized reference works (terminologies and/or specialized dictionaries). This standardization of terms consists in defining terminological norms and consequently imposing usage upon the users of a particular subject area, serving as corrector and harmonizer of a language.

As far as genocide matters are concerned, there is high risk to misinterpret some concepts which must have the same definition (characteristic of any concept). Given the challenges of understanding Kinyarwanda especially its sensitive and polysemous terms and expressions, a harmonized terminology is worth working on, otherwise communication would be hampered. To this point, there is way to commend works already started or produced so far. The work of Media High Council (2011) provided

the basic word lists in three languages (i.e. Kinyarwanda, English and French) to be used by journalists in particular and the public in general. Other analytic works by linguists and genocide scholars who explained the vocabulary of hate speech, propaganda, dehumanization, incitement to genocide... are also worth mentioning. This paper aligns those works and it is drawn from a big project in perspective to produce genocide-related comprehensive glossaries and encyclopedias.

3. Methodological approach

The collection, presentation and discussions of data used in this paper followed both terminological and social-linguistic approaches. In fact, the terminological method was used collecting and sorting out texts to be included in the corpus. A corpus⁷ is the source material chosen for a specific terminographical task from which the designations that make up the list for a terminological search are extracted (Cabr  1999:121). During the process of sampling, the starting point has been collecting, gathering and reading various written materials mostly relevant to the topic of genocide. In this regard, libraries and documentation centers were visited in search of documents that may be helpful in the perception of mechanisms of the field under study. The result has been the selection of most relevant documents on the genocide perpetrated against Tutsi in 1994. The latter included texts in Kinyarwanda, English and French. For triangulation purpose, I collected all those texts and incorporated them in three separate corpora.

The corpus building has been the second step. Therefore, among a long list of testimonies and other texts (both hard copies and soft ones), representative texts in the three languages have been picked and proportionally incorporated into the corpus as follows: In total, the balanced corpora that were used in this study comprised 2,014,742 Kinyarwanda words, 1,511,459 English words and 1,997,623 French words. All texts were stored in electronic format (*.txt) in order to allow term extraction and sorting out occurrences/concordances around selected terms and expressions. A focus was put on selecting relevant documents that may help both in clearly getting the right information on the research topic

⁵ *Metaphor*: implicit comparison: the use to describe somebody or something of a word or phrase that is not meant literally but by means of a vivid comparison expresses something about him, her, or it, e.g. saying that somebody is a snake (From Encarta English Dictionary)

⁶ *Hyperbole*: Exaggeration: deliberate and obvious exaggeration used for effect (Ibid.)

⁷ - A large collection of writings of a specific kind or on a specific subject". It is also "a collection of writings or recorded remarks used for linguistic analysis". (*Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary*/ Online/)

- A large collection of samples of a language on computer." The sample can come from anywhere the language is used in speech and in writings. The corpus helps us understand more about the language and see how people use it when they speak or when they write". (www.cambridge.org/let/corpus/cic/htm)

and most importantly lending a hand in carrying out a terminological research. Complete sources and references were also recorded.

The third step dealt with extracting terms and expressions related to the genocide perpetrated against Tutsi from the corpus and processing them. Then, statistics showed terms with high hits in the each corpus; and genocide-related terms were highlighted. In order to come up with this, polysemous and coined terms likely to cause trouble to a lay audience were selected and compiled in order to subsequently be analyzed. From a long list of those terms, only twenty most frequent and meaningful were picked and extended to the whole corpus to see the concordances and collocates. In fact, this browsing helped in getting close terms both on left and right side of the chosen terms. The whole process has been facilitated by the AntConc Software which allows such corpus processing. It should be noted that sole twenty terms and expressions were chosen for analysis and explanation in the framework of this paper. The remaining raw textual material is reserved to produce dictionaries and encyclopedias on the genocide perpetrated against Tutsi in Rwanda in 1994. The table of fifteen (15) terms and expressions chosen for analysis is presented below.

4. Findings

This section focuses on few terms and expressions around the genocide perpetrated against Tutsi in Rwanda in 1994 which have been selected for analysis in this paper. As mentioned above, they

are sampled from big corpora that will generate different reference works in further research. In this specific case, only fifteen (15) expressions are hereby presented and explained with the purpose of showing how the vocabulary around the Tutsi genocide is created or evolved. Briefly, they can be categorized into the following themes: Hate speech, dehumanization and denial language, killing methods, actors, after-genocide life (including justice).

N0	Term/expression in Kinyarwanda	Equivalent in English	Equivalent in French	Comments
01	jenosiîde	Genocide [1]	génocide	-Borrowed term from English
02	jenosiîde yakôrewe Abatuutsi	genocide perpetrated against Tutsi in Rwanda [2]	Génocide perpétré contre les Tutsi au Rwanda	Coined after controversy
03	RTL	RTL [3] <i>incendiary radio</i> <i>hate radio</i>	RTL <i>radio incendiaire</i> <i>radio de la haine</i> <i>Radio machette</i>	Created in 1992 with synonyms
04	intêrahâmwe	intêrahâmwe militias [4]	miliciens intêrahâmwe	Coinage +change of meaning
05	impûuzamûgaâmbi	CDR extremists [5]	Extremistes de la CDR	
06	hutu pawa	Hutu power [6] <i>hardliner extremist</i> <i>radical</i>	Hutu power <i>extrémiste hutu</i>	Coinage and borrowing
07	inyeênzi	cockroaches [7]	cancrélat	Coinage with equivalent at word level

08	umwâanzi	enemy [8] <i>traitor</i> <i>accomplice</i>	ennemi <i>traître</i> <i>complice</i>	Usual term with extended (contextual) meanings
09	inkootanyi	inkootanyi [9] enemy	inkootanyi <i>ennemi</i>	Usual term with extended meanings
10	gutêma ibihurû	to clear the bus [10]	débroussailler	Idiomatic and euphemistic expression with lot of synonyms
11	igitêero	hutu mob attack [11]	attaque	Usual term with extended meanings
12	kubôhoza	Liberation [12]	libération	Usual term with extended(contextual) meanings
13	uwacîtse ku icûmu	genocide survivor [13]	survivant du génocide	Coinage after the genocide
14	indakêmwa	rescuer [14]	juste	Adaptation
15	Gacaâca	Gacaâca court(s)	Tribunal Gacaâca	Borrowing

5. Discussions of findings

In this section, more clarifications are provided on the above-mentioned terms and expressions in order to help the current and future generations well understand how the language and messages can be salutary or lethal. For Kinyarwanda in particular, it proved to be a highly changing language with several and different ways to express the same reality (polysemy). There is no concepts entering a given language. A borrowing helps in rendering more easily the concept which would otherwise be expressed by a long paraphrase in the target language. However, it is worth acknowledging that it violates the linguistic integrity of a language. Like many other domains which resort to borrowing in Kinyarwanda, the genocide-related terminology uses some French and English borrowings, the reason is that the genocide was planned and it occurred before it was named, i.e. the reality of genocide did not exist in the Rwandan vocabulary (IRDP:2006).

[3] RTLM: The French acronym *RTLM* means *Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines* and it is used as such across all languages. In English, it has synonyms such as “incendiary radio” or “hate radio” to imply the devastating effect its broadcasts had before and during the genocide against Tutsi.

[4] Interahamwe militias: This compound word means in English, *impûuzamûgaâmbi* means “People with one single purpose” “People who have the same aim or stand up together to perform a given task”. According to Linda Melvern (2004, p.26 & 118), this MRND⁸-Defense of the Republic and Democracy (CDR), political party of hard-affiliated militia was created at the end of 1991 from an initial liners up to July 1994.

small group of Sunday morning football club called “Leisure”. The President of this club, Kajuga Robert, was named the National

doubt that further naming would occur in future as things keep changing.

[1] Genocide: It was highlighted that the concept of genocide was borrowed from foreign languages and applied to Rwandan tragedy. Borrowing is a natural linguistic phenomenon and it is used to meet the needs of designating new

[2] Genocide perpetrated against Tutsi: This official naming of the Rwandan tragedy came after endless debate within local and international spheres. We may mention Rwandan genocide, mass killings, genocide and mass killings, civil war, crime against humanity. In fact, each of these names has its own meaning depending of the context in which it occurs. Nevertheless, the genocide remains unique by its definition (intent).

President of Interahamwe in exchange for using his players. The Interahamwe were formalized in 1992. It comprised coordinated structure and organization from national to grass root (cell) level. One of the hard-liners’ newspapers was also named *Interahamwe*.

[5] CDR extremist(s): Literally, the Kinyarwanda compound term

A coalition means:

- Temporal alliance that is dealt between individuals, groups or parties to defend common interests and
- Temporal alliance against common enemy (Encarta Dictionary)

⁸ Revolutionary Movement for National Development (MRND)

The second meaning (b) applies well to the Rwandan case.

[6] Hutu power: The word *pawa* is borrowed from English “power” and it means “strength”. To the common knowledge, *Hutu pawa* was first announced by the then political leader called Frodouald Karamira at a political meeting in Gitarama and it drew widespread support at a rally in Kigali on October 23, 1993. Hutu power members advocated for a “pure Hutu race and regime” and the elimination of Tutsi minority.

[7] Cockroaches: Etymologically, the word *inyeenzi* is the anagram to name Tutsi monarchist rebels who attacked the young Rwandan Republic in early 1960s in order to conquer the power. It is derived from the Kinyarwanda *Ingangururugo Ziyemeje kuba Inyeenzi*: *Ingangururugo* who promised to be brave.

The expression of “cockroaches” was taken on by Hutu Presidents Kayibanda and Habyarimana who applied it to all Tutsi both inside and outside the Rwanda, in this sense to mean cockroaches (IRDP: 2006, p.26). This expression carries a dehumanizing meaning in this context.

[8] Enemy: The word “enemy” was previously and abusively used to label the RPF fighters and their supporters. It is on 21 September 1992 that the Rwandan Army defined clearly the enemy as follows:

“the principal enemy is the Tutsi inside or outside the country, extremist and nostalgic for power and who never recognized or will never recognize the realities of social revolution of 1959 and who want to take back their power by any means, including weapons. The accomplice of the enemy is anyone who supports the enemy” (Melvern, 2004: 23).

From this definition, it appears that the term “accomplice” could be extended even to foreigners. See *Document N0 437 of 21 September 1992 by the former Rwandan Army's Intelligence Services* [Online].

In broader sense, the term enemy can have several meaning and usages depending on the context (peace vs war time).

[9] inkotanyi: The term *Inkotanyi* translated respectively in English as ‘indomitable fighters’, ‘brave warriors’, ‘fierce fighters’, ‘those who fight courageously’ by different authors got diverse meanings across periods of history:

1. One of the militias at the Reign of Kigeli IV Rwabugiri at the end 19th Century. The same name was taken by the RPF armed

wing (RPA) since October 1990 when they launched an attack against Rwanda

2. For Tutsi, the term *Inkotanyi* conjures images of brave warriors sent to save Rwandans from Genocide.
3. For extremist Hutu, the term *Inkotanyi* was rarely used alone; they mostly used *Inyenzi-Nkotanyi*, *Inyenzi-ntutsi* to mean and dehumanize both the RPF soldiers and Tutsi indistinctly.
4. Today, in addition to former rebel fighters, *Inkotanyi* also means indistinctly members of RPF as ruling political party and it is borrowed by English and French as such.

[10] to clear the bush: This is an euphemistic expression that was used during the genocide to mean killing Tutsi. It has a lot of synonyms such as:

- to work
- to carry out community work
- to neutralize the enemy
- to exterminate the enemy
- To get rid of enemy

[11] Hutu mob attack: This term can have different meanings depending on the context: In the genocide-related context, the attack could be made of simple peasants with traditional weapons or organized mobs of killers under the supervision of grass root leaders, soldiers, policemen or intellectuals, sometimes with firearms in order to quickly exterminate a big number of Tutsi (Mironko 2014:107-115).

[12] Liberation: Since 1991, members of political parties in opposition used to conduct violent attacks against local leaders loyal to MRND and they maintained that they were liberating the population from the MRND's burden. The term liberate had its meaning changed in regard to that practice: Thus, before and during the genocide, rapes, forced weddings, looting, taking houses and plots were labeled as ‘liberation’ Kimonyo (2008:127).

In few days after the end of genocide in July 1994, liberation meant taking abandoned properties which were left by the owners inside the country who had been killed or fled in neighboring countries.

Today, the term liberation has more positive meaning: Politically, Rwandans got liberated from the genocidal and dictatorial regime since 1994 and it is now striving for sustainable and self-reliant development. At individual level, liberation would mean changing the mindset especially in terms of fighting against negative attitude and poverty.

[13] Genocide survivor: Under its jurisdiction, the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda recognizes the genocide survivor as someone who survived the genocide acts and other crimes against humanity committed in Rwanda between January and December 1994. The official definition by the Rwandan Government seems more inclusive as it extends genocide acts and other crimes against humanity committed between October 1990 and December 1994.

[14] Rescuer: This term has been coined by the team of researchers who conducted a pilot study on the Rwandans and foreigners who rescued Tutsi during the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, under the auspices of IBUKA in 2010. In fact, the concept of rescuer evolved from any non-Jew citizen who took the risks of helping hunted Jews during the Nazi extermination between 1939 and 1945, without expecting any compensation. In the post-genocide Rwanda, the Jew concept of rescuer has been borrowed to be applied to the Rwandan and foreign people who saved Tutsi during the 1994. They are considered as models to follow in the framework of the genocide commemoration in Rwanda and for the peaceful cohabitation. See Kayishema & Masabo (2010).

[15] Gacaca: This term is borrowed from Kinyarwanda and it is likely to have extended meanings depending on the context of usage. In traditional context, it used to be a kind of popular court where disputing people sat and settled their conflicts with the facilitation of wise peers. In the context of genocide, Gacaca referred to judgment of perpetrators by their neighbors with an aim of eradicating the culture of impunity on one side, and reconcile people on the other hand (MINIJUST, 2012). In daily life, people use the term Gacaca to mean finding ways of solving conflicts.

6. Conclusion

This paper tried to analyze terms and expressions with specific meanings related to the genocide perpetrated against Tutsi in Rwanda in 1994. It basically showed how most of them are drawn from everyday language while few ones were either borrowed or coined to fill in terminological gaps that were created by new realities (such as the genocide) to be named. The literature review consisted in two main parts, i.e. one section of the genocide in general and the genocide perpetrated against Tutsi in particular. An emphasis was put on hate speech, propaganda as well as incitement to genocide as it has been analyzed by Rwandan and foreign scholars, especially between 1990 and 1994 where many terms and expressions have been

coined or changed with the purpose of serving the genocide plan. Linguistic and socio linguistic features of languages used (especially Kinyarwanda) before, during and after the genocide were also briefly explained in a bid of clarifying the readership.

Methodologically, this paper resorted to terminological approach which consisted in collecting, presenting, processing and analyzing representative terms and expressions (15 in total) from big corpora in Kinyarwanda, English and French. Documentary method also helped to triangulate linguistic data and sort out contextual usages of chosen terms and expressions. For the sake of clarifications, translations into French and Kinyarwanda were provided though the analysis was made in English. It is worth emphasizing here that those terms and set expressions are just samples of many realities that need to be documented as shown in the methodology. This paper has proven the assumption stating that any language (including Kinyarwanda) has its own way of designating new concepts. These terminological units were compiled for the simple reason that it was believed that Rwandans and Kinyarwanda are in good position to express the realities of the Tutsi genocide better than foreigners. To this end, the process of term birth in Kinyarwanda through derivation, coinage, compounding, borrowing, terminological phrases and other literal and non-literal techniques were explored, as well as the term disappearance. It is hoped it enriched the existing documentation about the Tutsi genocide and opened doors to further descriptive researches on that complex field of study.

7. References

1. CABRÉ, M.T., (1999). *Terminology: Theories, Methods and Applications*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
2. DES FORGES, A., (1999). *Leave none to tell the story. Genocide in Rwanda*, London: HRW
3. FLETCHER, (2014). Words That Can Kill: The Mugesera Speech and the 1994 Tutsi Genocide in Rwanda, In *Journal of Multidisciplinary International Studies*, Vol 11,N01
4. GOLDON, S. G., (s.d.), *Speech Along the Atrocity Spectrum*, pp.429-431 [Online] Accessed on June 10, 2015
5. IRDP, (2006). *Génocide des Tutsi: Causes, exécution et devoir de mémoire* : Kigali
6. JORGENSEN, C., (s.d.), *The Role of Language in the Media during the 1994 Rwandan Genocide* [online] Accessed on 27/6/2015
7. KAYISHEMA, JMV., MASABO, F. , (2010). *Les Justes Rwandais « Indakemwa » : Etude pilote* : Kigali
8. KIMONYO, J.P., (2008). *Rwanda. Un génocide populaire*, Paris : Karthala

9. MBONIMANA, G., KARANGWA, J.D., (s.d.). Etude thématique des chansons *Twasezereye*, Nous avons dit adieu, *Nanga abahutu ou Akabyutso*, Je déteste les Hutu ou L'Eveil et *Bene Sebahinzi ou Intabaza*, Les descendants de Sebahinzi ou L'alerte de Simon BIKINDI : Expertise réalisée pour le compte du TPIR (Arusha)
10. RWANDA MEDIA HIGH COUNCIL, (2011). *Appropriate journalistic language in relation to Genocide against Tutsis in Rwanda: Key Guidelines*, Kigali: MHC
11. MELVERN, L., (2006). *Conspiracy to murder: the Rwandan genocide*, London & New York.
12. MIRONKO, Ch., (2009). (2014). Dehumanization revisited in *Confronting genocide in Rwanda: Dehumanization, Denial and Strategies for Prevention*, Conference Proceedings, Bogota: Epidama Ediciones Ltd
13. MOREL, J., (2010). *La France au cœur du génocide des Tutsi*, Paris : Esprit Frappeur
14. MURWANASHYAKA, J., (2011). *Beyond Mass Murder. Proof Erase and Genocide Denial*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis
15. NKUSI, L., (2010). Le Génocide perpétré contre les Tutsi : Documentation, Mémoire et Réconciliation après le Génocide des Tutsi en 1994 : Un défi possible à relever dans *Actes du Colloque '16 years after the genocide perpetrated against tutsi: Handling its Consequences'* Kigali: CNLG
b. ----- (2010). Homologie thématique des discours de la haine, source de l'idéologie de génocide au Rwanda in *Conference Proceedings*, Kigali: CNLG
16. NKUSI, L., RUZINDANA, M., & RWIGAMBA, B., (1998). *La langue Kinyarwanda : Son usage et impact dans les divers médias pendant la période 1990-1994 : Une étude sociolinguistique*, Kigali : ICTR
17. NTAKIRUTIMANA, E., (2010). Les mots pour le dire in *Rwanda Journal, Series A, 2010 : Arts and Humanities*, UNR
b. -----(2010). Les paroles traumatisantes: Un défi langagier à relever in *Actes du Colloque*, Kigali : CNLG
c.----- (2012). Les proverbes et la Bible avant les machettes dans « *Actes du Colloque : Testimonies and Reflections* ». Kigali : CNLG
d.----- (2008). Cry havoc : Discourse of war in Rwanda, 1994 in *Revue Scientifique de l'ULK*, N0 10: Editions de l'Université Libre de Kigali
18. REPUBLIC OF RWANDA, (2012). *Summary of the report presented at the closing of Gacaca courts activities*. Ministry of Justice: Kigali
19. RUZINDANA, M., (s.d). *The challenges of understanding Kinyarwanda key terms used to instigate the 1994 genocide in Rwanda, Chapter 4*. [online]Checked on 10 November 2014
20. SEMELIN, J., (2003). Toward a vocabulary of massacre and genocide in *Journal of Genocide Research* [online], checked on December 10, 2014
21. STANTON, G., *8 Stages of Genocide* [online] Available at <http://www.genocidewatch.org> Checked on 20 September 2014
22. The Rwandan Constitution, (2015), Article 5
23. TIMMERMAN, W., (2005) The Relationship between Hate Propaganda and Incitement to Genocide, In *Leiden Journal of International Law*, 18, pp. 257-282
24. TOTTEN, S., BARTROP, P.S., (Ed.), (2009). *The Genocide Studies Reader*, New York and London: Routledge
25. TOTTEN, S., et BARTROP, P., (2008). *The Dictionary of Genocide*, Connecticut/London : Greenwood Press
26. TYRRELL, L.,(s.d.), *Genocidal Language Games* [Online]
27. United Nations on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide Adopted by Resolution 260 (III) A of the United Nations General Assembly on 9, November 1948.

Author: BIMENYIMANA Valens, BA, MA
University of Kibungo (UNIK)
P.O. Box 06 Kibungo
Phone: +250 788644060
Email: bimenyimana75@gmail.com (Private)
Valens.bimenyimana@unik.ac.rw (Official)